OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

6-7 EDWARD VII., 1906-7

VOL. LXXX

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIRST DAY OF MARCH TO THE FIFTH DAY OF APRIL, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1906–7

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 1, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Tnree o'clock.

PAPERS RE SUB-TARGET GUNS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. I beg leave to renew the motion I made yesterday that the return to the House with reference to the purchase of 250 sub-target guns be referred to the Public Accounts Committee for investigation.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I quite concur.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LAND BELT, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) to ratify an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of British Columbia respecting the western boundary of the Railway Belt. He said: This is simply a formal Bill carrying out an agreement entered into between this government and the government of British Columbia as to the actual delimitation of the western boundary of the Canadian Pacific Railway land belt.

KAIEN ISLANDS TITLE—PAPERS.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not remember at this moment whether or not a motion was made in connection with the Kaien Islands title.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I think papers are down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could the minister inform me whether the papers as brought down contain the particulars of the title? It was said that this government had given a certain title, whatever it could, to the Grand Trunk Pacific as I understood.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is down. I have not really looked through the papers to see, but I am satisfied it is in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I shall look it up myself and remind the minister.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS.

House again in committee on Bill (No.36) to aid in the prevention and settlement of strikes and lockouts in mines and industries connected with public utilities.—Mr. Lemieux.

On section 24—where settlement effected, memorandum of same with report to be forwarded to minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) has an amendment to move.

Mr. PARDEE. I wish to move that this section be amended by inserting after the word 'authorized' in line 31 the following words: 'and shall, if the parties so agree, be binding as if made as a recommendation of the board under section 55 of this Act.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will my hon. friend explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. PARDEE. The question was raised by the hon. leader of the opposition the other day, what would happen if, after convening the board, and proceeding with the case, the parties should come to an agreement between themselves. Several suggestions were made, and I remarked that if that should happen it would be exactly the same as a settlement by consent in an ordinary civil case before the courts, and the terms of the agreement should be as binding on the parties as if it were a recommendation of the board. After discussion, it was thought that that might possibly savour of compulsion, and both the employer and the employee might be bound by something that they had not intended to be bound by. The amendment I propose provides that if, after the board has been convened and proceedings have commenced, and possibly some evidence has been taken, the parties should come to an agreement between themselves, that shall have the same force and effect as a recommendation of the board if they agree to that, while if they do not agree to that, then it will not be a recommendation of the board, but simply a private agreement between themselves.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does that meet the objection of the hon. member for Nanaimo?

Mr. PARDEE. The hon. member for Nanaimo seemed to think the other day that my suggestion involved compulsion. There can be no compulsion if the parties themselves agree that the terms of their agreement shall be a recommendation of the board.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That is satisfactory.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 25—where settlement not effected, board to make report with recommendations.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This section is quite easy to understand. It will give the public an unbiased and unprejudiced report, instead of a report coming through the press, which may take sides with one party or the other. The report, when published, will be published as sent to the minister and signed by the arbitrators.

Section agreed to.

On section 26—form in which recommendation shall be made.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is taken verbatim from the New Zealand legislation.

Section agreed to.

On section 27—report and recommendation to be made to the minister in writing.

Mr. GALLIHER. It seems to me that it would be advisable that the minority report should also be filed. Suppose that the arbitrator representing the company and the third arbitrator agree, but there is a dissenting member of the board. As the section stands, we would only receive the report of the two who agreed, and the public would have no idea of the views of the dissenting member. Therefore I would suggest that the following words be added to this section; 'and in the same manner a minority report may be made by any dissenting member of the board.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. When this clause was drafted I had in my mind the idea that, if there was a minority report, the report of the board would always contain both; but, as my hon. friend suggests, it might be just as well to have it clearly stated in the Act, so that all parties will have the advantage of having their views published. Besides, in any report made to parliament, I think it is the custom, when there is a minority report, to publish it alongside with the majority report.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 28—filing and distribution of report.

Mr. GALLIHER. It will be necessary to amend this section in the same way, by adding after the word 'report' in the sixth line, the words 'and any minority report.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. I agree to that. I think it is sound policy. In connection with legislation of this nature, which relies on public opinion it is wise that the report should be distributed broadcast, especially amongst the unions. The minister should have that discretionary power, whenever a demand is made upon him.

Section agreed to.

On section 29—publication of report,

Mr. GALLIHER. The same amendment will have to be inserted there. Insert after the word 'board,' in line seventeen, the words 'and any minority report as well.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 30—powers of board to summon witnesses, etc.,

Mr. LEMIEUX. The first part is taken word for word from the Railway Labour Disputes Act. I think we ought to give the board as much power as possible, and not allow any technical or legal objection to hinder its action. It should have as much power as any court.

On section 31—form of summons,

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is taken from the Railway Labour Disputes Act.

On section 32—documents not to be made public,

Mr. CONMEE. The wording of this section would confine the right or examination to the parties themselves, but they might require an expert accountant. That might be remedied by inserting after the word 'parties' the words 'or their agents.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. The better way would be to strike out the words 'of the' before the word 'parties.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 34—allowance to witnesses,

Mr. BOYCE. This provides that witnesses shall be paid according to the scale for the time being in force with respect to witnesses in civil suits. But there is one scale for the division court and another for the superior court. Better make it according to the superior court.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to have the advice of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) on this point. We can bring up that question later on.

On section 35—witnesses in railway disputes,

Mr. LEMIEUX. As that affects the railways, we will let that stand.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Are the other clauses that concern railway men also to stand?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Anything in the Bill affecting the railway men stands until I have received a reply from the representative of the railway brotherhoods, Mr. Harvey Hall.

Mr. BARR. Does the minister contemplate leaving out the railway men altogether?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am expecting an answer in a day or two from Mr. Harvey Hall, before going on with these clauses.

Mr. BARR. Then it depends on Mr. Hall.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not exactly; but as he represents a number of brotherhoods, I thought it would be only right to hear their views before putting this legislation through.

On section 38—View by direction of board—Power to interrogate. Examination of factories, &c. Inspection of work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is taken from the New Zealand, New South Wales and West Australia labour legislation.

Mr. CONMEE. This seems a very useful section, but I think that it could be amended to advantage. Under the section as it is, no inspection of the works and premises, &c., can take place until the board shall have determined that there is danger that a strike or lock-out may take place. Then, the board or any member thereof, or any other person duly authorized, can exercise this power of examination of premises, and interrogation of employees or employer. Why not give this power to the registrar, so that he may act even before the board is convened?

Mr. GALLIHER. The board are in the same position as the jury in a trial going to take a view, that they may deal with the matter involved more intelligently.

Mr. CONMEE. But I do not see why it is necessary to wait until the court is convened. If evidence as to the local conditions is necessary, why should not one of the parties be able to get an order from the registrar to make investigation.

Mr. GALLIHER. It would involve all sorts of inconveniences.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not see why that should be. It seems to me it would facilitate matters.

Mr. LOGAN. This gives the board power to authorize entry upon private property which is a very serious power to grant, and it is one which should be exercised under the most conservative conditions. It seems to me that to leave this to the registrar would be to give that official a power greater than is needed and one that should be exercised only under direction of the court.

Mr. CONMEE. But would a single member of the court be more likely to act conservatively in these matters than the registrar, who is the deputy minister of the department?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is the board, not a single member of the board, who gives this power.

Mr. CONMEE. It says 'the board or any member thereof.'

Mr. LOGAN. But any other person must have the authority of the board in writing, as the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) will see if he reads the section.

Mr. CONMEE. It says 'The board or any member thereof, and, on being authorized in writing by the board, any other person' may enter the premises. The hon. gentleman may be right in his interpretation. But my point is that this means delay until the board is convened, and I think it will facilitate matters if the power were given to the registrar.

Mr. GALLIHER. Even when there is no dispute on?

Mr. CONMEE. There would be no request for such an examination except when there is a dispute.

Mr. GALLIHER. Then, there is no need for granting the power.

Mr. PORTER. I would call the attention of the minister (Mr. Lemieux) to the fact that there is no provision here for notice to the other parties. It authorizes the board or any member of it, or any person authorized by the board, to enter the premises at any time. This means that they would have the authority to enter a man's premises at night. It seems to me only fair that the party should have notice in some way of what is taking place.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not think it necessary that formal notice should be given that a view of the place would be directed by the board, because a view of the premises will be directed by the board in the presence of the party. Besides it is just as well that the board should be able to decide at any time to view the locality or the place where the trouble has arisen.

Mr. PORTER. I cannot understand how that order by the board can be made in the presence of the party. As soon as the board is convened it may make that direction at once in absence of the party. I think it is only fair that he should have some direct notice.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not agree with the member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) in that

regard. The matter in dispute might be the condition of a certain part of a mine; the men might have gone out on strike because a certain part of the mine was not ventilated, or there was some condition to which they objected. We should give the board power to send the man there immediately upon its formation, without notice.

I would like to point out to my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) something with reference to his suggestion that the registrar in Ottawa should have power to authorize any man to go upon the premises. There are mines in this Dominion of a very dangerous character; the men have to go down with safety lamps, and penalties are imposed upon them if they take matches into the mine. Does the hon. gentleman really think that we should give the registrar here in Ottawa power to authorize some man to go down into that mine in Nova Scotia or elsewhere, when, by his lack of knowledge or negligence, he might blow the whole mine up and destroy the property entirely? Should not that power be confined to the board itself?

Mr. CONMEE. I do not see that the mine would be in any great danger of being blown up by giving the power I have asked for. I would suggest that instead of the registrar having that power it should be the minister. I think that where there is a dispute going on there ought to be facilities to enable the parties to acquaint themselves with the matters in respect of which they will have to give evidence instead of having the examination prolonged for days and weeks, and perhaps months, in order first to get the authorization, after the board is formed and secondly to send a party to make the examination. There will be no greater risk because authority is given by the minister. The parties will take pains to acquaint everybody with the conditions. They will send some one with the examiner. No man will examine a mine without having somebody to accompany him who would protect the mine and property from any of the calamities to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), but as Minister of Labour I would object to making any such order as the one he suggests which is intended to direct the board. Let us as much as possible leave the putting into motion of the machinery of the Act to the board itself, and as little as possible to the minister. It is already a great power that is vested in the minister to appoint the third arbitrator when the two parties fail to agree. We should shrink from the idea of giving the minister power to enter at any moment into an establishment without any notice. The minister after all is in politics, and sometimes it might savour of tyranny if he were to exercise that power. I would rather leave it with the board itself so that public opinion would respect the decisions of the board pending an investigation, whereas if we left that power in the hands of the minister public opinion might become divided, and not a few would say that the minister has done something which he should not have done and which should have been left in the hands of the board.

Mr. PORTER. I cannot agree with the minister nor with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) that no notice should be given. If I understand their argument, it is that the board should have the right at any time to go on and inspect a man's premises, without a notice which would allow him to put his house in order, so to speak, before the inspector got there. This provision in the clause it seems to me is in direct violation of one of the very first principles of British liberty, to say that a man's property should be taken possession of, so to speak, by any authority or person without notice. I am not arguing or suggesting that he should have a notice of two days or five days or ten days, but it does seem to me to be a violation of the rights of the individual or corporation to allow a person to walk into your premises when you are absent and nobody is there in your interest. If any notice whatever is given surely the case that is imagined by the minister could not arise. When he goes there to make his inspection he tells the proprietor of the premises, I am going to make an inspection, and the proprietor will send some one with the inspector to see that the investigation is properly carried out. The proprietor ought to know what is going on as well as the board.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think any board would ever make an inspection in any other way.

On section 42,

42. No counsel or solicitor shall be entitled to appear or be heard before the board, except with the consent of the parties to the dispute, and notwithstanding such consent the board may decline to allow counsel or solicitors to appear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is taken from the Labour Disputes Act. It might be in some cases that the employees would be placed at a disadvantage in being unable to retain counsel, while the companies would be able to engage the best legal talent. In order to shorten the proceedings before the board I think this is a good provision.

Mr. HAGGART. Why not allow one party to this dispute to employ counsel?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If both parties agree then they can have counsel.

Mr. HAGGART. This clause requires the consent of both parties?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. For instance, a union engaged in an industrial warfare against a big trust company appears before the board, the trust will be in a position to retain the best legal talent in the country, while the poor union might not be in that position. It is better to treat both parties alike and to say that counsel or solicitors will not be admitted unless both parties agree to have their representatives. Besides, it would prevent the union from incurring any large costs, because we were told during this debate that the labour element would already have spent large amounts in negotiating with the company. If after having had these negotiations they decide, before declaring the strike, to apply for a board, it is fair that they should go there and present their case in a business like way and not be forced to retain counsel declaring which would entail more costs.

Mr. BOYCE. I must confess that I am unable to follow the minister's reasoning on this point. When this board is constituted the trial of the issue has a somewhat judicial character.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. It would be a fallacy if one party, whether it be the employer or the employee, cannot have his solicitor or counsel to represent his interests at investigation. In a division court case involving only $10, the parties are entitled to be represented by counsel. I fail to see the reasoning of the hon. gentleman. For instance he speaks of a wealthy corporation as the employer on one side——

Mr. LEMIEUX. The union.

Mr. BOYCE—or a number of individuals as constituting a union on the other side; if this clause were to remain in the law one could block the other and burk investigation, and what is to take place during that time with both at arms length, with a sharp issue between them, if it is made obligatory upon them to give consent that each shall have counsel? I might point out that possibly he may have unwittingly thrown a barrier in the way of expeditious and easy investigation and that the right of either party to appoint his own counsel or representative should not be interfered with. My hon. friend's Bill provides in clause 41 that:

Every party appearing by a representative shall be bound by the acts of such representative.

But, if an employer wants to engage the greatest counsel in the land as his representative before that board or if the employed wants to do a similar thing he cannot do it. He is limited in regard to his choice of a representative by what ?—by the consent of the other party, which must be obtained, and is it reasonable to suppose that the consent of the other party under such strained relations as we would naturally expect to find at that time could be obtained to the choice of a counsel without which consent that counsel or representative could not act. It would be a bar to the selection of a counsel and it would delay the adjustment of disputes.

Mr. GALLIHER. In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) I would point out that in my opinion there are no parties to a dispute of this nature that are more capable of acting in their respective interests than are the heads of unions or the director, president or manager of interests like a big railway company. When these parties are authorized to appear there I am satisfied that they would expedite the progress of the arbitration quite as much as any lawyer, who, no matter how eminent he might be, would be employed on either side.

Mr. BOYCE. Take the illustration of a strong corporation with a keen, competent business manager, and say, fifteen men—the number must exceed ten—the strong corporation with its wealth, power, activity and business acumen does not want counsel. The men do. The manager of that corporation can prevent the men from having counsel and from being put upon the same plane as it is in regard to ability to present their respective views.

Mr. GALLIHER. There might be that particular case of a few men who do not belong to an organization.

Mr. BOYCE. If there were a hundred it would be the same.

Mr. GALLIHER. But my hon. friend knows that most of these organizations not only have their head local man but also a man above him, and that these men have the law and conditions with respect to these matters at their finger ends. I might also say that under the Railway Disputes Act that has already been passed and from which, I believe this section is taken—am I right in that ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. GALLIHER. This has been found, so far, to work very smoothly.

Mr. BOYCE. There have been no references under it.

Mr. GALLIHER. There may have been no references but there has not been any complaint on behalf of the companies or employees in regard to the provisions of this section. This is not a hard and fast thing that must last for ever. If it is found that it will work a hardship by leaving it as it is now it can easily be amended at another session of parliament. I do not think that anything of an undesirable nature can occur in the interim and we have before us the fact that at all events the section of the Railway Disputes Act has not been com-

mented upon adversely by those for whose benefit it was passed.

Mr. BOYCE. It has not been tried.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. We have only had one case under the Railway Disputes Act, that with respect to the telegraphers' strike, and both parties in this case agreed to have a solicitor. My hon. friend can refer to that case as it is reported fully in the 'Labour Gazette.' He will see that each party was represented by a solicitor. My hon. friend looks at it from the solicitor's point of view. I am a barrister. He is also an eminent barrister and he may be sure that I do not wish to prevent the barristers of this country from appearing before any tribunal. I think they can appear worthily before any tribunal, but in this particular case, before such a board which will hear evidence on labour questions no better representatives of counsel could be had on behalf of each of the parties than their own immediate representatives. For instance, suppose the railway men are under the operation of this Act, and that there is trouble between a railway company and therir employees; the railway company would be represented by its manager and the brotherhood would be represented by a man say like Mr. Hall. Does not my hon. friend think that the fact of being represented by Mr. Hall would mean as much for their railway brotherhood as if it were represented by counsel. After all, it will not be so much a legal questeion which will be discussed or investigated by the bord as a labour question, a question of fact, not a question of law, and I am afraid that if we were to allow parties to be indiscrimately represented by solicitors and counsel we would defer the object of this legislation.

Mr. BOYCE. I will put another case to the minister. He will remember the trackmen's strike. The trackmen are a class of men not as well educated, perhaps, as a rule, not of the same intelligence as the railway engineers, coal miners, or railway firemen, but they have just as much right to have their grievances properly placed before the commission, as the others. Pre-eminently the keen business manager of a railway will outweigh in ability a representative of those trackmen appearing before this board, and of course in saying this I intend no disparagement to the trackmen, but they would be handicapped, if not outclassed, by the railway's representative before the board and why should they be deprived of the right to put their case into the hands of a solicitor, to exercise the ordinary just right of the British subject and to avail themselves of the skill, ability and force which is perhaps not possessed by one of their own number, but which the business manager of the railway company possesses ? The minister says : Let us try this. I say let us try the position of affairs as they exist to-day in an arbitration or dispute when each party has the right to employ counsel. I would suggest that you wipe out the necessity for the consent of both parties to the employment of counsel, and let the board determine whether there should be counsel and whether either party is outclassed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not share the views of my hon. friend. The trackmen are a very large organization. I quite agree that the individual members may not, perhaps be intellectually speaking, of the same class as the engineers, locomotive firemen, &c., but a large organization such as the Trackmen's Union will always find as their representative a level-headed, bright and intelligent man. My experience teaches me that all those labour organizations, take them at the lowest grade of labour or at the highest, are well represented. During the last two or three months I have had many occasions to meet them. I have met the representative of the trackmen, and not many solicitors could do better than him before a board of this nature on questions which would call his presence there. Even if they did not take their representative from amongst themselves, they could employ an expert from outside, an able man, say an engineer, but if we allow solicitors to appear before that board, you may cause one of the two parties who have to appear to incur costs which would not be justified. I would suggest that we retain this clause as worded, because we have it in the Conciliation Act and in the Railway Labour Disputes Act and it has worked well. The deputy minister informs me that in all the cases with which he has been concerned, under the Conciliation Act, the parties never were represented by counsel and yet the labour unions, generally speaking, were very ably represented and could always bring forward their views and their conclusions just as well as if they had been so represented.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not arguing for the solicitors or lawyers, they are able to take care of themselves, but I did not catch the reason for the latter part of the clause. Suppose the trackmen, trainmen, or whoever they may be, wish to have a lawyer—any man has a right to employ a lawyer if he pleases. These men, for certain reasons, wish to employ a lawyer and the employer may consent to their having one. You get there a condition of affairs which does not militate against the agreement between the two parties. The two parties agree to have counsel, there is no dispute about that, but when they do come to that necessity and agree that they shall meet the necessity by having counsel, is it not

arbitrary to say that the chairman of the board shall say: I do not care what you think, I absolutely refuse to have a lawyer appear before me in the interest of clients. That is, you are giving into the hands of the board the very arbitrary power of denying to the contestants before them all their rights towards the explicit stating of their quarrel, their claims and what they think should be the conditions of settlement. What is the reason for that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. First of all I take exception to what my hon. friend stated that the chairman has power——

Mr. FOSTER. Or the board.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The board because it will always mean two if it is the majority.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not make any difference, whatever the number may be.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Even in the Privy Council or before any of the courts of law the judge can at any stage of the proceedings prevent a lawyer from arguing a case, he may hear one side——

Mr. FOSTER. Because he has had enough.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the present instance we must always rely on the fair play and the sense of justice with which the members of the board will be imbued. Now if it is apparent to the board, which I may remind my hon. friend is already clothed with vast powers and rightly so, in order to settle the trouble as quickly as possible—that the employment of barristers or solicitors or counsel will delay and protract indefinitely the proceedings and will cause the trouble to continue for any length of time, is it not better that the board should say at once: 'In order to avoid any costs, and to save time, no lawyers will be heard on behalf of the parties.' We must rely on the common sense and spirit of fair play of the board.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend has made the matter a little worse. In proportion to the arbitrary or plenary power of the board or chairman, should be the right to the contestants before them to the plain and full statement of any one of their claims. Now, on the start I have not a good way of putting my views before this board. I am hesitating and modest in approaching them, and I cannot get out exactly what I want to have brought out, but I am willing to pay a lawyer to do it, and he is here. It seems to me that the more power the board has the more reason there is why I should have the right to put my case before it as I please. You may go on the assumption that human nature is perfect, but you will fall down if you do. You may assume that this board or its chairman will be high-minded and fair; we hope they may be; but there will be cases in which they are not, and that is all the stronger reason why one who knows the law should have the right to give his services if required by one of the contestants.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend must remember that each party will have already selected one member of the board, and therefore their views have always a chance of being fairly put before the board. I am informed that in connection with the conciliation boards in the United States and in England a provision similar to this, exists. My hon. friend, I think, takes an extreme view of the case. The representatives of the parties, employers and employees, are always well able in such cases to present their views, and I honestly think it is saving time and money to prevent the parties from employing counsel, even when they have agreed to do so.

Mr. PORTER. It seems to me that the position taken by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is unassailable. There are two parties to the dispute, the employer and the employees. They get together and they agree that they shall each have the right to employ counsel. They are the only ones who have any interest at all in the case. The board is a disinterested body, who are there simply to consider the evidence and the views brought before them, and to see that the proceedings are fairly and properly conducted. If the parties, the only ones interested, agree between themselves on a certain line of action being pursued, does it not seem to be the most arbitrary thing for the board to have the power to say to them: You shall not carry out your agreement?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I would like to say that representations have been made to myself from the largest labour organization in the province of Nova Scotia to the effect that this clause should at least stand as it is, and that no counsel should be permitted to appear for either party. They point out that to give permission to counsel to appear on behalf of either party to the dispute would only result in confusing the issue and prolonging the agony. So far as I am concerned, I have no clear-cut views on the subject.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you that letter or petition?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have the letter somewhere, but not here. The grand secretary of the Provincial Workers' Association, Mr. John Moffat, wrote to me, stating it as his view and the view of his organization that no counsel should be permitted to appear on behalf of either party.

Mr. FOSTER. I can see consistency in that position. My hon. friend's advice is

not in favour of this clause. What he says bears out the idea of not having any lawyers about this thing at all and I would have more sympathy with that idea than with the idea of giving the board power to refuse the parties the right to employ counsel if they wish to do so.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not know that I would be prepared to go so far as my hon. friend goes, and say that if both parties to the dispute should desire to be represented by counsel they should not be allowed to do so.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is the practice in New Zealand?

Mr. CALDWELL. I have received a letter bearing on the subject under discussion which I would like to read. It is from the Carleton Place Labour Council, and says:

> Should employer and employed not be able to come to an amicable settlement and a conciliation board be called, capital would be willing and able to employ costly counsel to work in their behalf, which it would be almost impossible for labour, with very little funds, to back it up, to compete against, and, as is generally the case, capital would win, and keep the employee at a standstill for another year. I have been instructed by the council to write you to this effect and to ask you, as our representative, to give this matter your very best consideration.

I merely quote this because it gives an idea of what the labour people are thinking of with reference to the employment of counsel.

Mr. MONK. For my own part, under reserve of the objection I have made to the whole Bill, I do not think that the labourer or the employer would gain much by being represented by counsel in an arbitration of this kind. There are no questions of law. With the questions which arise, as a rule, it seems to me that lawyers are not at all competent or accustomed to deal. We must admit that the lawyer has a litigious tendency, and he would be liable to introduce into an investigation of this kind legal intricacies which would perhaps retard a final decision. At the same time, I can conceive that some cases might arise in which, the circumstances being very special, the parties would require the assistance of a legal mind, and, having sanctioned the principle that no lawyers should be employed, I would be disposed to leave to the board the discretion in those special cases of allowing the employment of counsel. But, as between the two, I would prefer such a disposition of the law as would absolutely forbid the employment of counsel.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The intention of this section is to prevent the use of counsel except in extreme cases, and in such cases it is provided that both parties must be willing to have counsel. This is based on the principle that an employer of labour is in a position to get the most expert and capable counsel of the country, while in nine cases out of ten the labour men would not be able to employ counsel who would be likely to meet, in strength and ability, the representative counsel of capital. Moreover, matters of this kind, which are domestic matters, can, as a rule, be conciliated far better by practical men than by lawyers. In England the history of conciliation boards has been that they began by calling in counsel. To-day there is scarcely an instance where a lawyer has an engagement with a labour conciliation board. It is considered that these domestic questions are understood best by the practical individuals who have daily experience in them, and a counsel has the tendency to confuse and prolong the whole difficulty.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Under the New Zealand law, no counsel or solicitor is allowed to appear or be heard before the court or any committee thereof unless all the parties to the reference expressly give their consent. There is not this proviso in our clause but in New Zealand the award is binding and partakes therefore of a judicial character.

On section 43,

> Persons other than British subjects and residents of Canada shall not be allowed to act as members of a board.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Strike out 'residents of Canada'. There may be cases, where the representative of one of the parties may reside abroad and be a British subject.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. On section 42 the minister said that these people could not be better represented on the board than by the selection of their own delegates. That remark is equally applicable to this section. But it is now desired to limit their selection. Take for instance the case of a new invention, there are but few people who have practical experience in handling that. Not long ago, on the western section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the railway employees took exception to the double cabbed locomotive but the matter was adjusted in some way. Under this section you would prohibit the railway employees from having a representative on the board who has practical experience and are restricting the selection of the board. Take, for example, the brotherhood of railway trainmen or locomotive engineers, up to the present their executive officers, or the great majority of them, reside in the United States. These brotherhoods would want to have the best men they could get on this board, and by this prohibition you would create friction in the organization. It seems to me that you should permit the men to select the best representatives they could from wherever they could best get him.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Under this and preceding section, could the representative of the locomotive engineers, who happens to be in the United States, be allowed to appear before the court and present the case of the locomotive engineers ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly. But a man must be a British subject to be a member of the board, no matter where he resides. It would be humiliating for this country that a board of arbitrators should be partly composed of Americans. You might as well have an American sitting as a judge in any one of our courts of law. But suppose a union has its ablest representative an American citizen residing in the United States, there is nothing to prevent that representative from appearing before the board and presenting its case.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. It is quite possible that an officer of the board of locomotive engineers might be a practising lawyer. Could the labour organizations select a representative, whether he be an American or a British subject, to appear before the board and present the case of the men ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly, but he cannot be a member of the board unless he is a British subject.

Mr. MONK. I would be inclined to agree with my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy). If this law is to be useful, we must try and give the greatest satisfaction to the labouring men in the selection of the board. Strange to say the labour organizations lose sight entirely of territorial limits. In Europe, the international extends from country to country, and, in order to achieve their object, labour organizations are affiliated quite irrespective of national lines. My hon. friend the minister (Mr. Lemieux) knows that here in Canada,—in the province of Quebec at any rate—there has been a strong movement to nationalize our labour organizations. There are at present in Montreal two federated labour organizations, one affiliated with the organization in the United States and known in common parlance as the international, while the other is exclusively Canadian. For three or four years a strong movement has been carried on to diminish the affiliations with the United States and to make these labour organizations pure Canadian. That movement has failed and, I think that at the present moment the order affiliated with the United States is far more extensive than the purely national organization. Under these circumstances it seems to me it would be only fair that as they have only one representative on the board they should be allowed to choose freely. There are very experienced and able representatives of labour in the United States in whom our labouring classes have great confidence. They are very often invited here, while representatives of labour in Canada are very often called upon to settle disputes in the United States. I think that my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has, on one or more occasions been called upon to act as arbitrator in the United States, because they had confidence in him and because they felt, perhaps, that, as he was far removed from the scene of the trouble, he would be able to give a more disinterested verdict than one more closely connected with the trouble itself. I do not see what objection there could be to a man acting as a member of the board, even if he were a foreigner. He is only one member, the majority would be Canadians, and, in case he had the confidence of the labour men, the fact of his being an alien, would not be a valid objection to his acting.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I feel sure that, on second thoughts my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will see that it would seriously reflect upon Canada if we should go to any foreign country to form a board under this Act. For my part, I would very seriously resent it. And I believe my hon. friend would also resent it if he were called upon to appear before a tribunal to settle a national issue—and he will understand the sense in which I use the word 'national,' the dispute being one within our own territory—if that tribunal were composed in part of foreigners. Why, in the very humblest sphere of our judicature, in the appointment of the justices of the peace, we require that the appointees shall be British subjects.

Mr. MONK. That is for the administration of our law.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And this board is to administer our law.

Mr. MONK. It is for investigation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, investigation of matters in dispute between British subjects. And why should British subjects be called upon to appear before a board, the majority of whom may be foreigners—all of whom may be foreigners, for, if you give one side the right to choose a foreigner, you can hardly deny a similar right to the other side, and why should not these two choose a third foreigner to complete the board? My hon. friend will see that it is undignified—I think that word is not too strong. I use it not because I do not like our American friends, but because we ought to feel able to manage our own affairs. At present there is a strong public opinion against the walking delegates coming in here from abroad and sometimes causing trouble. That objection would be much stronger on the question of the formation of a board under this Act. I know that my hon. friend is as true a British subject and Canadian—as proud a British subject and

Canadian—as I am, and I think he will see that to allow this amendment might authorize the formation of a board before which every true British subject would refuse to appear, and so would defeat the purpose of the Bill.

Mr. MONK. I think as I am as true a Britisher as my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux)——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK—but the crucial point here seems to be to give satisfaction to the labouring party; and I do not see why in a matter of this kind, their selection should not be perfectly free. This board is to investigate, which is a very different matter from applying the law, particularly the criminal law, which would be the main point involved in the hon. gentleman's illustration of the justices of the peace. We have an analogy in our incorporation Acts, where it is quite commonly provided that a majority of the board of the company incorporated shall be British subjects. I do not see why it could not be provided that a majority of this board shall be British subjects.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no frontier for money.

Mr. MONK. And there is no frontier for labour. My hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) knows that efforts made in very high quarters in the province of Quebec to prevent our labouring classes from affiliating with the international organization have been fruitless.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We should encourage those efforts.

Mr. MONK. I believe that it would be a great advantage from the national standpoint if our labour organizations were confined exclusively to this country. But they are not so, and, until that happy condition of things obtains I would be in favour of liberty in this matter.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. How would the hon. member (Mr. Monk) carry out the idea of having the majority of the board British subjects when both parties were free to select foreigners ?

Mr. MONK. I would like to see the labouring men untrammelled in the selection of their representative.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Then, he would have to give the same liberty to the other side, and, as the board consists of three I do not see how we could be sure of a majority of British subjects.

Mr. BARR. I think it is to be regretted that this section is not to be allowed to remain as it is in the Bill. We know that the most turbulent spirits we have in all strikes come from a foreign country. I think it would conduce to our national interest, and would also be much more dignified, and would even be more in the interests of both parties in a labour dispute if the clause were left as it is in the Bill, and all the members of the board were not only British subjects but residents of Canada. I do not think that any case could arise in which we could not find suitable men for this service. We know that in the Senate a few days ago, a Bill was introduced to prevent foreigners from coming here and agitating strikes, the object being to keep out the class known as walking delegates. One reason why that Bill was not received with greater favour in the Senate was because it was that the Bill now before us would prevent other than those that are British subjects and residents of Canada from being members of this board. I think we are doing wrong by changing this Bill. I think it would be to the interest of both parties if the board were to be composed not only of British subjects, but of residents of Canada.

Mr. MONK. I think there is a distinction to be made with regard to the walking boss. We know that legislation has been sought to prevent the interference of foreigners in our labour troubles, and that legislation has caused great dissatisfaction, the labour classes have all protested against it. Here we have a law which is designed to conciliate, not to irritate, and for that reason it seems to me a distinction ought to be made.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have been looking at the United States Arbitration Act, and I find in it no reference to the citizenship of the arbitrators.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I suppose that in the United States it goes without saying that the board must be composed exclusively of Americans. Public opinion would not stand any other but a British tribunal. Let us be as loyal to our country as the Americans are to theirs. We have often heard it said, once a British subject always a British subject. Whether a man resides in the United States or in Canada, provided he remains a British subject, we should not bar him out from serving on these boards. We know that in the county of Essex, for instance, and indeed in a great portion of the province of Ontario where the territory is contiguous to the United States there is a network of railways on which many Canadians are employed, who reside in the United States. In order to earn their living they are obliged to reside in the United States, although their families are in Canada and they have large interests in Canada. They are, and they remain, British subjects, and no one can deny them that right.

Mr. BARR. I do not think the hon. gentleman meets the argument. If a man resides in a foreign country he cannot become a magistrate there, he cannot vote there, as a rule. Now these labour disputes are purely domestic affairs, and there is no reason why foreigners should be allowed to have any say in them. It might happen that one of the parties would appoint a person living in the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman would like to see this clause stand as it was, with the words 'a resident of Canada ?'

Mr. BARR. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, suppose the parties in a dispute would like to bring some one from the British West Indies or from Newfoundland, or from England, to represent them on the board, would the hon. gentleman prevent them from doing so ?

Mr. BARR. I would prevent them bringing a man from Newfoundland or from England if he did not know anything about the merits of the case, as a stranger would not be likely to know.

On section 49,—All members of the board to be present.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My attention has been drawn to the fact that in some cases one of the members of the board, through illness or other cause, might not be able to sit. We have therefore to provide for the appointment of another member, and I would move that the following words be added :

If any member of a board dies, refuses to act, becomes incapacitated or neglects to act, his successor shall be appointed in like manner as is provided in respect of the original member of the board.

Motion agreed to.

On section 52,

The members of a board while engaged in the adjustment of a dispute shall be remunerated for their services as follows :

(a) to members other than the chairman—

(i.) an allowance of five dollars a day for a time not exceeding three days during which the members may be actually engaged in selecting a third member of the board;

(ii.) an allowance of fifteen dollars for each whole day's sittings of the board.

(iii.) an allowance of seven dollars for each half-day's sittings of the board;

(b) the chairman shall be allowed twenty dollars a day for each whole day's sittings of the board, and ten dollars a day for each half-day's sittings;

(c) no allowance shall be made to any member of the board on account of any sitting of the board which does not extend over a half day, unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the minister that such meeting of the board was necessary to the performance of its duties as speedy as possible, and that the causes which prevented a half-day's sitting of the board were beyond its control.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The amounts fixed for remuneration of services of members of the board are based upon the due regard for the responsibilities and duties of these members. This section should be read with sections 53 and 54. It is expected that persons requested to act upon the board will be prepared to act from motives of duty rather than from a consideration of the amount of remuneration which may be offered them. There might be a temptation in some cases for the board to protract its sittings for a period of time if payment were made for the entire time. That is the reason we have divided the payment, so much for a half day and so much for a whole day.

Mr. LOGAN. It seems to me that we are making provisions for a rather large remuneration for members of the board to investigate cases in which the dispute may amount to very little.

Mr. CONMEE. I think it is too small.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not. I would like to ask why the change is made from the payment of members provided for in the Railway Disputes Act. If you will allow me I will read section 17 of the Railway Disputes Act :

The department will pay to each member of a conciliation committee or board of arbitration his actual travelling expenses and also to each of them other than the chairman, ten dollars per day for each day that he shall attend a meeting of the committee or board or be engaged in travelling from or to his home (being in Canada) for the purpose of attending or after having attended a meeting of the committee or board. The department will pay to the chairman such sum as the Governor in Council deems reasonable. The department will also at its expense provide the committee or board with a stenographer, secretary and any other clerical assistance that to that minister may appear necessary for the efficient carrying out of the provisions of this Act.

You will see that the members of the board are allowed $10 whereas in this case they are allowed $15 for each day's sitting. Under the Railway Disputes Act the chairman is paid at the discretion of the minister and under this Act the chairman is paid $20 per day. I think that in dealing with the question of a dispute in reference to wages it is not a wise thing to pay a man who is arbitrating upon or investigating that dispute an excessive wage, and for my part I would suggest that the amount be reduced from $15 to $10 per day to the two members of the board, and that the chairman be allowed $15 per day instead of $20 per day.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We must get the best men possible to sit at these boards and we must pay them, if not lavishly, at least liberally. This has in view the delays to

which the parties may be subjected and it is better to fix the remuneration beforehand than to leave it to the good will of the minister or the Governor in Council. If my hon. friend will read clause 53 he will see the reason why the amount may appear a little high in section 52. We propose to allow $20 for the chairman and $15 for the others for a day's work. We do so because it is provided in section 53 that

No member of the board shall accept in addition to his salary any perquisite or gratuity of any kind, from any corporation, association, partnership or individual in any way interested in any matter or thing before or about to be brought before the board in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

We must have as far as possible a disinterested board above suspicion, and in order to ensure the working of the Act, and to secure for it as much respect as possible from the public, we should pay fairly the members of it. The parties who will be called upon to sit at that board may be parties occupying very high positions and having large salaries, and it would not be fair to ask such parties to sit for a trifle.

Mr. LOGAN. Besides getting the confidence of the general public we must have the confidence of the parties to the strike. Suppose a man who was getting $2 a day at his ordinary occupation is chosen as one of the board of investigation. He suddenly jumps from $2 per day to $15 per day. Are we not liable to create a suspicion in the minds of some men that the sessions of the board would be unduly protracted? There might be some man who would be mean enough to take advantage of his position to protract the sittings of the board for a long time because of the fact that he was receiving $15 per day. From the first discussion of this Bill to the present time I have in any part of the discussion in which I have been engaged and in any amendments which I have moved advocated the necessity of providing for expedition. We want to make this matter quick, short and sharp and anything that tends to protract the length of the sessions should be eliminated from this Bill. I do not like to disagree with the minister in this matter, but it seems to me that the provisions of the Railway Disputes Act for $10 per day to these men is a reasonable compensation. After all, the big man is not going to be influenced by a matter of $10 or $15 or $20 or $50 per day. It is only a matter as between a reasonable payment of $10 a day and a payment of $15 a day. It does not seem to me that we will be able to get any better class of men for $15 a day than we will get for $10, and, after all, $10 a day will only apply to two of the men whereas the third man will be paid $15 per day. I think we should try to avoid the suspicion that might be created in the minds of some persons that a man would be tempted to keep this investigation dragging on for an indefinite period on account of getting $15 per day when he was only earning at his ordinary occupation perhaps $2 or $1.50 a day. It must also be remembered that we allow $5 per day for three days before the investigation commences and that in addition to that we allow them their travelling expenses.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend refers to the Railway Disputes Act, clause 17 of which says:

The department will pay to each member of a conciliation committee or board of arbitration his actual travelling expenses and also to each of them other than the chairman, ten dollars per day for each day that he shall attend a meeting of the committee or board.

A man may sit one hour or half a day under the Railway Disputes Act and he will receive $10, while under this Bill he would receive only $7 for a half day's sitting. However, I am inclined to be governed by the committee in this and I would like to have the sense of the committee.

Mr. LOGAN. Stand.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is easy to decide that now. If the committee is of the opinion that I should reduce it to $10 instead of $15 I am quite willing to do it. Is it the sense of the committee to reduce the salary of the members of the board except the chairman, to $10 ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Leave it $15.

On section 53,

No member of the board shall accept in addition to his salary any perquisites or gratuity of any kind, from any corporation, association, partnership or individual in any way interested in any matter or thing before or about to be brought before the board in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The accepting of such perquisite or gratuity by any member of the board shall be an offence and shall render such member liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Under this section would the paid secretary of a union be prevented from acting as one of the members of the board ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, the unions are free to employ any one.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. What do you mean by salary ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The special salary for the work he is doing on the board.

Mr. CONMEE. Could the paid secretary of a labour union sit as a member of that board at all ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Unquestionably he could.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. And draw pay ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. CONMEE. I doubt if he can.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Why not ?

Mr. CONMEE. He is to have no direct interest.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is not specially paid by the company or the union to work on the board, he has a salary all the year around. He is the best man to represent the employees, he is selected by them and sits on the board and he receives from the government the amount which is fixed by section 52, but that would not prevent him from receiving his usual salary.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. By section 53, would a corporation be able to appoint as their member of the board a retained lawyer ? They might give him a $5,000 additional fee if he did the right thing by them as a member of the board. There is nothing to prevent it, he is the paid lawyer of the corporation. The word 'salary' in the section means as a member of the board ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes as a member of the board.

Mr. GALLIHER. I take it the object of the section is to prevent a man sitting on the board receiving a bribe ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. After the word 'salary' I would insert an amendment in accordance with the suggestion of my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Duncan Ross) 'as a member of the board.'

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 54,

54. Each member of the board will be entitled to his actual necessary travelling expenses for each day that he is engaged in travelling from or to his place of residence, in Canada, for the purpose of attending or after having attended a meeting of the board.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would move to strike out the words 'in Canada,'

Mr. GALLIHER. What is the intention in striking out the words 'in Canada.' If they bring a man here from Peru to represent them will we pay his expenses from there ? I think when we go so far as to pay his expenses from the borders of Canada to the place where the commission meets and back that is all we are called on to do.

Mr. LOGAN. We have provided that the limitation is only to a British subject and by striking out these words you could not pay a man his expenses from London, England, for instance.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think we could settle it without going that far.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If expedition is the point we could not wait until he came from there.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 57,

It shall be unlawful for any employer to declare or cause a lockout, or for any employee to go on strike, on account of any dispute prior to a reference of such dispute to a board of conciliation and investigation, or during the pendency of any proceedings in relation to such dispute before a board under the provisions of this Act : Provided that nothing in this section shall prohibit the suspension or discontinuance of any industry or of the working of any persons therein for any cause not constituting a lockout or strike.

Mr. PARDEE. Reading that clause in conjunction with clause 65 of the Act, it appears to me some ambiguity might possibly arise as to the right of the employee to strike and of the employer to exercise his right to lockout. I move that section 57 be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words :

And provided that, except where the parties have entered into an agreement under section 65, nothing in this Act shall be held to restrain any employer from declaring a lockout, of any employee from going to strike, in respect of any dispute which shall have been duly referred to a board, and which has been dealt with under sections 24 and 25 of this Act.

That simply puts it beyond peradventure that unless there is an agreement between the employer and the employees, the employees shall practically have a right to strike at any time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Do the brotherhoods endorse that ?

Mr. PARDEE. I do not know. I did not ask them. I take it that the Act is rather ambiguous as to whether or not, after a binding agreement has been entered into between the parties, or even after there is a recommendation of the board, if they are not satisfied with the finding or recommendation, they would still be entitled to declare a lockout or go on strike. I take it that they would be ; but to remove any doubt, I desire to provide that, if they have not come to any agreement within a certain time under section 65, the employees may at any time go on strike. The Act is simply to aid in conciliation, but not to prevent the employees, if dissatisfied, from exercising their right to strike if they want to.

Mr. CONMEE. I think there is a further object to be served by the amendment of my hon. friend. Suppose, after an agreement is made between the parties, one of them breaks faith. Then there might be doubt as to whether the employees could strike without recourse to another reference. I take for granted that that is not

the intention of the Act, but that the intention is that once they have given notice, they are to be at liberty, in case of bad faith or disagreement afterwards to strike. The amendment, it seems to me, would clear up that point, and put it beyond doubt that under such circumstances they could strike without having a re-hearing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. After the remarks of my hon. friend and after reading over the amendment, I may say that it was my intention that the Act should have such an effect. The intention of this Act, as I have stated many times, is to give the public a chance to know the real causes of the dispute before it becomes effective either by a lockout or a strike. Now, the parties may agree together ; but they must be at liberty to have that agreement binding on them or not binding. Under these circumstances I will not object to the amendment.

Mr. CONMEE. I want to ask the minister a question. I am not so certain that the amendment as worded covers the point I have in view. Suppose there is a reference by the parties to the board, and then they come to a settlement and do not make their agreement a ruling so as to be enforceable, or the arbitration is discontinued. Then suppose one of the parties violates the understanding, would the employees be required to give notice of another hearing, or would they be at liberty to strike, having given the previous notice ? I do not think they should be required to give a second notice.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend has correctly interpreted that clause.

Mr. MONK. As I understand the legislation under consideration, there will be upon the labouring man, once proceedings have been initiated under this Act, an obligation to continue working as long as the investigation goes on. That is the principle to which I object, and I would like to point out to my hon. friend that it places our labouring men on a footing of inequality as compared with the labouring men of the United States. I have here the American Act, the only Act analogous to this one, 'an Act concerning Carriers engaged in Interstate Commerce, and other Employees.' That Act provides for an arbitration, both parties consenting, and the decision rendered by the arbitrators in the case of a labour difficulty is binding ; but there is a proviso that during the pendency of the arbitration, 'no employee shall be compelled to render personal service without his consent.'

Mr. GALLIHER. He would not be here either. There is a difference between leaving one's employ and striking.

Mr. MONK. Here, according to section 60, he is liable to a fine if he leaves the employ for the reason that has given rise to the dispute.

Mr. CONMEE.

Mr. GALLIHER. There is a difference between a man refusing to work at any time, even during the pendency of the reference, and a strike. A strike means concerted action on the part of a number of individuals, but a man individually may quit work whenever he likes.

Mr. MONK. Under the American Act concerning carriers engaged in interstate commerce, the sentence of the arbitrators is deposited with the Circuit Court and may be enforced by that court, but there is nothing to compel any labourer to go on working. Under this Bill, however, he cannot leave the work, whether on strike or individually.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A strike and leaving work are two different things.

Mr. MONK. Under this Bill, if a man does not wish to wait for an investigation and decides not to go back to work, he is liable to be fined.

Mr. GALLIHER. You could not punish him in that case.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The object of this measure is to prevent a strike or lockout before an investigation takes place. Is not that the object of the American legislation to which my hon. friend refers ?

Mr. MONK. As I understand this Act, should a difficulty take place among the railway men, they may submit that difficulty by common consent to arbitration. Once it is submitted they must remain in statu quo just as in the Bill of my hon. friend, and they must abide by the decision of the arbitrators, and that decision can be enforced by process of law. But the liberty of the labourer to quit work is guaranteed because he cannot be compelled to perform personal services and cannot be punished if he refuses. But under my hon. friend's Bill, if he should leave work, after the proceedings are initiated and a board appointed, he is liable to fine and imprisonment.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Suppose the two parties submit their dispute to a board and the board gives a finding to which both parties agree, and which is binding on them during a certain period. In the meantime let us say that the men accuse the company of not living up to the agreement and the company deny the charge. That was the case which caused the strike at the Crow's Nest Pass. Who is to be the judge as to which contention is right ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Under section 65, when both parties agree to be bound by the finding of the board, that agreement can be enforced by any court of law just as any other agreement. If either party complains that the other is not living up to it, that will be a matter for the courts to decide. And the judgment of the court would be

binding on the parties, just as the agreement was supposed to be. Now, if it is not an agreement such as is contemplated under section 65, the parties are their own judges—one party can lockout or the other strike, or they can apply for another investigation.

Mr. CONMEE. And have the same board again ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is not provided in the Bill that the board shall be reconvened. But it is provided that the minister may make regulations, and there is nothing to prevent his making a regulation which will cause the board to reconvene to hear the parties.

Mr. CONMEE. I understood the minister, in one of the discussions on the Bill, to say that that would be provided for.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I did introduce an amendment, but it was dropped and another one substituted for it.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If a finding of the board has been agreed to by the employers and the men, it is to have effect for a stated period. But if, in the opinion of the men, the company are not living up to the finding and a court of law afterwards decides that they are, will the men be mulcted in the penalty provided under section 60 because they had the honest opinion that the agreement was not being lived up to ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not at all.

Mr. MONK. I would like to point out to the minister that the United States Act is much more liberal than the Bill under discussion, because, though it provides in a different way for the settlement of the dispute and although the finding of the arbitrators is binding, still the personal liberty of the workingmen is absolutely safeguarded. Before this Bill is read the third time, I would ask the minister to consider how this legislation will work out in view of the Trades' Union Act of 1872. My hon. friend will find that, in the well known Act of 1872, which was reproduced in the consolidated statutes and is in the revised statutes to-day exactly as it was enacted in the first place, the agreements among trades unions are absolutely lawful and binding and can be enforced. Now, what I ask myself is this : If a labouring man went on strike in contravention of the section now under consideration, and were charged with that offence, if he offered as a defence that he belonged to a trade union and was bound to follow the rules and by-laws of that organization, which are expressly declared to be legal, would it be possible to convict him ? He would say : I received orders under the by-laws of my association, from the committee on strike or from the walking delegate, to cease work —it seems to me that his defence could not be overruled as long as the Trades' Union Act is in force. I mention that in order that the minister may give the point his consideration, for, if this law is to be worth anything it must be workable ; and it seems to me that the defence which the labouring man would offer under the circumstances I have indicated would be a valid defence and would enable him to evade absolutely the provision of this section and the one following.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not think the Trades Unions would evade the law any more than other parties. This law provides that no strike or lockout can take place unless an investigation has been held. A trades union or any member of a trades' union could not evade that law under the pretext that he has received instructions to strike from the walking delegate or the officers of the union.

On section 58,

58. In every case where a dispute has been referred to a board, until the dispute has been finally dealt with by the board, neither of the parties nor the employees affected shall, on account of the dispute, do or be concerned in doing, directly or indirectly, anything in the nature of a lockout or strike, or a suspension or discontinuance of employment or work, but the relationship of employer and employee shall continue uninterrupted by the dispute, or anything arising out of the dispute ; but if, in the opinion of the board, either party uses this or any other provision of this Act for the purpose of unjustly maintaining a given condition of affairs through delay, and the board so reports to the minister, such party shall be guilty of an offence, and liable to the same penalties as are imposed for a violation of the next preceding section.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At a former stage of the discussion, I submitted to the House in anticipation of the discussion to take place on this clause an amendment which I intended to propose. I move to insert, before the words 'in every case,' the words : 'Employers and employees shall give at least thirty days' notice of intended change affecting the conditions of employment in respect of wages and hours ; and also to insert after the word 'shall' and before the words 'on account' the words: 'alter the conditions of employment in respect of wages or hours or——

Amendment agreed to.

On section 62—Dismissing an employee because of membership in union, illegal ; and section 63—Striking because of employment of persons other than union members, illegal.

Mr. LOGAN. Some time ago the minister agreed to drop these two sections. I ob-

ject to these sections, among other reasons, because they go to determine matters in dispute between employers and employees which are better left undetermined by this Bill. I think it would be better for all concerned in reference to this matter of open shop or closed shop, that we should leave it entirely in the hands of the parties themselves.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When I first introduced the Bill, several members of the House on both sides, notably the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), represented to me that we should hesitate to embody these two clauses in the Bill. Personally I was in favour of these two clauses, and thought they should be incorporated in the Bill. But I find there is a strong objection to them. Under these circumstances I yield to the pressure which is brought to bear by hon. members, and I will drop these two clauses 62 and 63.

Mr. BARR. The two most important clauses in the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Would that be called a saw off ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is tit for tat.

The final clause being passed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must thank the committee for its courtesy in dealing with the Bill so far. I have already stated that it would be necessary to have the Bill as amended reprinted and distributed to members, in order that they might have a knowledge of the Bill in its present shape. There are some clauses which have not yet been passed. I think perhaps on Wednesday next, if it is agreeable to hon. gentlemen, we may be able to take up the Bill again after it has been reprinted. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before you rise, and while we are devoting a good deal of attention to this phase of the railway question, there is another phase of it that ought to be taken up, and that is the large number of accidents that are happening to-day in Canada and all over the continent of America. The matter has become so serious that I think it demands the immediate attention of parliament. It seems to me that the great railway corporations of this country are devoting too much attention to the expansion of their systems rather than to the operation of their systems to the satisfaction of the public. I take this occasion of calling the attention of parliament to the matter, by reason of another accident that has occurred to-day very near this city.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

Mr. LOGAN.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 27) respecting La Banque Nationale.—Mr. Lachance.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Masonic Protective Association of Canada.—Mr. Parmelee.

NORTHWESTERN TRUST COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Northwestern Trust Company, Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

On the preamble,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is this one of the regular trust companies ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, these Bills are made to conform to the usual trust company Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is there a clause that calls for an annual report to the government as the minister promised a year ago ?

Mr. FIELDING. We do get reports.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I asked that a year ago and the minister could not tell if he had got reports.

Mr. FIELDING. I brought the reports down afterwards.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Are the reports of the trust companies on the table ?

Mr. FIELDING. A portion of them are ; some which are provincial companies send their reports to us and they are included in one of the volumes of the Insurance Report. Yes, this contains a clause requiring a report to be made.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. These trust companies are becoming so numerous and have such a large volume of business to transact that I think it is time they should be put under a general Act. The minister promised that he would think of it and bring in a general Act defining the kind of report they should make.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I did not promise ; I said the matter was worthy of consideration. Of course these companies are by no means numerous as insurance companies. It is worthy of consideration whether we should have a general Act. This is in the usual form and it would not make any great difference, it is a matter of convenience.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of Auditor General for the year ended June 30, 1906, volume II.—Mr. Fielding.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public buildings—Quebec—Grosse Isle quarantine station—improvements and repairs to buildings, $12,000.

Mr. MONK. How is this sum going to be applied?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). There are a lot of small repairs of various kinds to the church, sheds, stables, &c. There are no large amounts.

Mr. MONK. What repairs to the church?

Mr. FISHER. To recover part of the roof which leaks.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How do we come to repair churches?

Mr. FISHER. This station is an island without any inhabitants except the people in the government employ and we provide for their spiritual welfare.

Immigration buildings generally, province of Quebec, $5,000.

Mr. DANIEL. In what places are there immigrant buildings?

Mr. FISHER. In Nominingue, Roberval and Peribonka. These are where the repatriation work is being carried on. The provision for this year was $5,000. Of that $1,600 has not been spent so that there will be a revote of $1,600 out of the $5,000. The Nominingue immigrant building was placed under contract in 1906. The amount of the contract is $3,400; fittings and furniture will cost $1,600, and the site will cost $1,500; making a total of $5,500. Tenders were called for and the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice by the Auditor General's Report at page V—53, that there was purchased for the Montreal immigration offices a gas stove at a cost of $86, 25 cots at $10 each, a roll-top desk for $32, 2 dressers and stands for $42 and $16, a 9 foot by 4 foot table for $32, and other things in the same proportion. These are pretty high prices.

Mr. FISHER. I suppose these things were necessary furniture for the buildings. Unless I am mistaken the cots are iron, with woven wire fittings under the mattresses. I should think that was not an out of the way price for them. Twenty-three dollars does not appear to be out of the way for a refrigerator. The cost of a gas stove depends altogether upon the capacity of the stove.

Mr. MONK. I would like to get some information in regard to these immigrant buildings. What we require most in the northern part of the province of Quebec for immigration as well as all other purposes is railway communication. Who is at present in charge of the building at Nominingue?

Mr. BOURASSA. That is in my constituency, and if the minister will permit me I can satisfy my hon. friend in a few words. This building was asked for by the Immigration Society of Montreal for a number of years. Nominingue is the terminal point of the Canadian Pacific Railway branch going from Montreal to the north. The object of this is to afford to settlers who are being repatriated or to ordinary provincial settlers who want to reach further points to the north, varying from ten to sixty miles distant, a house where they can lodge with their families and their effects, without being subjected to the high prices exacted by hotel-keepers. The house is built right at the station; they get there without paying any transportation and can remain there and thus avoid the higher rates charged by hotel-keepers until they are prepared to go to the Lièvre valley.

Mr. MONK. The purpose is a very good one. Is the house finished?

Mr. FISHER. It will be for this season.

Mr. BOURASSA. Now they can go up the railway instead of having to go round by the Nominingue district.

Lachute public building, $10,000.

Mr. MONK. Is that to be erected this year?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, the plans are prepared and tenders will be asked at once.

Levis public building, $8,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is to finish. The total cost will be $42,000. The expenditure to November 30 last, was $29,000. It is intended for a post office, custom house and usual government offices.

Montreal barracks for permanent corps, $20,000.

Mr. MONK. Where is that to be situated?

Mr. FISHER. The site has not yet been purchased.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What will be the total cost?

Mr. FISHER. Probably three quarters of a million. I have not yet seen the plan, but these barracks will be on the same scale as those in Toronto, and the estimate I have given is what the latter is expected to cost.

Mr. MONK. We are entitled to a more detailed statement before voting this amount. Is the minister in a position to tell the committee how far negotiations have proceeded for the purchase of the site or what is the obstacle in the way?

Mr. FISHER. Various propositions have been made. The city of Montreal has acquired from the government St. Helens island for park purposes, and we propose utilizing the money to be received from the city in the purchase of a site and construction of these barracks. There is a good deal of difficulty in deciding on the best place. Some people want the barracks to go to the west end; others want them in the east, some want them in the centre of the city, and others at Lachine, and others also at Longue Pointe. With such a variety of proposals, the Militia Department has not yet been able to make up its mind.

Montreal new postal station 'B'—site and building, $30,000.

Mr. FISHER. This building is under contract. It is situated on St. Catherine Street near University.

Nicolet public building, $17,000.

Mr. MONK. What is the total cost?

Mr. FISHER. $25,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I see in the Auditor General's Report a charge made for the travelling expenses of Mr. J. B. Charleson. What position does he hold with regard to public works?

Mr. FISHER. He is the general inspector of public buildings.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that the same Mr. Charleson who was inspector of the Yukon telegraph?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Quebec immigration buildings—additions, renewals, repairs, &c., $7,500.

Mr. MONK. How is that to be expended?

Mr. FISHER. On a variety of small repairs. The amount expended last year up to the end of December was about $900 out of an appropriation of $5,000. These are the buildings on the Louise embankment to which the immigrants have come from the ships. The buildings are constantly in need of repairs.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Does the department call for tenders for this work?

Mr. FISHER. No, this is only for small repairs.

Quebec immigrant hospital for treatment of immigrants suffering from trachoma and kindred diseases in Savard park—reconstruction of building destroyed by fire, $40,000.

Mr. FISHER. That is under contract.

Mr. MONK. What is the entire amount we have spent on that hospital from its inception? What did the building cost which was destroyed by fire?

Mr. FISHER. The building destroyed cost about $30,000. I have not before me the total expenditure. The new building is to cost about $80,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How is this maintained? Do the parties who get the benefit of it contribute?

Mr. FISHER. I understand that the steamship companies have to pay.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But if the immigrants have the money they are expected to pay, are they not?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but for the destitute ones the steamship companies have to pay.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. About what size is this building?

Mr. FISHER. The building is to be 147 feet long by 57 feet in width and two stories high.

Mr. DANIEL. How many patients will it accommodate?

Mr. FISHER. I understand that at a pinch it will accommodate 400.

Mr. DANIEL. The question may not be quite in order here, but perhaps the minister can tell us something of the policy of the government with regard to the detention of trachoma patients?

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to ask the Minister of the Interior when the immigration estimates are up.

Quebec military buildings—main store building at Dominion Arsenal, $6,500.

Mr. MONK. What is that?

Mr. FISHER. This is a stone and cement building which is to be 71 feet long and 53 feet wide at the intersection of Carleton and Arsenal streets. It has been put under contract recently. Tenders were called for and the lowest tenderer was awarded the contract.

Mr. MONK. What is the total cost?

Mr. FISHER. The tender came in very recently, and my information concerning it is not complete. But the estimate is $36,000, and I am told that the contract awarded is for a good many thousand dollars less.

Mr. MONK. Who is the contractor?

Mr. FISHER. I have not the name before me, but I will ascertain it.

Mr. MONK. Is it a tender for the completion of the work?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Quebec East—public building, $30,000.

Mr. FISHER. Nothing has been done about that yet.

Mr. MONK. No site chosen, nor anything else done?

Mr. FISHER. I find nothing in the information before me about a site having been purchased.

Mr. MONK. I do not think that system of voting money is a very satisfactory one. The committee is given no information to show where the building is to be or what kind of building it is to be. We have no means of judging whether the vote should be $30,000, or $40,000, or $15,000.

Mr. FISHER. I will give my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) some information if he will allow me. The report is that St. Rochs post office is absolutely inadequate for the wants of the place. St. Roch is a large manufacturing and industrial portion of Quebec in which centres a large retail trade. I have before me a copy of a petition from the people showing the need of additional post office accommodation.

Mr. MONK. To whom is it addressed ?

Mr. FISHER. To the Postmaster General.

Mr. MONK. I know that St. Roch is a very busy locality. Would the minister let me see the petition?

Mr. FISHER. What I have before me is only a copy of the allegations and without the signatures. The signatures appear on the original petition, which, of course, we can bring down if desired.

Mr. MONK. I would give great consideration to such a petition, aside from any reasons that the minister has given. But when the government ask for such a sum as this they should be ready to show that there is some immediate need for it. There has been no purchase of a site, there is no recommendation from the Post Office Department, nor the report of any official showing the necessity for this building. The petition is the only thing we have to enable us to judge what amount should be voted.

Mr. FISHER. I can give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) some further information if he will allow me. There are now two post offices one at St. Sauveur and one at St. Roch, both under rental, one at $700 and the other at $300. The population of the first to be served is a trifle under $40,000. The postal revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30th last were, for St. Roch, $11,775, and from St. Sauveur, $4,824; a total of almost $17,000 per annum. Money orders issued, $77,000, and paid, $20,000. Payments to postmaster at St. Roch, $824; to postmaster at St. Sauveur, $691. These payments are based on the amount of business done in these offices. Then comes a petition which was forwarded, endorsed by the Postmaster General to the Public Works Department.

Mr. MONK. Is that the information upon which this vote is asked ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. In addition to that, is the reason that the Public Works Department understand the need of a public building of this character at Quebec, and it is considered that $30,000 could be properly utilized during the coming fiscal year towards the erection of such a building.

Mr. MONK. I think that a considerable expenditure of money is required, both at Quebec and at Montreal, for many purposes. These are the two most important places in the province of Quebec. If we have regard only to the recommendations of the transportation committee, and if we intend to carry out those recommendations, we ought to be spending a large amount of money to solve the transportation problem at Montreal and Quebec. It is not with any feeling of hostility to this expenditure that I must say that I consider the data is insufficient upon which we are asked to vote this money. The minister shows that a considerable postal business is done in that part of the city of Quebec, there is no question about that. But that is no proof that a new postal building is required there. It would be better to expend this money in carrying out the recommendations of the Transportation Commission in the important port of Quebec. We have no reasoned report from the Department of Public Works to show what this $30,000 is specifically required for. No doubt there is a petition somewhere asking for this improvement, but we have not got it before us. It seems to me that where it is a question of initiating a large public work such as this which must cost $100,000 at least, the department would proceed much more satisfactorily, and the committee would be more willing to consent to the vote, if we had such information as is generally laid before a board of directors of any business company when they propose to enter into a large enterprise of this kind. It is not because there is a large business at that post office that we should have a $30,000 building; we should have to justify this vote a statement from a responsible official of that department to the effect that a new building is absolutely necessary, and what will be its approximate cost. It seems to me we ought to have before us the petition asking for that expenditure, in order to understand the grounds upon which they ask it. Speaking generally, there is no doubt that improvements of this kind are required in the city of Quebec and in the city of Montreal. But I would object to a large vote, for instance, to enlarge the post office at Monreal without having before us all the necessary information to justify it.

Sherbrooke drill hall, $20,000.

Mr. FISHER. The site has been purchased, the plans are all prepared, and tenders will be asked for probably within a few weeks.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. When will the building be completed and ready for occupation ?

Mr. FISHER. I hope the contracts will be awarded within a month, and I think a year from this spring the building will be completed.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Has the minister any information as to how the regiments will be provided for in the meantime ?

Mr. FISHER. No, that would come under the Militia Department.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. What will be the probable total cost of the building ?

Mr. FISHER. About $80,000.

St. Johns military buildings—stables for cavalry, $7,000.

Mr. MONK. Are there any stables there now ?

Mr. FISHER. I think only a temporary stable. There was a cavalry school there, but they had no cavalry stables, and had to build some.

Mr. MONK. Is the department in possession of any estimate as to the cost of these stables ?

Mr. FISHER. Not a detailed estimate. There is a requisition sent in by the Militia Department.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Has the department under consideration the disposal or exchange of this property ?

Mr. FISHER. Not the Department of Public Works.

Mr. MONK. For what number of horses is accommodation needed here ?

Mr. FISHER. For one school, I think about 100.

Mr. ALCORN. Would the minister explain this item of $322.89 for advertising St. John public buildings ?

Mr. FISHER. Advertising for tenders.

Mr. ALCORN. In what papers?

Mr. FISHER. Local and other papers in Montreal, Quebec, Ottawa, and I do not know how far west.

Three Rivers drill hall, $15,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is under contract ; nearly completed.

Mr. MONK. What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. FISHER. $52,500, and the total cost will probably be about $70,000.

Mr. DANIEL. How many different corps is the building expected to accommodate?

Mr. FISHER. My notes do not tell me that.

Mr. MONK. There is only one corps at Three Rivers.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I think there is one regiment of four companies.

Mr. MONK. What will bring the cost up from $50,000 to $70,000?

Mr. FISHER. The contract is $52,500, and there is the additional work of laying a mastic floor, $1,100, making $53,600. Then there is $1,425 for heating boilers, $2,000 for electric wiring and fixtures, $5,000 for fittings and furniture, $3,000 for sidewalk and fences, $2,300 for contingencies and superintendence, and nearly $2,000 for printing and advertising and supervision of the architect in Three Rivers.

Mr. MONK. I know it is a very invidious task to criticise any expenditure for public buildings, but knowing Three Rivers as I do, if it is to accommodate one regiment composed of four companies, it seems to me a very large expenditure. I doubt very much if the business population would not have preferred to seeing that amount of money spent in improving the port and giving greater facilities to that port in view of the large trade which the back country is developing just now. I doubt very much if the people would not have preferred that kind of expenditure to so abnormal an expenditure on the drill hall. I know there is a great desire generally to erect a public building in a constituency, but I think that in most cases, but certainly in this one, the expenditure would have been wiser if it had been even greater, but applied to a more practical object.

Mr. FISHER. I suppose the militia people want this drill hall.

Mr. MONK. No, I do not think that probably in this case that is what has happened. It is generally the sitting member who wants to erect a monument to himself —I do not say it is so in this case—and have his name placed on a post office or public building. But very often it seems to me that expenditures, perhaps less calculated to reflect undying glory upon the member, but more useful to the constituency might be made.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I asked the minister if the department had in contemplation the removal of the dragoons from St. Johns, Quebec. My reason for asking was that in the 'Star' to-night there appears an article as follows :

Want barracks for seminary purposes.

St. Johns deputation will ask government to remove dragoons.—Many citizens opposed.—It

is claimed such a step is unnecessary, and might become permanent.

Mr. FISHER. What is that?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. It is an article in the Montreal 'Star.'

Mr. FISHER. Oh, well, you need not bother about that.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The 'Herald,' I mean.

Mr. FISHER. It is only a rumour.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. It says:

St. Johns, Quebec, March 1.—A deputation, consisting of the mayor-elect, J. S. Messier, councillors and other citizens, is in Ottawa today for the purpose of urging the government to allow the temporary displacement of the dragoons from the barracks at that place. This step they ask in the interests of the homeless students of the College of Ste. Marie de Monnoir, who would then find quarters in the barracks here until, as it is represented, the academy could be rebuilt.

Mr. FISHER. I have not heard anything about that.

Mr. MONK. I would like to make this observation in connection with the whole of this vote for the province of Quebec. It is always a disagreeable task to select any particular locality for criticism, but anybody who will look through the whole list of appropriations for next year, amounting to nearly half a million for the nine months ending the 31st of March, 1907, and amounting to nearly another half million for the next fiscal year——

Mr. FISHER. We are not asking any more for the twelve months than we asked last year for the nine months, and nearly half of these are revotes; so that it is not extravagant at all.

Mr. MONK. Well, it is extravagant in this way, that I am perfectly sure that if we devoted the half of that amount in the province of Quebec—because I will admit that perhaps half of it is devoted to necessary works—to carrying out the suggestions of the Transportation Commission, which have been referred to more than once this year in this House, the province would derive a hundred times more benefit from that expenditure than from most of these expenditures for new public buildings which are mentioned in this list. Very often during the present session the advisability of carrying out the suggestion of the Transportation Commission has been discussed. I do not wish to refer to that debate, but why is it since that very important document has been before the government and before the country we have so signally failed to carry out specifically the recommendations made there? It is, I venture to say, because every year we are obliged to vote a very large amount of money to erecting buildings, and very often the wharfs, in constituencies where the benefit derived is very slight. Very often it is done to enrich or benefit individuals. If we carried out the suggestion of the Transportation Commission, as far as the province of Quebec is concerned; if, for instance, we devoted that money to making the ports of Montreal and Quebec national ports and making the channel between Montreal and Quebec and below Quebec what the Transportation Commission recommended the government to make it without any delay, the money would be far better spent.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend, before the end of the session, will see that he has nothing to complain about in regard to transportation.

Public buildings, Ontario—Alexandria, reconstruction of portions destroyed by fire, $3,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is this the ordinary buildings of the usual kind, customs house, post office and that kind of thing?

Mr. FISHER. There is a post office; I do not know if there is a customs house or not. The usual public building in a small place.

Belleville armoury, $30,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice an item of $391 for law expenses; it seems an enormous amount.

Mr. FISHER. I suppose that was for the purchase of site, &c. I understand that a site was purchased there and then an exchange was made at the request of the people of the city involving a considerable amount in searching for titles, no less than three lots had to be obtained in the exchange.

Mr. ALCORN. Where does Mr. Butler who was paid this amount at V—60 practise?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose in Belleville.

Mr. ALCORN. I do not know any man of that name there.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It seems a large amount in comparison with what you pay others for similar work.

Mr. FISHER. There was a good deal more work.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Deeds are generally at the expense of the seller. I understand a prudent man having the title examined to see that it was good, but this seems an excessive amount.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know the Ontario practice, but in Quebec I have had to pay for the registration of the deed.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But not the legal expenses to have the deeds drawn. You

have to pay for registration if you want to protect yourself, but that is a small item and I think $40 or $50 would be a big fee for this work. I know that lawyers in the House do not like to criticise the bills of other lawyers; they have a sort of feeling among themselves, but some of us who have to pay these bills sometimes feel like criticising them.

Mr. ALCORN. I would like an explanation of the item. I do not think there is a gentleman of that name practising in Belleville.

Mr. FISHER. I really cannot say. I will have to inquire about this. The Justice Department tax these bills always and authorize the payment.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is not satisfactory. If there are two departments concerned in an item, both ministers should be here. It has become a common practice for the other ministers to be absent when one minister is getting his estimates through, but we should be able to get these explanations fully.

Mr. FISHER. I am willing to get the information for my hon. friend, but he knows that there is a lot of this detail about which the minister does not know anything.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. There are your officers.

Mr. FISHER. We cannot have the officials here all the time. I will see that the information is given.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I have not asked who Mr. Butler is because I think I know.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps he will tell the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn)?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. My impression is he is a brother of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals and a very respectable man.

Mr. FISHER. Is he a lawyer?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I think he is.

Mr. FISHER. Is he at Belleville?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I think he was, but I do not know whether he is there now or not. I think he is a brother of Mr. Butler, the deputy minister, for whom I have the greatest respect, but that does not make any difference.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to know just what the hon. gentleman wants?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I want a detailed statement of what these law costs were for.

Mr. FISHER. I shall get the details.

Dominion public buildings—post office renewals, repairs, &c., $16,000.

Mr. U. WILSON.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I presume the Brockville public building is included under this. I see a charge of about $6,000 for that at V—62.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that was a settlement of an old claim on the Brockville public building.

Mr. ARMSTRONG There is a charge for interest?

Mr. FISHER. When the claim was settled, as the money had been retained for some time, interest was paid.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There are apparently three claims, as there are three items of interest.

Mr. FISHER. There were three different claims at three different dates, and the interest had to be reckoned on each claim up to the time of payment.

Mr. MONK. If the minister is in a position to explain, I think it would be interesting to learn something respecting the award to Tompkins, Crain & Company, in connection with the Brockville public building. An award was made on June 13, 1904, of $2,102.50, and Tompkins, Crain & Company were paid $6,046.60. The difference between these two amounts apparently is for interest—some $4,000. The minister can no doubt find out from his officer how there came to be such a large amount paid for interest.

Mr. FISHER. This claim was dealt with by a special board of arbitration, composed of the deputy minister. the chief engineer of the department, and the engineer of the Otawa river works. They examined witnesses under oath, went into all the facts of the case, and eventually made this award. It was a special item, voted by the House with an explanation. The interest on the award was from 1886 to 1906, twenty years.

Mr. MONK. Was that included in the award ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Do I understand, from the vote just passed for the Chatham armoury, that the contractors, who I understand have completed their contract and want their money, will now be able to get their money ?

Mr. FISHER. They will when this vote has passed parliament.

Guelph armoury, $50,000.

Mr. ALCORN. I notice that in connection with this $543.70 has been paid for advertising.

Mr. FISHER. That is for advertising for tenders.

Mr. ALCORN. Is it the practice of the department to advertise every contract in

a set number of papers, or are the papers selected for different contracts ?

Mr. FISHER. The practice is to advertise in large cities, where a large number of the contractors live, and in smaller places within a fair radius of the place where the work is to be performed.

Mr. ALCORN. All Reform papers.

Mr. FISHER. Both.

Mr. BARR. I notice that $392 has been paid for advertising the Hamilton drill hall.

Mr. FISHER. That is probably for advertising all over western Ontario.

Mr. BARR. Are notices sent to the papers, or do they put in the advertisement without any instructions ?

Mr. FISHER. The King's Printer sends notices to the papers.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister advertise only in papers which support the administration, or does he advertise in papers generally ?

Mr. FISHER. I think we give a preference to those which support the government.

Mr. DANIEL. He does sometimes put an advertisement in a paper that does not support the government ? Could he tell us what Conservative papers these advertisements appear in ?

Mr. ALCORN. The amount spent for advertising the Guelph armoury was more than ten per cent of the amount spent.

Mr. FISHER. The Guelph armoury is an $80,000 contract.

Hamilton drill hall—addition, $100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will that building cost ?

Mr. FISHER. $300,000 in round numbers.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the city furnish the site ?

Mr. FISHER. No, we purchased it and paid $30,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How was the site purchased ?

Mr. FISHER. Through the Justice department, no doubt on the recommendation of the Militia department.

Mr. SPROULE. Who has the contract ?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. George Webb.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. A first-class builder and a good contractor.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it given to the lowest tenderer ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Hamilton post office—alterations to building, &c., $10,000.

Mr. ALCORN. I find that the Office Specialty Manufacturing Company figures extensively in the Auditor General's Report for supplies to the different post offices. It figures for $193.12 to the London post office, $2,897 to the Guelph public building, $1,406 to the Galt building $652, to the Chatham building and so on. Are all these purchases made without tender ?

Mr. FISHER. Very likely. The explanation was given the other night. There are only two firms who can supply the letter boxes and other post office fixings, and we give the contract on fixed prices which were established some years ago.

Kingston military buildings—barracks for Royal Canadian Field Artillery, $18,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Last year we spent $6,900 for new stables for the Royal Military College. What is the explanation of that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Formerly the college used the horses attached to the field battery, but that was found exceedingly inconvenient. The commandant has been urging us for years to take this step, and I thought it was in the interests of the college to build these stables.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How many horses ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not remember.

London post office—additions and improvements, $7,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice that Mr. H. C. McBride, architect, was paid seven and a half per cent commission on $23,000 expenditure, $1,725.

Mr. FISHER. That is the standard commission paid an architect for superintending repairs and alterations.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did he superintend as well as do the architect's work?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. ALCORN. What is the explanation of the payment of $617 for extra work for moving defective wall ?

Mr. FISHER. When they got to work they found another piece of wall not indicated in the contract which was defective and which had to be removed.

London military buildings—new stores building, $12,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there not a very large item for a military building some years ago ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend is thinking of the drill hall, which is completed. This is a small building for stores. We had been renting a building for many years which was not satisfactory, and it was thought better to construct a build-

ing and thus save money because the interest at three and a half per cent is less than the rental we were paying.

North Bay public building, $25,000.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. How much land was purchased for that site, and what was the total cost?

Mr. FISHER. The site is 66 by 132, and the building will be 55 by 90 feet. It will cost $8,100. We hope it will be finished by the 1st of January next.

Mr. ALCORN. I find an item for advertising, $307. Does the government pay the advertising rates fixed by the papers themselves, or has the government any scale of their own?

Mr. FISHER. The rates are fixed by the King's Printer for all papers. They go through his hands and payments are made by him.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister said some time ago that the Department of Public Works sends out a copy of the advertisement to each paper.

Mr. FISHER. The King's Printer does that, and only those are paid. I have noticed, not unfrequently, advertisements of this kind in other papers which were not authorized to print them, to which the advertisements were not sent. But only those are paid which the King's Printer has ordered. As I explained a few minutes ago, advertisements are inserted in the large papers of widest circulation. Then we take a radius from the locality itself, and advertise in the papers within that district.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is this building to cost altogether?

Mr. FISHER. About $59,000. The contract was let for $33,879. Then there is the site, heating, lighting, furniture, fixtures, sidewalks and fences.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice in the Auditor General's Report, in connection with this (North Bay building, there is an item of $100 for salaries at Ottawa. In looking up to see what that refers to, I find it refers to services of Mr. Beaton, architect. Is Mr. Beaton an employee of the government, living in Ottawa?

Mr. FISHER. I understand that this gentleman was taken out of the Public Works Department and put on this special work. He is paid that amount until he was appointed by order in council. This $100 is to pay his salary before he went on by order in council.

Ottawa departmental buildings—fittings, &c., $40,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. With reference to this item, I notice a purchase of metallic fittings from the Eclipse Manufacturing Company. I notice that this company are furnishing a large number of book racks, steel drawers and roller shelves. Is this the only company in Canada that is capable of furnishing these articles?

Mr. FISHER. That and the Toronto Specialty Company are the only two companies who make these steel shelves. There was another company at Gananoque, but that has gone out of business.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice there are very extensive purchases of these goods. Are they supplied by tender?

Mr. FISHER. Tenders have been asked for several times, and these two companies are the only ones who tender. It is a question in my mind whether that amounts to anything. Where the tenders are not asked for, prices are fixed according to those which have been paid under tenders.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. When the minister says that tenders were called for, does he mean that several firms were invited to send in their estimates?

Mr. FISHER. No, we have advertised several times, with the result that nobody else has tendered except these two companies. They are the only two companies equipped with the machinery necessary to make these steel shelves. The article is patented. A little while ago we advertised for tenders for fittings in the post office buildings here, and nobody else tendered except these two companies.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How are these goods purchased—by the foot, by the pound or by the yard, or how?

Mr. FISHER. Plans and specifications are prepared by the officers of the department, and these people have to work to that plan and specification.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then their estimate is made on that plan?

Mr. FISHER. Plans are prepared for the room. I happen to have observed one case, and know how this work is done. The plans for the room are prepared and estimates made of the weight of shelving required. This is done by an officer of the Department of Public Works. The plans being all drawn to scale. When the weight of metal required is known, tenders are called for.

Mr. MONK. What is this $40,000 to be spent for ?

Mr. FISHER. Almost altogether for the steel shelving and filing cases. There are a lot of them in this building.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it intended to call for tenders publicly ?

Mr. FISHER. Whenever we can get tenders from parties outside of these two firms we shall be glad to get them. We have asked for tenders over and over again and none but these two firms have put in tenders.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do you publish an advertisement in the papers ?

Mr. FISHER. No, they come and look at the specifications. Or, by writing, they can get a copy of the plans, and then they can tender.

Owen Sound public building, $30,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What progress is being made with this building ?

Mr. FISHER. A site has been bought on the corner of Baker and Sproat streets. Tenders are now being called for. The site cost $10,950, and it was bought from the Kilburn Real Estate Company, Limited.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the building to accommodate, post office, customs and inland revenue ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the plan for the building been made ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not the details of the plan here. I suppose the building will nearly cover the lot.

Mr. SPROULE. The contract will be let by tender ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and to the lowest bidder.

Mr. SPROULE. How was the lot purchased ? Was it purchased direct by the department ?

Mr, FISHER. Yes, from the Kilburn Real Estate Company, Limited.

Peterborough armoury, $30,000.

Mr. MONK. Is this to complete the building ?

Mr. FISHER. The contract is let. I believe it is for $126,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is the building to cost when completed ?

Mr. FISHER. About $150,000 or $160,000.

Mr. SPROULE. To whom was the contract let.

Mr. FISHER. To Mr. Proctor, of Sarnia.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the result of tenders ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the lowest tenderer get the contract ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. From whom was the site purchased, and what size is it ?

Mr. FISHER. It was purchased from the corporation of the town of Peterborough and the price was $10,000. The lot has a frontage of 450 feet on Murray street and 185 feet on St. George street.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. Is it the ordinary custom for the department to decide to put up a building, spend money on the site and let a contract, and then come to parliament for the money ?

Mr. FISHER. There was a vote for this last year, and I think one the year before. When the first vote is made by parliament, that is looked upon as a decision by parliament in favour of the construction of the building, and then the work is gone on with.

St. Catharines public building—improvements, &c., $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What improvements is the department making there ?

Mr. FISHER. Renewing the plumbing, carpenter work, painting, repairing the roof and other items.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this done by tender, or by day work ?

Mr. FISHER. It is done by day work on the estimate of the architect.

St. Mary's public building, $20,000.

Mr. FISHER. That is under contract for $22,506.

Mr. ALCORN. This contains an item of $355 for advertising ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it is the same kind of thing as in the other instance.

Mr. ALCORN. I see that the amount spent for advertising last year was about $182,000.

Mr. FISHER. I suppose that was for the advertising of all the departments all over the country.

Mr. ALCORN. What other advertising is there besides Public Works ?

Mr. FISHER. There is a great deal of advertising, for instance, by the Department of the Interior. Occasionally the Department of Agriculture has to advertise—we have to send out notices concerning quarantine and diseases of animals. The Justice Department is called upon to advertise in certain matters. The Railways and Canals Department advertise their time tables. You hardly can take up a newspaper but you find there a government advertisement of some kind.

Mr. ALCORN. Does this $182,000 include everything in the way of advertising ?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose it does from what my hon. friend says.

Mr. ALCORN. This item at page V—10.

Mr. FISHER. I should think that was the general item of advertising.

St. Thomas drill hall—grading grounds, $3,000.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. What is the nature of this vote ?

Mr. FISHER. This is for grading and levelling the ground around St. Thomas drill hall as requested by the Department of Militia and Defence.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. How much land does that take in ?

Mr. FISHER. 601 feet on Wilson street, and 590 feet on Chester street, 32 lots, including a street called East avenue, in all 8⅝ acres.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. That $3,000 is intended to be used in grading that ground ?

Mr. FISHER. Levelling and fencing the property.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. How is that work being done ?

Mr. FISHER. It is not done yet. I do not know whether it will be done by contract or not.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. I know that they are working at it now. I know the fence is up and they are grading. Is that work being done by day labour or contract labour?

Mr. FISHER. I understand the fence is paid for so much a foot.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. Who has the contract ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not the names.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. Who is the overseer?

Mr. FISHER. I have not the names.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. How is the grading done ?

Mr. FISHER. My officer thinks it is done at so much a yard ?

Mr. WM. JACKSON. If it is done by the yard who has the contract ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know anything about the details.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. I would like to know.

Mr. FISHER. I will get them for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. If it is done by day work I would like to know who is the overseer.

Mr. MONK. How much is being paid a yard for that work ?

Mr. ALCORN.

Mr. FISHER. I will find that out, I have not the information.

Simcoe public building, $10,000.

Mr. MONK. Anything done yet there ?

Mr. FISHER. The site is bought and this is to go on with the work. Contract has not been let.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a post office and custom house combined.

Mr. FISHER. Post office and customs.

Stratford armoury, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for ?

Mr. FISHER. To complete the building.

Toronto customs house—alterations and additions, $15,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is under contract.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. minister say whether he has any policy in regard to the proposal to dispose of the present Toronto custom house and put up a large building ?

Mr. FISHER. I could not say as to that.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Of course it is a building that in its present position you would not be justified in spending much on, in view of the fact that the block is likely to be taken for the railway improvements. The business now done there is the largest in any custom house in the country and there is a lack of accommodation for that business. It is a very old fashioned building and I would suggest to the minister that he should give his attention to the question of providing the facilities required to accommodate the large amount of business done in the Toronto custom house. With all the improvements that are going on now in Toronto I would suggest that the government instead of continuing to spend money on this building should consider the question of providing a new building.

Mr. FISHER. I will ask my hon. friend the Minister of Customs about it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask what the position of Mr. S. G. Curry is in reference to these Toronto buildings ?

Mr. FISHER. He is supervising architect on commission.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What commission does he receive.

Mr. FISHER. I suppose the usual architect's commission. It depends on the class of work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has he charge of all the public buildings in Toronto ?

Mr. FISHER. Most of them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. He acts as clerk of the works as well as architect.

Mr. FISHER. He is architect and clerk of works.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have just gathered from the Auditor General's Report that S. G. Curry has received in all $4,499.77.

Mr. FISHER. Last year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As his commission on different works that have been going on there. I think that some explanation is necessary.

Mr. FISHER. At page V—76 there is a list of works which he has been supervising, and the commission paid him is for each of these works. I notice that in most of these cases the value of the work is given and the commission is evidently based upon that value.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At page V—77 I find a payment of $2,559.

Mr. FISHER. That is for the same kind of work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is that additional ?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well then I made a mistake in saying $4,499.77. Instead of $4,499.77 it appears that he received $7,459.35 and it appears that the more expensive is the building the more money this gentleman expends the greater the amount the commission he will receive.

Mr. FISHER. That is always the case in architectural work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does that apply to the clerks of the works as well ? The more expense a man can place on a building the greater his commission will be ? Is that what I understand ?

Mr. FISHER. No, he does not design the building, it is designed here, the contract is let here, and he is requested to see to the carrying out of that contract. The price is fixed before he gets it and he is given a percentage on the cost of the work carried out under his supervision. This is the regular thing in architect's payments ; clerks of the works are generally paid so much a day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Some of this work is not done by contract but under his supervision and the more money he would spend the more commission he would receive. Apparently he receives $7,459.35 for his commissions on this work.

Mr. FISHER. That work was not necessarily done all in that year and all his payments that I can see are the two items of $2,959 and $2,958.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister will find a number of other items such as V—76, $95 and payments for the Toronto post office, and the postal station, &c.

Mr. FISHER. These are the itemized statements, it is all included above, the two figures I have given are the only ones.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. Would it not be better to employ a man on a salary ?

Mr. FISHER. That would depend on the amount of work to be done. In a place like Toronto we might keep an architect all the time, and if there was a great deal of work of this kind being done it would be cheaper but where there is not much it would be dearer.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How does the minister propose to handle the large appropriations for the new drill hall and armouries, $150,000.

Mr. FISHER. I think a special arrangement would have to be made for a thing of this kind.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Are clerks of works still employed ?

Mr. FISHER. Not where there is an architect.

Mr. MONK. I would suggest, in view of the lateness of the hour and the absence of members for Toronto, that these larger items should be reserved.

Mr. FISHER. We might hold one item or pass these with the understanding that any Toronto items which members want to discuss may be taken up again.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows that is very unsatisfactory to those interested.

Mr. FISHER. If we apply that principle we could not pass more items, as the members for Manitoba I do not think are present. We will keep one item.

Mr. SPROULE. It is understood that any Toronto member may refer to these items or the ones which are held over.

Mr. FISHER. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I see that Mr. Curry gets five per cent commission on this work in Toronto.

Mr. FISHER. When Mr. Currie prepares plans and designs for the buildings as in the case of the customs house he gets five per cent. When he acts simply as clerk of the works and supervising architect, and the plans are prepared here, he only gets two and a half per cent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. For superintending work on the post office, he gets seven and a half per cent.

Mr. FISHER. That is the usual payment to architects for repairs of that kind. This kind of work is much more difficult than designing a new building.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. A great deal of this repair work is done by day labour, of which I approve, especially on small jobs,

but in that kind of work he is merely a foreman in charge of the men, yet instead of getting two and a half per cent as when he does not prepare plans, he gets seven and a half per cent.

Toronto drill hall—additional accommodation for new corps, $150,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That work is under way?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Were the plans prepared at Ottawa?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The same applies to the barracks for the permanent corps?

Mr. FISHER. Yes; those plans have been prepared, but they are not yet authorized.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like the minister to tell us whether the government intend to go on with these barracks, or what is their policy in regard to them?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Two or three years ago the land was acquired. The expenditure involved is very heavy, and we made arrangements with the city by which the present barracks could be occupied for a time; and it was thought, in view of the heavy expenditures which are being carried on in Canada, that we might take a reasonable time to construct these buildings. I understand that now the acting Minister of Public Works, with his officers and the officers of the Militia Department, are going carefully over the plans, with a view to determining just the kind of buildings to be constructed.

Toronto military buildings—magazine, $3,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is that to be built this year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Toronto military buildings—barracks for permanent corps, to replace property sold to the city, $50,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What does the minister propose to do with this preliminary $50,000, and when does he intend to spend it?

Mr. FISHER. The moment the plans are completed and approved by the Militia Department and by the Public Works Department we shall advertise for tenders.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Are those plans prepared?

Mr. FISHER. Plans have been sketched, and an officer of the Militia Department and an officer of the Public Works Department have been going over these plans with myself to see what could be done in the way of perfecting them. The whole scheme involves a considerable number of buildings. The first thing will be to choose out one or two buildings and go on with them, and afterwards add to them as the Militia Department thinks best. The first buildings will perhaps cost from $50,000 to $100,000. It is not intended that all the buildings for the permanent corps will be built at once.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is there a prospect of their being commenced this year?

Mr. FISHER. I do not see any reason why the contracts for one or two of them should not be let this year.

Mr. SPROULE. What are they expected to cost exactly?

Mr. FISHER. That will depend on the nature of the plans, which are not yet completed; but probably $400,000 or $500,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be an evidenee of business wisdom to reach some conclusion as to what you intend to do before you go on and take a vote of $50,000?

Mr. FISHER. We have done that.

Mr. SPROULE. But you can give the House no idea of what the buildings will cost. You only ask the House for money.

Mr. FISHER. This whole scheme has been decided upon, but the details as to how it shall be carried out have not yet been worked out. Plans have been discussed and sketches made, which are tentative in their character.

Mr. SPROULE. They may be tentative in their character, but the hon. gentleman knows whether the buildings will cost $100,000, $300,000, $500,000 or $1,000,000.

Mr. FISHER. When the whole scheme is finished, the cost will be certainly over half a million, very likely three-quarters of a million; but I cannot say how quickly that will be done. It will depend largely on the necessities and the demands of the Militia Department. The scheme, as first sketched out, would involve a cost of a million dollars. We are now at work seeing how much we can cut that down, and, judging from conversations which I have had with officers of the Militia Department, there is no doubt that we can reduce that by 25 per cent, perhaps by 30 or 40 per cent.

Mr. MONK. As there is not an approximate estimate of what this work will cost, I think the committee, in view of the importance of this item, might reasonably ask to see those sketches.

Mr. FISHER. The sketches are so entirely tentative that I would not like to bring them before the committee. They will have

to be changed in many respects before they will reach the stage at which it can be said they have been approved.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Was it not announced some time ago that it was the intention of the government, by reason of the requirements of the permanent corps, to have a first-class building? That announcement was made a year or two ago, and this is the beginning. I thought the policy had been adopted, and Toronto has been led to expect that these improvements would take place. The policy having been announced, I hope the minister will have the buildings under way at the earliest possible date, because it is of some importance to have a military headquarters in Toronto suitable to the requirements of the permanent corps.

Mr. FISHER. I think we can do that.

Mr. MONK. Will the minister have any objection to allowing this item to stand, and we will take up the others?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dropped.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This item has been discussed over and over again for three years, and the policy has been accepted by the House and the country. I do not believe that any hon. member from Toronto will take any exception to it or ask that the item be allowed to stand.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No; we want the work to go ahead.

Mr. MONK. Did I hear hon. members saying 'dropped'? Do they think that a member desiring information is not justified in asking that the consideration of the item be put off?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) knew that the matter had been considered.

Mr. MONK. Was the hon. member for Cape Breton one of those who said 'dropped'?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If my hon. friend is not in favour of the item I would not object.

Mr. MONK. I thought I spoke clearly enough for my hon. friend to hear. When we are only eight or ten on this side of the House, and the city of Toronto is not represented at all, and we ask that the consideration of the item be put off, it seems extraordinary that hon. members should say 'dropped.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is an old item. Three times at least I have explained it. It seems to me the only thing the government might be blameable for would be that it has not gone on more rapidly.

Mr. MONK. That may be, but it is quite legitimate to ask that an item should stand for further consideration, which amounts to nearly a quarter of a million of dollars with what has been expended before. It seems to me that request is reasonable in view of the absence of these gentlemen from Toronto, and it gives no justification to members from British Columbia calling out dropped.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is able to look after the interests of Toronto and he is doing it very well. The interests of that city are not likely to suffer, even in the absence of its other representatives, while he is here, and if that item should stand over they may not be present when it comes up again.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We all appreciate the complimentary reference to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), but when the hon. member from British Columbia (Mr. Macpherson) refers to the Toronto men as not likely to be present——

Mr. MONK. And invited us to drop the item.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—he is very unfair. They are regular in their attendance, more so than the hon. gentleman himself. As I understand, what they desire is an assurance from the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) that the building is going to be erected this coming season.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend must not be too thin skinned and should remember that comparisons are odious. He takes himself altogether too seriously—far more than anybody else does.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. As regards the representation from the city of Toronto, when that question is brought up I may say that I am the senior member for that city. There is a portion of the city now in my constituency, and with the exception of a few weeks I have represented the city more or less in this House the last fourteen or fifteen years. And while I do not claim the position, still, when it is called into question, I must tell the House that a portion of the city is in my constituency and that, with the exception of a few weeks, I have been one of the city's representatives for the last fourteen years.

Mr. MONK. I am quite prepared to admit that, even apart from what he has said, my hon. friend is competent to speak for the city of Toronto, but until the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) told us that this item had been discussed before, we were justified in asking that it should stand over for further discussion, and that was no reason for hon. gentlemen opposite asking that it be dropped. I am surprised that my hon. friends from another province should avail themselves of that request to ask that the item be dropped.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The fact that the minister is not able to lay a plan on the table warranted the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in asking that the item stand.

Mr. FISHER. I shall not be able to lay the plans on the table this session as they will not be ready.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. From what the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) has said they ought to be ready, for the decision to put up a building was come to two years ago. The minister is not ready to go on with the work but still he wants the item passed at once. What guarantee have we that anything will be done this year at all ? We may be just in the same position next year as that in which we have been in the last two years.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so.

Toronto post office—additional postal station 'F,' $37,000.

Mr. MONK. Is that to complete ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. $14,000 was paid for the site and the contractor has received $56,000 to date. Total expenditure to date, $73,000. Probable cost $115,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Where is the site situated ?

Mr. FISHER. Corner of Young and Charles streets.

Brandon drill hall, Manitoba, $30,000.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. minister not think we have done enough ? There are no representatives from Manitoba here. We might, in any event, take up the Saskatchewan items.

Mr. FISHER. It is only half past ten and it is not quite fair to delay the work of the House because members are not present. However I have no objection to taking up Saskatchewan.

Alameda land office, Saskatchewan and Alberta, $2,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is for the erection of a one story building with stone foundation. It is for the Dominion lands branch and is going on this year.

Barracks for permanent corps (Strathcona Horse), $40,000.

Mr. LAKE. Where is this barracks to be, and when is it proposed to go on with it ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). It is hoped, by the Department of Militia at any rate, that this work will be proceeded with at once. It has been talked about for a long time, and I am exceedingly anxious that the building should be constructed. I believe that the military authorities to whom the matter was referred gave it as their opinion that either Calgary or Medicine Hat would be equally advantageous from a military point of view for the location of these buildings. I believe it has been settled that they shall be at Medicine Hat.

Mr. LAKE. Is the Department of Public Works going to be able to start these works this year ? I observe votes appearing for a number of these military buildings year after year, but we do not seem to get any further than voting the money for them.

Mr. FISHER. I will do my best.

Mr. MONK. Are any plans prepared ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. MONK. Any estimate of cost?

Mr. FISHER. I have none.

Mr. MONK. No report of any kind?

Mr. LAKE. I am afraid the Public Works Department is in a bad way.

Calgary public building—enlargement for post office and examining warehouse purposes, changes, fitting, &c., $35,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is under contract.

Mr. LAKE. I understood that when $30,000 was voted for this last year, it was to complete the building ?

Mr. FISHER. I think there must have been a mistake about that. The probable cost of the building is given at $106,000. The contract is for $77,000.

Mr. LAKE. Is this for an enlargement of the present building ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, for an enlargement of the post office and examining warehouse building, with changes and repairs.

Edmonton immigration building, $7,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is that to be a new building ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it is to house the immigrants while they are arranging what part of the country they will go to.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What will be the total cost ?

Mr. FISHER. It is given at $16,945.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How do you heat the building, with steam or with hot water?

Mr. FISHER. With hot water.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is a pretty expensive arrangement.

Mr. HERRON. Is any arrangement made for immigrants in the southern part of Alberta ?

Mr. FISHER. I have nothing before me on that subject. I think we have no request from the Department of the Interior with regard to that.

Mr. HERRON. It seems strange that provision should be made for the northern part of the country from time to time, and nothing for the southern part.

Mr. FISHER. That is a matter for the Immigration Department to explain.

Mr. HERRON. It is a fact that immigrants who wish to make their homes in the southern part of Alberta have no accommodation, they lie around the railway stations at night. That is the case at Macleod, and has been for years. Something should be done about it.

Mr. FISHER. I will tell my colleague, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Herron's) remark.

Mr. MONK. Is there a report on that ?

Mr. FISHER. There is a requisition for it.

Mr. MONK. Has the minister that requisition with him ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. MONK. No document ?

Mr. FISHER. No document—simply the statement of advantages by the Department of the Interior showing what is required.

Mr. MONK. From the statement of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) there is a great dearth of accommodation for immigrants in the southern part of Alberta. Does not the hon. minister think we should have something from the department to justify this vote?

Mr. FOSTER. The statement of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) indicates the necessity for a building of this kind, but, apparently, the Minister of the Interior has not asked for other buildings.

Mr. MONK. Why should we start a building in the north when there is such need for one in the south ?

Mr. FISHER. That is for the Immigration Department to say.

Mr. DANIEL. I find thirty-four yards of ribbon charged for, used in the immigration building. Also, two loads of evergreens, total, $15. What were these for ?

Mr. FISHER. They must have been for some celebration. I believe it was on the occasion of the Governor General's visit.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is the need of an immigration station at Edmonton ?

Mr. FISHER. That, my friend the Minister of the Interior must answer.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are we passing items about which we can get no information ?

Mr. FISHER. I can give all the information about the building. And there is the fact that the Minister of the Interior requires this for immigration purposes. The statement of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) shows that these immigrants require a place to go to. Edmonton is a centre from which they are distributed throughout the country. He says also that there ought to be something similar in the southern part of Alberta. I hope he will be able to get it. I shall inform my colleague, the Minister of the Interior of what he has said.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It seems that Medicine Hat is the place for distribution of immigrants—not Edmonton. They are distributed long before they get to Edmonton.

Mr. FISHER. No, they go to points north, east and west from Edmonton.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me the committee is placed in a most ludicrous position. Here is a plain statement from an hon. member from the Northwest that we have not sufficient accommodation for immigrants in the southern portion of Alberta. We ask the minister why he is putting up a building in the north, and he says we must ask the Minister of the Interior. But the Minister of the Interior is not here, and the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher) will not show any document or representation upon which he says that this building is necessary.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) states a fact that a building is needed in the south. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has stated that a building is needed in the north.

Mr. MONK. Where is that statement ?

Mr. FISHER. He made a requisition.

Mr. MONK. Where is it ?

Mr. FISHER. It is in the department. I cannot lay every document——

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister ought to have every document here that may be necessary to justify these votes.

Mr. FISHER. I do not agree with the hon. member (Mr. Monk) I think he is wholly in error. It has never been customary to bring down such documents and lay them on the table. My hon. friend is an old enough parliamentarian to know that that has never been asked for.

Mr. MONK. I maintain that when we are asked to vote an item under these circumstances, we have a right to get from the government everything tending to show that the vote is necessary, not only the requisition which may come from another department, but the plans, specifications and contracts, if any, and statements of what has been paid and of what remains to be paid. Is there a contract for the construction of this immigration building at Edmonton ?

Mr. FISHER. There is a contract, at a price of $8,495.

Mr. MONK. We have voted $13,000 already.

Mr. FISHER. But $7,000 of it is a revote. There is a contract for $8,495 for the building and $1,500 for heating. The estimated cost of the building is $16,990.69.

Mr. MONK. How is the difference made up between $9,516 and $16,900 ?

Mr. FISHER. Heating and boilers, $3,-700 ; furniture and range, $1,000 ; sidewalk and fencing, $500 ; contingencies, &c., $2,945.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is the size of the lot ?

Mr. FISHER. The building is 60x32, two and a half stories high.

Mr. MONK. I will take back what I said about plumbers in Montreal, if it costs over $3,500 to put in a heating apparatus in this building 60x30. What is the name of the company ?

Mr. FISHER. The Standard Plumbing and Heating Company, Limited, of Edmonton. The building is at the corner of Columbia and University streets. The contract for the heating apparatus alone $1,500, but the heating and boilers together are estimated to cost $3,500. Tenders were called for the heating apparatus, and the contract was given to the lowest tenderer.

Medicine Hat public building, $27,000.

Mr. LAKE. How much is that going to cost altogether ?

Mr. FISHER. The probable cost is $46,-000. It is under contract.

Mr. LAKE. Is it necessary to spend $237.34 in advertising for tenders in the press of Medicine Hat?

Mr. FISHER. It is not only in the press of Medicine Hat, but probably the press of the whole Northwest, including Winnipeg, Edmonton, Calgary and Regina.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total contract price of the building at Medicine Hat ?

Mr. FISHER. $46,445, inclusive of site, electric wiring, heating and all the fittings.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In V—83, 1906, the estimated cost was to be $25,550.

Mr. FISHER. That was for the building alone. The land cost $5,000.

Mr. HERRON. What system of heating do you adopt ?

Mr. FISHER. Hot water.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What will be the size of the site ?

Mr. MONK.

Mr. FISHER. 75x130, 3 lots. The contract for the heating is not let yet, because the building is far from being finished.

Mr. MONK. I notice that in all these public buildings the advertisements for tenders are extremely high, ranging from $250 to $400, and in one case, I am told, to $600. Has the minister a list of the newspapers in which tenders were called for ?

Mr. FISHER. I have it in the department.

Mr. MONK. Would my hon. friend mind taking a note and letting us know?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I will send it to my hon. friend for his edification.

Mr. ALCORN. And also the advertisements for the Calgary public building ?

Regina post office, custom house, &c., $100,-000.

Mr. LAKE. It cost $637.84 to advertise this building. Does it cost more to advertise a large building than a small one ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, because we advertise in a larger number of places in order to attract the attention of a larger number of contractors at a distance, who would be able to undertake a contract of that kind.

Mr. LAKE. It would be interesting to see a list of papers publishing advertisements in regard to all these buildings in the Northwest.

Mr. FISHER. I will lay a list on the table of the House of all the advertisements of all the buildings included in this item.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would much prefer that the hon. minister should read it off to-night and put it in 'Hansard.'

Mr. FISHER. Do not ask me to read it off.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Your time is pretty valuable but you sometimes waste a little of it. How much will the building at Regina cost ?

Mr. FISHER. $200,000 and perhaps a little more.

Mr. MONK. What is the size of the building ?

Mr. FISHER. 75 by 125.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was paid for the land.

Mr. FISHER. $10,000.

Mr. MONK. Are all the contracts given in that case ?

Mr. FISHER. No only for the building. The buildng is not covered in.

Mr. MONK. Is the contract given for the plumbing ?

Mr. FISHER. It is included in the contract for the building.

Saskatoon public building, $25,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the cost of this building to be ?

Mr. FISHER. The plans have not been yet completed and tenders have not been asked for.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the estimated cost ?

Mr. FISHER. Until the plans are completed I could hardly give a very close estimate.

Mr. LAKE. I think we were told last year that it was to cost about $43,000. Saskatoon is likely to be a very large place.

Mr. FISHER. I think it will be more than that.

Mr. LAKE. Yes, and I hope the minister will take that into consideration.

Mr. FISHER. I think it will be $50,000 or $60,000.

Mr. LAKE. When does he propose to undertake the work ?

Mr. FISHER. The plans are now, I believe, ready to submit for approval.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the size of the lot ?

Mr. FISHER. 60 feet frontage by 75 feet depth.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the population of Saskatoon ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember ; it is quite a large place and growing rapidly.

Mr. LAKE. Over 3,000 according to the last census.

Mr. FISHER. I think it was 4,000 and over according to the census.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. You are paying $9,000 for a lot 60 by 75. It is a most extravagant price.

Mr. MONK. Land is more valuable there than in Montreal.

Mr. SLOAN. I know something about Saskatoon property and I think the government could probably get $15,000 for that site to-day.

Mr. MONK. What is land worth a foot there now ?

Mr. SLOAN. It is pretty high. I know that the Bank of Commerce paid for a corner lot in the neighbourhood of $20,000 recently. There are seven banks in Saskatoon at the present time.

Mr. MONK. How large was that lot ?

Mr. SLOAN. It is two lots composed of two 25-foot lots and has a frontage of 50 feet.

Mr. FISHER. I am mistaken in giving the dimensions of the property. They are 90 by 100 feet.

Public buildings—British Columbia—Fernie public building, $20,000.

Mr. FISHER. Tenders are in for that but the contract has not been signed.

Mr. MONK. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. FISHER. About $40,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I see that the government paid $5,000 for a site ? How large was that site ?

Mr. FISHER. 120 by 220 feet. I think the successful tender was something over $40,000.

Mr. ALCORN. What is the population of Fernie ?

Mr. FISHER. Fernie must have a population of 6,000 or 7,000 people.

Ladysmith public building, $10,000.

Mr. FISHER. The plans are not quite prepared for that and the contract has not yet been let. Ladysmith is a mining town of about 5,000 people I am told.

New Westminster public building for Marine and Fisheries and Indian Affairs agencies, $5,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is meant by that item ?

Mr. FISHER. The Marine and Fisheries Department and the Department of the Indian Affairs have asked for a building for the accommodation of their officers. It is not attached to the present building but is adjacent to it.

Vancouver public building, $100,000.

Mr. MONK. Is that under contract ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That is the post office, is it not ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes the post office.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total cost and the contract price of the building?

Mr. FISHER. The cost is $544,000. The contract price was $434,500.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And the usual extras?

Mr. MACPHERSON. There were no extras.

Mr. FISHER. There was the heating, electric lighting, furniture, elevators, &c.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it completed?

Mr. FISHER. No ; we expect to have to pay $100,000 on this next year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it built under a clerk of works or an architect?

Mr. FISHER. A clerk of works, who is paid by the day.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is there a clerk of works and architect as well?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The superintendent of public works for the province, in his duties, also oversees the work. He is an architect.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What commissions were paid?

Mr. FISHER. The superintendent of the work got $7 a day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In Winnipeg I see that Darling & Pearson received $8,500 for services as architects.

Mr. FISHER. They prepared the plans, specifications and everything of that kind. The Vancouver plans were prepared by the architect of the department.

Mr. LAKE. What is the claim of Mr. Thomas Tompkins against the building in the last year's public accounts?

Mr. FISHER. I am told there was an old building built there years ago, and Tompkins had a claim in regard to it, which was only adjusted recently.

Mr. LAKE. Not the same building?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. FISHER. It appears to have been a relic from hon. gentlemen opposite that we settled up.

Public buildings generally—salaries to resident clerks of works, assistants, &c., $17,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think this should be explained.

Mr. FISHER. Those are the clerks of works like the architect just spoken of in Vancouver, who are stationed at different places in the country, representing the Department of Public Works, and looking after the public buildings within their region.

Mr. MONK. How many clerks of works are there in that estimate of $17,000?

Mr. FISHER. Eight, with their clerks.

Mr. MONK. Would the minister give the names and residences?

Mr. FISHER. They are Mr. Adams at Ottawa, $100 a month; Mr. John Cowan, Ottawa, $3.50 a day—he is not one of the men I alluded to—Mr. Desjardins, Montreal, $90 a month; Mr. Béland, Quebec, $106.87 a month; Mr. Shehan, $3 a day; Mr. Hastings, at Toronto, $100 a month; Mr. Curran, of Winnipeg, $55 a month—Mr. Curran is a clerk under Mr. Greenfield—Mr. Greenfield, Winnipeg, $175 a month; Mr. Brown, of Victoria, $116 a month. He is under Mr. Henderson, who gets $191 a month and Mr. Mollard, of Regina, who gets $125 a month; a total of $16,187.15 out of the $17,000 vote.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In comparing the salaries you are paying these men now with those stated in the Auditor General's Report, they seem to have been very much increased.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say as to that. They may have had some increases lately.

Mr. MONK. I would like to know what works Mr. Desjardins, of Montreal, is acting as clerk of?

Mr. FISHER. He looks after all the public buildings in Montreal.

Mr. MONK. Is he a carpenter?

Mr. FISHER. No. He is a builder, I think. He was appointed by my hon. friends when they were in power, and remains there still.

Mr. MONK. He must be a very good man.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend was quite ready to criticise him until he found that out.

Experimental farms—new buildings and renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $10,000.

Mr. CROCKET. How many experimental farms are there in the Dominion?

Mr. FISHER. Five.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it proposed to establish an experimental farm in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. FISHER. That will come up in the votes for the Department of Agriculture, and I would rather postpone the explanation till then.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is it proposed to establish a farm at Calgary?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 4, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election of Hon. Jacques Bureau, for the elec-

toral district of Three Rivers and St Maurice.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

QUESTIONS,

PAYMENT OF 38TH DUFFERIN RIFLES.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What is the cause of the delay in paying the men of the 38th Dufferin Rifles, located at Brantford ?
2. When is the said payment likely to be made ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). As soon as the Supplementary Estimates for the present year are voted, this, together with a few other similar items will be paid.

BOAT REGULATIONS AT LIME KILN.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Macpherson—asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the following newspaper report :

No boat race at Lime Kiln.

Vessels must pass in single file hereafter through 'Hell Gate' of the lakes.

Washington, February 21.—President Livingstone, of the Lake Carriers, has asked the War Department to make a set of rules for the navigation of the narrow channel at Lime Kiln crossing, in Detroit river, a channel which he describes as the 'Hell Gate' of the great lakes. The lake carriers desire rules which will compel vessels to move up and down through that channel in single file and not try to overtake and pass each other while within certain prescribed bounds. The War Department will accede to the request and will provide a vessel commanded by an army officer to patrol and police the crossing and direct the vessels as to the order in which they shall make the passage. A. A. Schantz, of the D. & C. line, is here to see that the rules are not made so stringent as to passenger boats that they cannot meet their schedule time, and the carriers are disposed to agree that passenger vessels ought to have privileges not granted to freighters ?

2. Has the government given consent or been asked to consent to the alleged proposed action of the United States government in Canadian waters ?
3. What authority, if any, has the United States government for the said proposed action ?

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

1. The attention of the government has not been called to the newspaper report.
2. No.
3. The government has no information on the subject, but will make inquiries.

GROSSE ISLE YACHT.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Have tenders been called for a gasoline engine for the Grosse Isle yacht, in the county of Montmagny ?
2. If so, who are the tenderers ?
3. What are the amounts of the tenders ?
4. To whom has the contract been awarded ?
5. What kind and of what capacity should such machine be ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes. Through Dr. Martineau, Medical Superintendent of the Grosse Isle Station.
2. La Cie Manufacturière de Montmagny. The Lavoie Electric Company, Quebec.
3. $600 and $595 respectively.
4. The Lavoie Electric Company.
5. A twenty horse power gasoline engine with propeller and reversing gear and all other necessary accessories.

HEALTH OF HON. MR. OUIMET.

Mr. DELISLE—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

Is the government aware that the Hon. J. A. Ouimet, to whom an annual superannuation of $4,666.66 is accorded as a retired judge, after nine years and eight months of service as such, is in perfect health and has just accepted the position of president of the Montreal District Savings Bank?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The government has no information as to the health or business of the Hon. Mr. Ouimet.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE OF MAJOR F. L. VAUX.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Has Major F. L. Vaux, of the Permanent Army Medical Corps, recently applied to the Minister of Militia and Defence for leave of absence from his duties?
2. If so, when was such application received by the department?
3. Upon what ground was leave of absence asked, and for what length of time?
4. What action has the department taken upon the application of Major Vaux ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1, 2, 3 and 4. Major Vaux has not applied for leave of absence since December 13, last, when he applied for and was granted leave from December 24 to January 1 on private affairs. This fact was published December 18, in Militia Order No. 290, as required by regulation.

EMPLOYMENT OF REV. G. C. PATTERSON.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Is Rev. G. C. Patterson, formerly of the village of Embro, in the electoral district of North Oxford, performing any duties or services for, or in the employment of the government?

2. If so, where is he located, what duties is he performing, when was he employed, and at what salary?

3. Upon what recommendation was Mr. Patterson appointed?

4. Has he passed any qualifying examination?

5. How often is he required to report, and what is the date of his last report?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). From information received from the different departments it does not appear that Mr. Patterson is employed by the government.

REDUCTION OF IRON, STEEL AND LEAD.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM asked:

What is the number of tons produced, the number of men employed, and the amount of wages paid out, in each of the different iron, steel and lead manufactories of Canada?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The Trade and Commerce Department have furnished me with the following; they cannot answer the hon. gentleman's questions in full.

The total production of iron and steel by manufactories in Canada and on which bounty was paid, during the fiscal year ended June 30th, 1906, is as follows:

Company.	Tons of Iron & steel produced.
The Dominion Iron & Steel Co. Ltd.	521,485
The Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co. Ltd.	125,858
The Hamilton Steel & Iron Co. Ltd.	124,175
The Canada Iron Furnace Co. Ltd.	34,773
The Algoma Steel Co. Ltd.	372,771
The Deseronto Iron Co. Ltd.	12,085
The Londonderry Iron & Mining Co. Ltd.	31,227
John McDougall & Co.	2,695
The Montreal Rolling Mills Co.	2,462
Total	1,227,531

The amount of lead contained in lead bearing ores mined in Canada and delivered by the producers at smelters in Canada, on which bounty was paid during the last fiscal year was 14,407 tons.

The mines producing the above lead and participating in the bounty thereon numbered approximately 135.

This does not represent all the lead produced, but only such as was entitled to bounty and of which only the department has record.

The Department has no knowledge of the number of men employed and the amount of wages paid by any company or parties producing iron, steel or lead.

FINES ON CORDAGE COMPANY.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked:

1. What amount of money was received by the government through fines against the Chatham Cordage Company, alleging that short twine was made?

2. Was a commission paid to Alexander Smith, ex-Liberal organizer for Ontario, for settlement?

3. If so, how much did he receive?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. The name 'Chatham Cordage Company' does not appear in connection with any seizure; but seizures were made from the M. J. Wilson Cordage Company. Ltd., of Chatham—presumably the company referred to—on account of which $281.52 was paid in by the court to the credit of Receiver General, and $67.50 through the inspector; total $349.02.

2 & 3. No. None so far as the department is concerned, nor has it any knowledge of any.

CHATHAM ARMOURY.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked:

If there is any money due to the contractors on the Chatham armoury and for work completed, when may the contractors expect to receive their money?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). Any money due will be paid as soon as the Supply Bill is through parliament.

W. S. LOGGIE & COMPANY.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. What sums have been paid by any department of the government during the years 1905, 1906 and up to first of March, 1907, to W. S. Loggie & Company, of Chatham, New Brunswick, and for what purposes?

2. Is this the firm of which Mr. W. S. Loggie, member of this House for Northumberland, New Brunswick, is a member and managing partner?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am not aware of the existence of any such company but there is a corporation known as the W. S. Loggie Company, incorporated under the laws of Nova Scotia. Nothing was paid during the years 1905 and 1906, but the sum of $2,467.38 was paid them for lumber, paint, &c. for reduction work and light house supplies by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in 1907. In reply to the second question, the government has no information on this subject.

STEAMER 'GOLSPIE.'

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. Was the steamer 'Golspie' in the service of, or employed by the government of Canada, in any capacity during the last two years? If so, for what purpose, and under what circumstances?

2. For what reason did the government dispense with the use of the steamer 'Golspie'?

3. From whom did the government charter, or use, or arrange for the use of the steamer 'Golspie,' and upon what terms ?

4. What are the total amounts paid by the government to the owners of, or to any other persons, for or on account of, the use of the steamer 'Golspie,' during the years 1905, 1906 and 1907, respectively ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (For the Minister of Marine and Fisheries).

1. The steamer 'Golspie' was employed in 1905 and 1906 in conveying lighthouse supplies to lighthouses between Montreal and Port Arthur and vicinity.

2. The steamer Golspie' was wrecked on Michipicoten Island, Lake Superior, on the 4th December, 1906.

3. The government chartered the 'Golspie' from Messrs. R. O. and A. B. MacKay, ship owners and forwarders, of the city of Hamilton, Ont.

4. $7,500 was paid in 1905. $7,500 was paid in 1906. Nothing was paid in 1907.

COPPER CLIFF POST OFFICE.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Was any inquiry made upon the direction of the Postmaster General into the complaints respecting the conditions of the Copper Cliff post office ? (See unrevised 'Hansard,' July 12, 1906.)

2. If so, when was the investigation held, by whom, and what was the nature of the report which was made ?

3. Has the postmaster at Copper Cliff been removed from office in compliance with the petition of the 500 residents of the town, and for the reasons given in their petition ? If not, for what reason is he continued in his office ?

4. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to hold any further investigation into the subject of the complaint ? If so, when ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (For Postmaster General) :

1. Yes.

2. An inquiry was made by the Post Office Inspector of the Toronto Postal Division, who reported under date the 7th September last, that he had inspected the Copper Cliff post office and found that the post office premises compared favourably with other country post offices of the same class and that the duties of the office were performed in a satisfactory manner.

3. No. The department did not consider that the circumstances of the case justified such action.

4. If any further complaints are brought forward concerning the present management of the Copper Cliff post office the department will make further inquiry regarding them.

LAKE SUPERIOR FISHING GROUNDS.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Has the government been made aware that the fishing grounds in Lake Superior, tributary to international water, are being steadily depleted of whitefish, sturgeon, lake trout and other merchantable fish ?

2. Did the Dominion Fish Commission hold any session in the neighbourhood of Sault Ste. Marie during last year, for the purpose of inquiring into these conditions ? If so, where did it sit and has the commission made a report ?

3. Is the Department of Marine and Fisheries aware that American fishermen are making use of the provisions of the fishery privileges accorded to Indians, for their own purposes, by supplying them with nets, and purchasing the fish caught by the Indians in their fishing grounds at Goulais bay and Gros Cap, and exporting them to the United States for the American market, to the injury of the Canadian market ?

4. If so, when were such complaints made ?

5. Has the department taken any action upon the same ? If so, of what nature ?

6. Is the government intending to take any steps towards prohibiting the exportation of fish from Canada, with the object of conserving the same for the use of Canadians ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (For the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No.

2. No ; but the first sittings that will be held when the commission resumes its investigations in the early spring, will be at Sault Ste. Marie.

3. No. Indians, the same as white men, must comply with the Fishery Regulations. The question of licenses for fishing purposes in Ontario, is administered by the provincial government as a proprietary right.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Answered by No. 3.

6. The intention of the government on this point of policy cannot at present be expressed.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Was there an accident to any Ross rifles on or about May 24, 1906, at St. John, N.B.?

2. How many casualties to arms occurred on this occasion, and were the rifles of mark 1 or mark 2 pattern ?

3. In what company and regiment did these accidents occur, and who was the officer in command ?

4. Was any report of the occurrence made by the officer commanding the regiment to the officer commanding military district No. 8 ?

5. When was this report asked for, by whom, and what was the nature of the communication ?

6. Has the Department of Militia and Defence the report of the officer commanding the 3rd regiment, C.A., or any report or reports containing the facts relating to these accidents ?

7. If so, what is the nature of the reports, and when were they received ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I would like to remind my hon. friend that an order of the House was granted to bring down all the papers in connection with the Ross rifle. These are

being prepared, and will probably be laid on the table within two or three days. It would be much more convenient to have the matter discussed after the return is laid on the table.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Have any accidents occurred in the Royal Northwest mounted police in connection with the use of the Ross rifle ?
2. If so, where, and on what dates did the accidents occur ?
3. What are the names of the parties injured ?
4. What was the nature of the injury, and how long was the party or parties confined to the hospital ?
5. Has the government any record or report of such accident or accidents ?
6. If so, what is the nature of such report, and by whom was it sent in ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). The same answer to this question.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I do not think that the returns asked for would cover these questions.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I assure my hon. friend that the return will include every thing down to the date at which it is laid on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. The questions will then stand I suppose, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the reply to be that the return ordered by the House will bring down all the information asked for.

Mr. BERGERON. There can be no harm in letting the question stand.

ANNUAL DRILL—LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Referring to militia orders, February 9, 1907, number 34, under section 1, a clause respecting the annual leave of civil servants, is it the intention of the government to restrict the privilege *re* annual drill and camps to civil servants in the inside departments only, or to extend the same privileges to the outside service as well ?
2. Is the government aware that members of the outside service attending annual drill and camp have the time expended in so doing deducted from their annual leave ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). The question of leave of absence for civil servants who are members of the militia in excess of their annual leave, to enable them to perform annual training in camp, was brought to the attention of the Department of Militia and Defence by other departments of the Public service at Ottawa, and the approval of His Excellency the Governor General for such leave was obtained and notified in militia order No. 34 of February 9 last.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

The order provides such leave for the inside service only, but there is no reason why it should not be extended to the outside service if, after a trial, it has been found to be in the public interest.

BOUNTIES ON CRUDE PETROLEUM.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM asked :

What amount of money has been paid in bounties up to the present time on crude petroleum ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1904-05.	$350,047 17
1905-06.	291,157 20
1906-07 to date (Feb. 27).	203,963 24
	$845,167 61

This was answered the other day, when the above figures were given, representing payments to February 28. Now the hon. gentleman wants payments for February 28 to that ?

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. That will do.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—THE QUEBEC 'SOLEIL.'

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, before the House takes up the notices of motion, I wish to raise a question of privilege. The 'Soleil' of February 28 last, contained an editorial entitled 'Another avatar,' which read as follows :

Another avatar.

In Ottawa yesterday, Mr. Dubeau, M.P., repudiated most positively and unreservedly, the statements concerning Mr. Fielding, attributed to him in an article which appeared in the 'Nationaliste,' on Sunday last.

As for us, we did not think it necessary to call attention to the evidently false stories circulated by the above paper, being satisfied that the people would not be fooled by such tittle-tattle.

However, it is very fortunate, indeed, that Mr. Dubeau should have deemed it worth while to call attention to these slanders and should have repudiated them most unreservedly in the House, not so much on account of those stupid concoctions themselves, as on account of the facts brought out in connection with his protest.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Armand Lavergne acknowledged having written the article in the 'Nationaliste' to which exception was taken, and admitted that he had written it on information supplied to him by reliable people.

I refrain from reading to the House the remainder of the article, which contains abuse regarding myself. I understand that the 'Soleil' has called attention to that incident in order to have people think that I make use of confidential information as contributions to the 'Nationaliste.' That is not so. The facts which I stated had come to my knowledge through various and public channels, and are on the whole abso-

lutely true. As regards the denial made by the hon. member from Joliette (Mr. Dubeau), I have accepted it as coming from a gentleman and I still accept it; but I am bound to say that the remainder of the story is entirely in accordance with the facts and that if the government papers persist in representing me as a spy and a slanderer, I shall apprise the House and the aforesaid papers of the picturesque and coarse expressions made use of by a certain member on that occasion to designate the Minister of Finance.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing: 1. The chief differences in principle between the Ross rifle and the 'Snider Enfield,' the 'Martini-Henri,' and the 'Lee-Enfield.'

2. The average annual number of each, the 'Ross' rifle and the 'Lee-Enfield' rifle manufactured.

3. The various kinds of rifle 'sights' for which adoption has been sought in recent years.

4. The number of accidents to men in Canada from each, the Lee-Enfield and the Ross rifle.

5. The breakages or disabled rifles of each class recorded.—Mr. Sam. Hughes.

For a return showing: The number of desks of every kind and description, with prices of the same, bought for the House of Commons by the government, since 1896.—Mr. Bergeron.

For a return showing: All coal lands leased, sold, or otherwise disposed of, from the 1st of January, 1906, to date, giving the area disposed of, the party to whom, the consideration therefor, the assignments made, if any, the date thereof, and the name of the assignee in each case.—Mr. Lake.

For a copy of all memoranda in the possession of the government, showing the amounts from month to month reported by the company and verified by the officers of the government, as having been duly expended in connection with the construction of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway, whereon the government of Canada guarantees the bonds to the extent of seventy-five per cent of the cost.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing: 1. How much money has been paid by the government of Canada in the form of bounties on lead.

2. To what companies the same has been paid.

3. Where the mines are located.—Mr. Marshall.

For a return showing: 1. What properties in Ottawa have been purchased by the government since January 1, 1904.

2. What amount of commission has been paid on each purchase, and to whom paid.

3. What amount has been paid for legal expenses, outside the Justice Department, on each purchase.—Mr. Blain.

IMPORTATION, MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. R. BLAIN moved:

1. That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good; and by an equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

2. That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injury to young people; impairing health, arresting development, weakening intellectual power, and thus constituting a social and national evil.

3. That the legislation, licensing and restricting the sale of cigarettes has not proven sufficient to prevent these evils, which will continue while the public sale of the cause of the mischief is permitted to go on.

4. That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons heretofore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes; and that it is expedient to bring in a Bill at this session to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

This motion, Mr. Speaker, I believe to be one of great importance to the present and future welfare of Canada. This parliament authorizes the expenditure of large sums of money to bring European immigrants to assist in the development of our fertile Northwest; we devote a considerable portion of our time in this House to the discussion of the railway and transportation question; we give great attention to the development of the natural resources of Canada. All these are matters of great importance to the people, and all are questions that should receive the careful attention of this House. But the resolution which I move to-day is one of vital importance to the youth of Canada; and, whatever differences of opinion may exist among representatives here as to the use of tobacco in its various forms, I am quite sure no hon. member will venture to say that it is in the best interest of the people of Canada that cigarettes should be used by our growing boys, those who are to be the men of Canada in the coming generation. This is not a new question in the House of Commons. On April 1, 1903, my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) moved a similar resolution. At that time a pretty general discussion took place. The members on both sides of the House agreed that this was an important question and the House decided in favour of the resolution by a vote of 103 yeas to 48 nays. Following that resolution the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) introduced a Bill to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes in Canada. The Bill was introduced on April 29, and the motion for its first reading was passed unanimously. The second reading was proposed on the 18th of May, but on a technicality, the Speaker ruled the Bill out of order, and the mover withdrew his Bill.

And that was the last heard of this important question until January 21 of this year, when I put a question which was answered by the right hon. Prime Minister. The question and answer are reported in 'Hansard' as follows:

IMPORTATION, MANUFACTURE AND SALE OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. Blain asked:

Will the government at this session introduce legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes, as expressed by resolution of this House on April 1, 1903?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government, Mr. Speaker, have not come to the conclusion that they should introduce any legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes as expressed by resolution of this House on April 1, 1903, but I need not tell my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that it is quite open to him to introduce such legislation if he sees fit.

From that answer I anticipated, of course that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would give to the House and country legislation in accordance with the resolution passed by such a large majority in 1903. Of course, my right hon. friend stated that he did not intend to propose such legislation this session, but that it was open for me to introduce a Bill of that kind. On looking into the rules of the House, I found that, although this resolution was passed in 1903 by the large majority I have mentioned, it would not be in order for me to base a Bill upon it, or in other words, it is necessary for a similar resolution to be passed at this session before a Bill can be introduced.

I wish now to give some figures to show the nature of the question with which we have to deal.

Statement of the number of cigarettes manufactured in each province of Canada each year from 1896 to 1906, both inclusive.

1896.	
Ontario	2,135,500
Quebec	82,772,400
New Bunswick	1,008,000
British Columbia	78,500
Total	85,994,400
1897.	
Ontario	1,404,000
Quebec	91,808,000
New Brunswick	13,230,500
British Columbia	50,680
Total	106,493,180
1898.	
Ontario	227,947
Quebec	77,189,550
New Brunswick	10,528,070
Total	87,945,567
1899.	
Ontario	212,128
Quebec	98,717,100
New Brunswick	6,430,600
Total	105,359,828
1900.	
Ontario	137,732
Quebec	115,906,300
New Brunswick	7,223,400
Total	123,267,072
1901.	
Ontario	1,304,084
Quebec	118,054,850
New Brunswick	5,858,000
Total	125,073,134
1902.	
Ontario	9,620,684
Quebec	122,788,250
New Brunswick	5,858,000
Total	138,266,934
1903.	
Ontario	11,259,300
Quebec	161,080,521
New Brunswick	6,394,210
Total	178,734,031
1904.	
Ontario	8,506,430
Quebec	201,468,300
New Brunswick	5,908,200
Total	215,882,930
1905.	
Ontario	6,560,400
Quebec	242,323,437
New Brunswick	4,739,200
Total	253,624,037
1906.	
Ontario	5,935,100
Quebec	268,312,700
New Brunswick	1,629,550
Total	270,877,350
Total, 1906	270,877,350
Total, 1896	85,994,400
Increase, 10 years	184,882,950

These were the cigarettes manufactured in the different provinces I have mentioned. With the forbearance of the House I will now give the latest figures that it is possible to obtain of the number that were consumed by the people of Canada. From 1896 down to 1902 the department did not separate cigarettes from cigars and tobacco, and, therefore, the returns do not show any exports of cigarettes from Canada during those years. Commencing then in 1896 the imports into Canada were as follows:

TOTAL CONSUMPTION OF CIGARETTES IN CANADA.

—	Exports from Canada.	Imports into Canada.	Manufactured in Canada.	Total Consumption.
1896	.....	1,513,440	85,994,400	87,507,840
1897	.....	900,240	106,493,180	107,390,420
1898	.....	1,546,560	87,945,567	89,492,127
1899	.....	1,617,120	105,359,828	106,976,948
1900	.....	2,519,760	123,267,072	125,786,832
1901	.....	2,719,200	125,073,134	127,792,334
1902	2,983,250	5,058,250	138,266,934	140,341,934
1903	1,085,000	6,056,000	178,734,031	183,705,031
1904	1,022,000	6,331,500	215,882,930	221,197,430
1905	1,308,000	5,698,750	253,324,037	258,014,787
1906	549,000	7,092,500	270,877,350	277,420,850

These, Mr. Speaker, are the latest figures that can be procured, and I am sure the country will be alarmed at the enormous increase, not only in the importation, but in the manufacture, and particularly in the consumption, of cigarettes by our own Canadian people. Of course this is a question that will be regarded from many different standpoints. Some will say that it is a question that ought to be dealt with by the fathers and mothers; that if the fathers and mothers cannot control their own children and keep them from contracting these habits that are so detrimental to the youth of our land, it is useless for schools or collegiate institutes or local legislatures or parliament itself to attempt to do what the home is unable to do. I am of the opinion that a very large number of the fathers and mothers have done their very best to prevent their children from using cigarettes. The primary schools in many parts of Canada have given this question special consideration. The churches of all denominations, I am glad to say, have also given it consideration, and the local legislatures of the different provinces, all or nearly all, have passed what may be regarded as strict legislation on this question. Speaking for the province of Ontario, I may say that this Act was placed upon the statute-book in 1892:

'Chapter 52, An Act respecting the use of tobacco by minors. Her Majesty, by and with the consent of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario, enacts as follows:

I will read clause 1:

Any person who either directly or indirectly sells or gives, or furnishes to a minor under eighteen years of age, cigarettes, cigars or tobacco in any form, shall on summary conviction thereof before a Justice of the Peace, be subject to a penalty of not less than $10, or more than $50, with or without costs of prosecution, or to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for any term not exceeding thirty days, or to both fine with or without costs and imprisonment to the said amount and for the said term, in the discretion of the convicting magistrate. And in case of a fine, or a fine and costs being awarded, and of the same not being upon conviction forthwith paid, the justice may commit the offender to the common jail, there to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding thirty days, unless the fine and costs are sooner paid.

This Act was assented to and came into force on the 1st of July, 1892, and is upon the statute-books of the province of Ontario at the present time. I will not make special reference to the other provinces in Canada which have legislation upon their statute-books of a similar kind. Notwithstanding these restrictive measures—and I think the people in the main have made an effort to enforce these statutes—there has been, and it is going on to-day in Canada, an enormous increase in the consumption of cigarettes. It would be worth our while to ask some people who have given rather special attention to this question what they think about the use of cigarettes by boys and, in some cases, I am sorry to say, by girls as well, although not to any great extent, in my opinion. I have here a testimony from an educationalist in regard to the harmfulness of the cigarette:

The annual meeting of the Toronto Teacher's Association was recently held in that city. The teachers discussed various questions relative to their work, among others, that of obstacles to the proper development of child-nature. Mr. Ferrier, Superintendent of the Mimico Industrial School, who has abundant opportunity to know whereof he speaks stated that he could most unhesitatingly affirm that the greatest evil he had to contend with among the boys in his care was the use of cigarettes. He found this proved the starting point on the road 'that leadeth to destruction' to many a boy. Mr. Ferrier bore this further testimony to the pernicious use of cigarettes. 'I have never yet met a cigarette smoker who was a truthful boy, and I also know when the habit is once fastened upon a boy he will do anything to obtain tobacco.' And yet how slow our country's law-makers are to put the ban of their condemnation upon an evil which, when once learned, will so surely sap and undermine the best in the characters of our Canadian youth.

The cigarette habit, now ranging like an epidemic among boys and girls, in high as well as low life, has come to be recognized as one of the principal crime producing agencies. The use of the cigarette seems so to deaden the moral sense as to make the victim lie, steal and even shoot to kill, with little compunction of conscience. Character is utterly demoralized, and weaklings and degenerates are being made by the thousands.'

That is the testimony of a gentleman who has had very wide experience in the province of Ontario. The Mimico Industrial School is one of the foremost in the pro-

vince in connection with the taking care of boys, and I rather think this is important testimony given at that convention in the city of Toronto, and testimony that speaks for itself without further comment on my part. In the city of Montreal the Rev. Dr. Shaw, chairman of the Protestant Board of School Commissioners, in answer to a communication from the president of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, wrote as follows :

Dear Madam,—In answer to your recent inquiries as to the use of tobacco by boys in the schools under the control of the Protestant school commissioners of this city, permit me to say :

1. Personally I heartily detest and lament the great and growing evil of the use by boys of cigarettes and of tobacco in any form, and I am in full sympathy with your efforts to reduce this evil. . . . . In the High School, regulation No. 8, as framed by the board, prohibits the use of tobacco and this and other regulations are required 'to be read and explained to each class at least once a month.' Probably there is greater danger in this matter in the High School than in others, as boys here have reached an age of rash independence which more readily exposes them to temptation.

The influence of the former rector, the Rev. Dr. Rexford, and of the present rector, Mr. Dixon, has done much by moral, rather than by legal means, to reduce this evil. It is well known that their attitude to it is one of decided opposition.

I made it my business to write W. G. Taylor, Esq., a gentleman in the city of Montreal who is superintendent of what is known as the Old Brewery Mission, which is doing a very important work in the reclaiming of men and boys. He sent me a letter in reply. I will just make a quotation from it :

To have such a Bill passed would be a great boon, and I pray that the legislators of this glorious country may be led to give this obnoxious business of making and selling cigarettes a death blow. The good to be accomplished is immeasureable for there is no doubt of the baneful effects from smoking those 'death dealing cigarettes' especially on boys.

Further he says, giving an example or two :

Here is the case of a doctor——a man of talent who has filled and could fill a good position, so addicted that though he has been told by the best physicians that his eyesight will be gone in a few months and has fought for months for victory, yet cannot give up the habit.

Another :

Some sad cases have come our way. Men who have been saved from drink tell me that they find the desire for cigarettes stronger than that for liquor. . . . . I have had many others cry out to me about their slavery and curse the day they began to smoke the cursed things. I believe these statistics will show that in the majority of cases where boys have begun stealing from their employers they have been cigarette smokers. I would be glad if these few words will help even to the slightest degree in having the Bill passed. No cigarettes means less drinking of intoxicants.

I have also here some letters from some very worthy workers in connection with the Dominion Women's Christian Temperance Union. I will not stop to quote them all. I have one dated London, Ontario, January 27, 1907 :

We of the W. C. T. U. are moving along this line and have instructed our solicitors, Perkins, Fraser and Gibson, to prepare a Bill.

They have had under consideration the introduction of a Bill into this House for the abolition of cigarettes in this country. I will not further quote these letters, because they are very numerous. I have, however, a very important document here that I want to make one or two quotations from. I quote the following opinions on cigarette smoking from business institutions, colleges, United States army and navy schools, etc.:

2. Business college.—This is our experience in teaching more than fifty thousand young people : cigarettes bring shattered nerves, mental weakness, stunted growth and general physical and moral degeneracy. We refuse to receive users of tobacco in our institution. (Henry C. and Sara A. Spencer, Spencerian Business College.)

4. Omaha schools.—No two ways about it Either let cigarettes alone, or go without an education. The use of cigarettes impairs the faculties of the pupil, and sooner or later will ruin him.—Superintendent of Omaha schools.

5. Swift & Company (Packing House, Chicago), and other Chicago business houses employing hundreds of boys, have issued this announcement, or similar ones : 'So impressed with the danger of cigarette using that we will not employ a cigarette user.'

9. United States Army positions.—Thousands of young men rejected by medical examiners because they had tobacco heart, the result of cigarette smoking. In one examination for West Point, one-fourth of the candidates were rejected. Cause : tobacco heart from cigarette smoking.

10. United States Naval schools.—Out of 412 boys examined by the naval enlisting officer (Peoria, Illinois), only 14 were accepted. Of the 398 rejections, the greater number were on account of weak hearts, and in the majority of cases this was caused by cigarette smoking.

12. Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad bars cigarrette smoking.

14. High schools.—I will not try to educate a boy with the cigarette habit. It is wasted time. The boy couldn't learn. Trying to teach him would be like talking to a block of wood. Cigarettes are poisonous. A boy who smokes cigarettes can't learn.

Boys who smoke cigarettes are always backward in their studies. They are filthy in their personal habits, tending to viciousness ; they are hard to manage, dull in appearance. There is danger of such boys making weak and undesirable citizens.—Principal W. S. Strickland. (All of these instances are from the school principals of one large city.)

Ayer's Sarsaparilla Company, Lowell, Massachussetts, employs hundreds of boys. March 1, 1902—Believing that the smoking of cigarettes is injurious to both mind and body, thereby unfitting young men for their best work—therefore, after this date, we will not employ any young man under twenty-one years of age who smokes cigarettes.

John Wanamaker's.—The application blank to be filled out by boys applying for a position reads :

Do you use tobacco or cigarettes ? A negative answer is expected, and is favourable to their acceptance as employees.

Western Union Telegraph Company will discharge from their employ messenger service boys who persist in smoking cigarettes.

Northwestern University Academy. — Dr. Fisk has asked all pupils who will not give up cigarettes to leave. Last year not one of the boys who used tobacco stood in the first rank of scholarship. Careful observation has convinced me that tobacco is largely responsible for low rank in scholarship.

I quote the following letter addressed to the editor of the 'Lancet,' the foremost medical journal in Great Britain, on the danger of inhaling cigarette smoke :

Poisoning by the inhalation of cigarette smoke.

To the editors of the 'Lancet :

Sirs,—In papers read some years ago before the Bolton and District Medical Society, and the Lancashire and Cheshire branch of the British Medical Association, I drew attention to and described some work I had done on this subject on the suggestion of Mr. Gibson Dyson, Ph.D. It was pointed out that the habit of inhalation rendered the cigarette the most dangerous form in which tobacco can be enjoyed. It was also pointed out that the connection of carbonic oxide with the evils attending the habitual inhalation of cigarette smoke hitherto had been overlooked, and it was further suggested that the enormous amount of damage inflicted by this vice on the younger members of the community constituted a national danger, and some means should be adopted to minimize or put an end to it.

I am, sirs,
Yours faithfully,
J. HILTON THOMPSON, M.D.,
Vict.

Dated Bolton, January 26, 1904.

I quote from an article in 'Chamber's Journal' the following :

It is no exaggeration to say that this new habit of inhaling the smoke of cigarettes—a habit which has only come into vogue in this country during the last few years, and which in the next few will inevitably tell a great tale upon the mental and bodily capacity of the nation—more quickly obtains a strong hold upon those who give way to it than any other habit which has for its object the gratification of the senses in one way or another.

It is now perfectly safe to assume that, whilst a smoker of only twenty or thirty cigarettes a week may or may not inhale—probably does not—every man who gets through more than a dozen in a day almost certainly does ; otherwise the insipidity or nicotine taken in this form would very quickly pall upon him, and such a consumption would be impossible. The man who is fond of his pipe, and has not learnt to inhale, is always more than satisfied with half-a-dozen cigarettes in a day, and cannot see any sense in smoking them. On the other hand, the confirmed inhaler, who has abandoned himself entirely to the habit, thinks nothing of forty in a day ; surprising as it may seem to the uninitiated, it is by no means an uncommon thing for such a man to smoke as many as seventy, and I have even known this figure to be exceeded. Of course, the cigarettes are not smoked outright ; as soon as the nicotine which collects at the lip-end begins to taste strongly the man who inhales rejects it, and lights a fresh one from the burning end.

I shall also quote the following letter, which is also published in the 'Lancet' :

The cigarette craze.

To the editor of the 'Lancet' :

I have had twenty-three years consecutive experience in the tobacco trade, as manufacturer and retailer, I have the pleasure of numbering among my clients many medical men, mostly cigarette smokers, and I have watched with interest how their purchase of cigarettes nearly always increase. As an example, one doctor returned from South Africa about a year ago and smoked about ten Virginian cigarettes daily. He now purchases and smokes fifty Turkish cigarettes daily. His appearance is deplorable, having all the pinched ghastly looks of an opium smoker, plus dull reddish eyes and shaking hands. My firm conviction regarding the insidious effect of cigarette smoking is that the cigarette does not nauseate, hence the appetite is never satisfied. Pipe smokers will agree with me that in most cases after smoking two or three consecutive pipes the tobacco appetite is satisfied, but never in the cigarette smoker.

In view of these expressions of opinions from those who have studied the question, whatever difference of opinion may exist among the members of this House as to the best mode of putting an end to cigarette smoking among our Canadian youth, we must all agree that it is a great evil. When we remember that this evil is growing in Canada, I believe that there is hardly any other question which can come before us of greater urgency than the devising of means to prevent our youths indulging in cigarette smoking. We are spending millions of money to bring settlers from other lands, but what avails it all if we continue to allow this deadly evil to sap the lives of our own Canadian youths who ought to be our best hope for the development of Canada. The right hon gentleman, I am sure, is always anxious to have behind him public opinion. Upon that point I am offering no complaint. I would like to direct his attention to the fact that behind him in this country he has an overwhelming public opinion in favour of placing upon the statute-books this session a Bill to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes. It may be that in some provinces the feeling would not be

so strong as in others; that will be the case with every important question that comes up.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There is a way of getting around that now.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, if there is a way I think it ought not to be found on this question. The government of the day have behind them a large majority both in this country and in this House who would at once support such a Bill. Personally, while I am not much of a supporter of the present government, I would give them my hearty support so far as it goes and my vote as well if a measure was introduced at this session to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes in Canada, and I believe that the people of this country are favourable to legislation of that kind. I do not think the right hon. gentleman can set aside the views of the people. The people of Canada were very much disappointed, I am sure when, in 1903, so large a majority of the members of this House voted for a resolution and Bill of this kind, and when the right hon. gentleman allowed so long a time to elapse, from April, 1903, when the resolution was introduced down to the present time without any action being taken. The government have been requested on every hand, important bodies of people in every part of Canada have passed resolutions calling upon the government to carry out the expressed wishes of the representatives of the people. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his government have turned a deaf ear to this request, and today, I believe, the people of this country will expect from the government legislation on this question.

It will not be enough for some hon. gentleman to stand up and say this is a Sunday school question, and should be relegated to the churches and the fathers and mothers in the homes. That is not an answer, that answer long since has been set aside by the people of Canada; we expect the government to deal with these questions, it is their duty to deal with such questions and if the Prime Minister will take hold of this, having behind him a large and strong majority, while he may not be able to get the support of every gentleman on this side of the House, I can say he will have support from a considerable number of the Conservative members on this question. I appeal to the Prime Minister and to his government. It is useless for us to appeal to any other body. It has been pointed out that the legislatures of many of the provinces have made an effort, an honest effort, to deal with this question. They have found it impossible to reach the evil and have not been able to check to any great extent the enormous increase in cigarette smoking in Canada. We must remember that we are living alongside a great and growing country where this habit is very general. In the United States the annual growth in the consumption of cigarettes is enormous; the consumption of 1906 was many millions more than in 1905. These people are passing in and out of our country and our Canadian people are going over there. It is the boast of the government that a large number of American citizens are coming into Canada and settling on the Northwest lands. Canadians rejoice at this intercourse. Some of our Canadian people are still going to the United States. With that country lying beside us, separated only by a line, there must be for all time a great intercourse between the two peoples. We are paying large sums to induce immigration from European countries and it is our duty as a parliament to face this important question and prevent the growth of this habit which saps the life of the growing children of this country, as the government and the people understand very well. To-day important commercial institutions are posting notices at their doors that boys who smoke cigarettes cannot be employed by them. What is the use of developing Canada if we are to allow evils of this kind to flourish and destroy the future of our growing young Canadians, who will, of course, make the best citizens we can have. I make an appeal to the government; I hope I shall not be disappointed. I do not wish to weary the government with statistics, but medical men the world over agree that this is a great evil, and I want to pledge myself, in so far as I have the right, in support of such a measure—and I think I can promise at least a fair measure of support from this side of the House if the Prime Minister undertakes to place on the statute books this session a law to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). I wish to ask my hon. friend a question. I do not rise with any unfriendliness to the idea presented in the resolution, but simply to ascertain—because I assume my hon. friend has given some thought to this subject and speaks for some of the elements behind a movement of this kind—whether he has taken into consideration the proposition mooted in Nova Scotia that this parliament should be asked to pass a Bill which would give to each provincial legislature the power to deal with the suppression of cigarettes. I have under my hand some correspondence from bodies interested in that in my province asking me to support such a Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the hon. gentleman say as a lawyer, that the Dominion government could give to the provinces such jurisdiction as that?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The proposition is one I would not like to answer off-

hand. I am only directing myself to the question as to whether or not the course suggested has been considered by my hon. friend and those for whom he speaks.

Mr. BLAIN. I will not attempt to answer that question; my hon. friend will be quite able, I am sure, to deal with that matter. All I have to say is that I understand the parliament of Canada have power to place upon the statute-books a law to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes, and I may remind my hon. friend that a gentleman from his own province stated that the legislation that they had on the statute books of Nova Scotia was a dead letter, and therefore he suggested that it would be useless for the legislature to put further legislation on the statute-book of that province.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I shall be very glad to give my hon. friend the correspondence I have.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask my hon. friend what his opinion would be on the constitutional aspect of that question ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am afraid my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) labours under the idea that in asking the question I did, I was actuated by some unfriendliness towards his project. Quite the contrary, I would be disposed to endorse the spirit of the resolution ; but when he spoke on behalf of a large number of people, not only in his own but in other constituencies as well, interested in the suppression of the cigarette, I was in receipt of correspondence from people in my own county who were suggesting the method I indicated as the best means of dealing with the question. And it was in all sincerity, and not out of any hostility to the proposed legislation, that I asked the question I did. As to the constitutionality of provincial legislation of that character, one could only give an opinion from a legal standpoint after the Bill had been drafted providing for the dealing with this evil in a certain way by this parliament. As regards the abstract question, I think that this parliament has jurisdiction to deal with the matter.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) if any of the correspondence he has is against this parliament legislating on this question this session?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Not at all. I shall send my hon. friend what letters I have.

Mr. THOMAS MARTIN (North Wellington). I have here a number of statistics which I had intended giving the House, but as my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has gone so fully into the matter, I shall not weary the House with them. I wish to say however, that I am heartily in sympathy with what my hon. friend has said. I believe that the cigarette habit is growing very fast and is a great injury to our young people—both boys and girls, and I am prepared to support any legislation which will rid us of such an evil, but there is one argument against this proposition of my hon. friend which he did not take the opportunity of answering. I would ask him, if we prevent the manufacture and importation of cigarettes, can we hope to accomplish the object aimed at so long as we import tobacco which can be made into cigarettes ?

Mr. BLAIN. My reply to this is that I think our youth acquire the smoking habit by beginning with cigarettes. My object is to deal with this from the boys' standpoint. I believe that if we prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes, we will get at the root of the evil from the boys' standpoint and will thus accomplish a great deal.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). While I am heartily in favour of the two first paragraphs in my hon. friends resolution, namely :

1. That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes good ; and by an equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

2. That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injury to young people ; impairing health, arresting development, weakening intellectual power, and thus constituting a social and national evil.

The motion of my hon. friend is too extensive. Three years ago, this question was brought up by the hon. member for St. Lawrence Division (Mr. Bickerdike) and pretty thoroughly discussed. The discussion we had then and the information I have gained since lead me to doubt the feasibility of enforcing the prohibition in such a general way. At that time we had the advantage of the experience of Dr. Roddick, of Montreal, who then had a seat in this House ; and if I remember rightly he declared that in the case of grown up people the smoking of cigarettes was the most harmless form of the evil. While cigarette smoking is highly detrimental to immature youth, and while I would approve of any legislation prohibiting the use of cigarettes by our school children. In its present shape, I doubt whether the resolution—if enacted into law—could be put into practice.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has told us that this is not a Sunday school question but a very practical question, in which I agree with him. The use of cigarettes is universally admitted to have very injurious effects, both physical and mental, on immature youth. I would be disposed to go further than my hon. friend

and say that the use of tobacco in any form is very detrimental to the health of young people. But the physicians generally agree that it is innocuous to grown up people, whether in the form of cigarettes or cigars or smoked in pipes. The whole of my hon. friend's argument was that the use of cigarettes is injurious to boys. He did not pretend to say it was injurious to men, and I am convinced he will not. Does he think it is fair to deprive adults of that which is harmless to them because it may be injurious to young people ?

I sympathize altogether, for my part, with every effort that can be made to discourage, and, if possible, prevent the use of cigarettes by young boys. And, if I may be permitted to express my own feelings, I may say that nothing can be more offensive to me than to meet on the street a young boy of ten or twelve with a cigarette in his mouth. It is a thing, I think which should be prevented by police regulation, it is a thing which should be prevented by parents. But, although this is offensive and dangerous in the young child and should therefore be prevented, does it follow that it should be prevented in the grown man in whose case it is neither dangerous nor offensive ? It seems to me that my hon. friend is going altogether too far. This resolution, like all legislation of this kind, if it were passed and put in the statute-book in the form of a law, would be likely to defeat the very object which the hon. gentleman has in view. All sumptuary legislation of this kind has been shown by experience to be, not beneficial but the very reverse, unless there is a strong public sentiment in the community against it ; and I do not think it will be contended that legislation preventing the use of cigarettes by men would have behind it the support of the community. No one would suggest that men who desire to smoke should be prevented from using cigar or pipe, and equally, surely no one would suggest that men who prefer cigarettes should be prevented from using tobacco in that form. Still, this is the effect of the motion which my hon. friend has offered to the House and which he asks us to adopt. His argument, to which I listened very carefully—and for which, if he will accept it from me I would express my high commendation—was against only one form of tobacco and against the use of that form by one class—that is it was against the use of cigarettes by children. And yet what is his conclusion ? It is expressed in the terms of his resolution :

That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons heretofore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes ; and that it is expedient to bring in a Bill at this

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

session to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

In my estimation the motion of my hon. friend goes altogether too far. I have also this to say: Even if I thought that this motion could be accepted by this House, I can hardly agree with him that it would be expedient to bring in this session the legislation he proposes. We are now in the third month of the session, and we hope, by the blessing of a kind providence——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And the help of somebody else.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—and the consent of His Majesty's loyal opposition, and the efforts of the third party also—I am sure that on this question we shall be unanimous—to bring the session to a close early next month. Under these circumstances, I do not think the motion should be agreed to.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Will the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allow me to ask him a question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to hear the right hon. gentleman's sympathy with the purpose of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) so cordially expressed. He would like to see cigarette smoking by children done away with as far as possible. But he thinks it is going too far to prohibit the use of this form of tobacco by adults. Now, what I would like to ask is what he would propose, within the powers of this parliament, to mitigate the evil which he deplores ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have nothing to propose at this moment; but I am always open to conviction and always ready to vote for a good measure.

Mr. FOSTER. That is good as far as it goes, but I do not know that it gives us much information. For my part I have not very much to say with reference to this matter, except to express my hearty and entire sympathy with the purpose of the mover of this resolution, and, in fact of all those who have spoken, to prevent, so far it can be done, the smoking of cigarettes or tobacco in any form by non-adults, especially young children. This should be done not only for the sake of the children themselves, but for the sake of the nation as a whole. I am afraid that we sometimes lose sight of waste at one end whilst we devote great expense and care to building up at the other end. For instance, we are very anxious to have immigrants come into this country. We spend half a million or a million dollars a year in order to add to our population by importations from abroad. We consider that this is good business policy for the country. But, when the matter is looked at properly, I think that it is

at least as good business to prevent loss of life amongst those who are born in the country and so prevent the waste of citizenship. Or, take our action with regard to the question of tuberculosis and the waste of life caused by that terrible disease. It is well agreed that every effort should be put forward to prevent the waste caused by that destroyer of life in this country. But, were we able to follow the deleterious effect upon mind, morals and physique of cigarette smoking by the young of this country, I am not sure that we should not find more waste of life—to say nothing of the deterioration of morals and habits—than we make up by our efforts to protect our people against the great white plague. I think it is a fair subject for all legislatures, and particularly for this parliament, to seriously consider, how far it can go and what it can do to prevent this waste and this deterioration through the use of cigarettes by the boys and youths of this country. I do not think that any one will find much fault with that statement of the case. Well, then, here is the position: This waste is going on; every year sees a new generation coming up to the age when this scourge can begin its work upon them. Every year sees the effect that it is having upon the young life in our country, an evil which must perpetuate itself in adult life as, those who are falling in to this habit grow older. Are we to do something, or are we to sit idly by and do nothing with reference to this scourge of the country?—for it is neither more nor less than a scourge. Of course, we must all agree that anything that is within our power we ought to do. But have we ever seriously considered in this parliament how far we can go in this matter? I had great hopes of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He sympathized so strongly with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) who moved this resolution and declared so warmly his desire to see the evil cured, that I began to think, that, if he could not go so far as approve the legislation asked at least he could point out to the House and country some line of action which could be entered upon to mitigate, at least, in some degree the evils which he and all of us deplore. But he does not end with that. I do not say that it was his duty to enunciate a policy. It was of interest to me to know, and I am sure it would be of interest to the country to know, how far he was prepared to go, and how far his many friends and supporters in this House and in the country would go, towards mitigating the evils which are commonly deplored.

There is another point, in which I do not agree with my hon. friend. I am not a medical man, nor is the right hon. gentleman, but I would not subscribe to the idea that adults can use tobacco, as it is commonly used, with absolute safety, I mean that, as my right hon. friend put it, it is absolutely innocuous to men of adult years. I cannot subscribe to that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is that the experience of my hon. friend, that the use of tobacco is injurious to grown up men? He does not use tobacco and I do not. But I give my experience, and what is his experience?

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend will agree with me that there are two methods by which we learn, one is experience and the other is observation. All the knowledge that comes from observation personally, from the observation of others in and through a series of years, the opinions of medical men, the results which have been treasured up and put upon record—all that forms a body from which we make our inferences outside of experience. I may say that so far as experience goes I have had but very little in this matter, either as an infant or an adult. I have never been able to conquer the strong natural aversion to tobacco with which I believe almost all people come into the world. It is a taste which, I think, in most cases has to be acquired, and there are certain inward and outward strivings which are necessary in order to acquire a taste for and an ability to enjoy what they call the weed. I have not had very much experience in that respect. The experience I have had has not been very pleasant, so far as I can remember, and it takes an effort of memory to go back that far. But what I mean to say is that if, upon the young person of the human family, the use of tobacco in the form of cigarettes is admittedly injurious, a priori I think we can argue that it is injurious to the human system; and that if it is injurious to the young, it cannot be, as a rule, healthful to the old; that if the old can use and enjoy it without absolutely quick ill effects, it is because they have become inured to it, and it constitutes no argument at all that if they had never contracted the habit they would not be far better off physically, mentally and morally. But I have not lived so long as I have without being able to judge by observation of the ill effects of smoking and of the use of tobacco upon others than children. I would be sorry to have the opinion go out from this House that the use of tobacco in all its forms can be indulged in by adults with absolute safety and without any hurtful results. I think the experience of the world and medical observation does not carry out that view.

However, to come back to the matter which is before us, I would be sorry if something could not be done to voice the opinion of this parliament in a more moderate way—if my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Blain) will excuse me for using that word—and in a way which would obtain a larger body of support, against the

use of cigarettes by young people in this country. If this resolution could be put in some shape which would voice that opinion, I am sure that it would have great weight in the country. We are an august body, most of the time. The parliament of Canada has its dignity and its importance; and until people begin to know better, which is very late in life with a great many, there is a general respect for parliament as being the highest representation of the worth and ability of this country. Any voice which would go forth from this parliament, from this House of Commons, with reference to a matter of this kind, would undoubtedly have its effect in the country. I hope that a resolution can be framed in some way which will carry out what is evidently the sympathetic belief by most members of this House that the use of cigarettes is an injurious thing, both for the individual and for the country, and that the cigarette habit, which has become so prevalent amongst us, is much to be deplored. Then, having voiced our opinion in that respect, I hope that, either during this session or another one in the near future, some method may be devised by which that evil would be, to some extent, if not entirely mitigated, at least largely repressed. For, after all, the laws that you make upon any subject whatsoever, it is the home, and the school, and the church influences which make public opinion, and keep it strong, and make it the largest factor in repressing evils and supporting laws.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has opened up a very large and interesting question of political economy in his introductory remarks. I was delighted to hear what he said with regard to the bad economy in paying so much attention to the importation of foreigners while neglecting to save our own people. This is a question which requires more thought than it has hitherto received. I believe almost every word that has been said in regard to the injurious effect upon children of the vile habit of smoking cigarettes. There are, however, some things that I could not subscribe to. I think a good deal has been said in an exaggerated way, a good deal has been written by emotional people and hysterical people, and emotional people and hysterical people always exaggerate. In discussing any subject we ought always to keep within the bounds of truth; and if we keep within the bounds of practical knowledge, we must all admit that the cigarette habit is most injurious to our boys. There is no more disgusting sight than to meet on the street a boy with a cigarette in his mouth. This evil is much more prevalent than we might suppose from what we see of it on the street. If you consult the teachers in our schools they will tell you, as they have told me, that very few boys between the ages of six and fifteen have not the odour of cigarettes in their breath.

I do not know what we may do to prevent it, but something ought to be done, and yet I am afraid that no very practical result can be achieved. While the fathers smoke the pipe or cigars, the children, I am afraid, will smoke the cigarette. It is the most natural thing in the world for the boy to imitate his father. The father is the beau ideal of mankind in his eye, and if the father can smoke a pipe he can begin by smoking a cigarette, and I am afraid we will not accomplish very much in the direction of stopping boys from smoking cigarettes while we smoke the pipe. It looks to me to be as inconsistent as it is on the part of the man who says 'damn' every day in his household and spanks his boy for saying 'darn.' The boy will imitate the father every time. I will do every thing in my power to prevent cigarette smoking by our boys. It is extremely injurious. I believe the use of tobacco by any human being is injurious, although less so to the adult than to the child. I was not so fortunate as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who told us that he was born with an aversion to the weed. I am afraid that I had the nicotine of several generations of Irish dudeens floating through my viens, and I naturally took to tobacco and kept at it until I got older and sensible enough to lay it aside twenty odd years ago.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Did it hurt the hon. gentleman?

Mr. BLACK. I am sure it did. Coming back to the question, how much it is the duty of the government to protect the lives of our people in their childhood, I believe that is a question that should receive our earnest attention. There are many other things besides tobacco and tuberculosis, which are depleting our country of the very best stock that we can raise in it. If you will look at the statistics you will find that there are more deaths up to the fifth year than there are from that until the fiftieth year. What is the cause? Is it preventable and is it our duty, if it is preventable, to prevent it? I think there is no medical man in this House with experience, and there are several who have had extended experience, but will agree with me that the great majority of deaths in children are preventable and that in many cases they are due to maternal and paternal ignorance. The vast number of deaths that occur up to the fifth year are caused by indigestion. The ignorant mother does not know how to properly feed her child, and the child dies of some form of indigestion. The parson consoles her by saying that she must not grieve because God took away her child, when as a matter of fact it was taken by pure, sheer ignorance. I am talk-

ing of a very sad thing, but of a very true thing, and I say that the great majority of our young Canadians below the fifth year are dying for the want of proper knowledge, and I have a very strong conviction that it is the duty of the government to instruct the people in the proper way to rear their young. I was reading the other day of a large amount of expense that was gone to —and properly gone to—to prevent the death of cattle down in Pictou county from a weed that grew there. This government sent a veterinary surgeon all the way down there to investigate and save the lives of these cattle. There have been thousands and thousands of volumes issued this year, properly and rightly so, by Dr. Rutherford on 'The conservation of the health of domestic animals.' I would like to know how much has been expended by the government on the conservation of the health of our babies. There is more money spent by the government in properly raising a bull calf than in raising a baby boy. I do not know that this has very much to do with the question of cigarette smoking, but I could not help saying it. I would join with the hon. gentleman who gave notice of that motion in anything that I thought would be feasible, but I do not think that what he has embraced in it would be altogether feasible. I do not think we can prevent the importation of tobacco or cigarettes. I do no think we can really prevent the sale of them. I do not think we can prevent the manufacture of them, because the manufacture of them is so extremely simple that any child can learn in a day or two to roll up a cigarette for himself in the most perfect manner. Indeed, those of us who have ever gone to Cuba or been with Cubans know the dexterity with which the Cuban, in a moment, pulls out his packet of papers, puts the tobacco on the paper and rolls it and then it is only a moment until he has it lighted and in his mouth. I do not think that any law can prevent the manufacture of cigarettes. I think that surely some master mind can invent some way by which this evil can be lessened.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). I think it is quite evident from what has already come out in the debate that the longer the question is delayed the more difficult it will be to deal with it. I am not an advocate of the theory that the old man should sow the wild oats for himself and the boy too. That is about the argument that has been used by some hon. gentlemen who say: Oh, the old man must get his cigarettes and the boy must run the risk. I think we ought to give the boy a handful of wild oats once in a while and I do not see why it should not be possible that the older people should make some sacrifice in the interest of the young. I believe it is difficult, as has already been said, to teach the boy in the parlour that he must not smoke, while the old man is smoking in the kitchen. The boy is an imitator and the argument that the father uses to the boy that he must not smoke while he himself is smoking has not much weight with the boy. I once heard of a reverend gentleman who chastised his boy for having his eyes open while the reverend gentleman was having family prayer. The young lad asked: How did you see me if your own eyes were shut? The boy wants to know why you are doing it if it is wrong for him to do it. I can quite understand the difficulties surrounding this question and the difficulty that there is in dealing with it, but no man can shut his eyes to the fact that the youths of this country are being very seriously injured not alone by the use of cigarettes, but by the use of tobacco generally. I read some few years ago a report made by a board connected with the schools in France which found that in these schools which were getting large public aid a great many of the pupils were not making the progress they should make. An investigation was instituted and they found that in nearly every case where boys were not making the headway they should in the schools they were using tobacco. That was several years ago. I do not think there is any use in talking of the injury that follows the use of tobacco, but the question before the House is whether or not it is possible to deal effectively with this question. I do not think the resolution should call upon this House to deal with it this session, beause I do not believe that a Bill of that sort, having the proper scope to deal with this matter effectively, should be brought in and put upon the statute-book hurriedly.

I believe the matter ought to be thoroughly canvassed before it is dealt with, and then it should be dealt with in the most intelligent way. It is quite easy to say that you can put a law upon the statute-book prohibiting a boy from buying cigarettes or prohibiting the vendor selling to a boy, but I know that in my village where we have such a prohibition, the elder boys buy the cigarettes and distribute them among the minors. They get around the law in that way and they are likely to do it more or less no matter what law may be passed. However, any law that proposes to deal effectively with this question, shall have my hearty support, no matter from what quarter it emanates.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). I am heartily in sympathy with the spirit of this resolution, but judging from some letters I have received from members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Ontario, I am afraid that those who are interested in working along this line, have not been consulted on this occasion. I understand it was their intention to have a Bill

prepared and submitted to the House, which would avoid any clash of jurisdiction between the Dominion parliament and the legislatures of the provinces. I do not always agree with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), but I heartily concur in what he said to-day, and I am also strongly in accord with the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Dundas (Mr. Broder). I can hardly see how we can expect to carry any legislation of this kind through this parliament, considering the number of smokers who are amongst our members. I do not suppose there are half a dozen members in this House to-day who are not smokers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, I am glad to know that there are more than half a dozen who do not smoke, but I doubt if there are fifty. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Broder) that there is very little use in our legislating against an evil which we seem to endorse by our actions. The boy is very apt to follow in the steps of the old man; he is sure to reason that if his father smokes a cigar he may smoke a cigarette, which to his mind is only a small cigar. It is human nature for the youth to reason in that way, and it is pretty hard to get him to understand anything else. The best way for us to discourage this bad habit is to set a better example to the boys. I think there is no doubt but that there is a great increase of smoking in our community. We hear a great deal from medical men about the value of pure air, but I will defy any man to walk down any of our public streets and get more than half a dozen whiffs of pure air in the whole length of the street.

Mr. BRODER. What street?

Mr. KENNEDY. Any well travelled street in this city. For curiosity, yesterday while walking along Bank street from the corner of Albert street to Sparks street I counted ten men smoking, some smoking cigars, some cigarettes, and some pipes; and between that street and the corner of O'Connor street I counted twelve more. There is one characteristic about tobacco smoke, and that is that you can smell it a long way off; after you have passed a smoker you can smell him for fifty feet, if not more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. KENNEDY. I know that I can. I would not say that smokers intentionally annoy their neighbours, but the smoking habit is certainly very annoying to those who do not like it, and it must be particularly annoying to the ladies. If you go to a lacrosse match, or a hockey match, and get an upper seat you are in a cloud of smoke all the time. I do not think it is right, and I do not think it is healthy. It would be well for smokers to consider a little, and to remember that they are responsible through their example for the great harm that is being done to our youths. The example of the older people is at the bottom of the evil, and until we can get rid of that there is very little use of our legislating against cigarette smoking.

Mr. B. B. GUNN (South Huron). I hope I shall have an opportunity of supporting by my vote the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). The Prime Minister expresses a great deal of sympathy with this resolution, and he seems to think that legislation of the kind proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) should be enacted. Well, the right hon. gentleman has the power to enact legislation of that kind if he chooses. The Prime Minister reminds me of the man who stood at the top of a well, and who said to the boy down below: I am exceedingly sorry for your plight, I would like to help you but I don't feel disposed to. The right hon. gentleman has the rope in his hand; he can haul that boy out from the well if he chooses, but so far as I can make out from his remarks to-day he does not feel disposed to do so. In some respects this is the most important proposition that has been submitted to the House since I have had the honour of a seat here, and I cannot conceive how any hon. gentleman who represents a respectable constituency could refuse to support a measure of this kind. We are told that the session will be brought to an early close, but whether that is so or not, there is plenty of time to put a measure of this kind through, if the government wishes to. It is not a new question by any means; before I was elected to this House the question was discussed and a large majority declared they were in favour of legislation of this kind. It was said by one hon. gentleman to-day that a law of this kind would be hard to enforce. Well, most of us Canadians believe that sumptuary laws like this are harder to enforce in the United States than they are in Canada, and yet in the state of Wisconsin there is an anti-cigarette law and you cannot buy a cigarette in any city of that state without being subject to a heavy penalty. I, for one, have no doubt that in Canada such a law as this could be enforced, and I trust the hon. gentleman from Peel (Mr. Blain) will press his resolution so that we may know where the members of this House stand on the question.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) This is a very important question and it is one as to which we should not act hastily. In 1903, this House, by a considerable majority, accepted the principle of the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of cigarettes in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. And the importation.

Mr. FISHER. And the importation also. I do not want to go back on that in any way or shape. I think that we ought to keep that before us and we ought to try

and work towards it. I say this because I find that other legislation in the country by which an effort has been made to accomplish the result aimed at has been ineffective. The provinces and the municipalities have certain control over the trade in cigarettes. I do not know all the details of the various provincial laws but I know that they are very drastic in certain respects. I presume that the provincial legislatures have gone as far as they thought the public opinion of the various provinces would permit them to go in the direction of checking the smoking of cigarettes. They have not gone as far as this resolution proposes and yet my observation and my information leads me to believe that the laws which have been passed are more honoured in the breach than in the observance, and that, as a matter of fact, to-day they are to a large extent a dead letter. This being the case it requires the most serious consideration as to whether we can go so far as this resolution requires us to go, with any hope of the successful enforcement of such an enactment. There is another side to that argument and that is why I think that we ought not to in any way weaken the position which this parliament adopted as an academic principle a few years ago. It may be that the reason that these provincial and local laws are ineffective is that the provinces have not sufficient power to control the evil and that it is necessary, in order to control the evil, that the law should be passed by the supreme authority of the land, and should be equally effective and equally enforced and equally drastic all over the country. For this reason I would be tempted to support a resolution and a law on the lines herein indicated.

I feel however that perhaps there has not been that fair effort on the part of the inferior powers in this country to accomplish the end which we might reasonably demand and expect. One speaker this afternoon referred to the influence of the home, the school and the church in this country. These are most potent influences in this land and yet, as far as I can see, looking abroad in the land, the influence of the home the school and the church is lessening in Canada to-day in regard to the bringing up of our youth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. No, no.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, my observation leads me to believe that to-day there is far less control over the immature Canadian than there used to be fifteen or twenty years ago.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the fault of the present government ?

Mr. FISHER. No, it is apart altogether from government or legislation, it is that the influence of the older people over the younger, the influence of the teaching which would induce a reverence and a recognition of authority on the part of the growing youth is weakening and I believe that this spirit is growing amongst the young people of this land in a way that is dangerous to the young people and to the community. When the home and the church and the school to-day come to the parliament of Canada to ask the parliament here to do by-law what in an older generation they did without a legislative enactment, I have the best proof of the proposition I have just laid down. I think this is most regrettable, most regrettable in every way. Some one said that there was no more deplorable or horrible thing than to see an immature boy smoking a cigarette. I would be disposed to agree in that proposition if I had not seen an even more deplorable thing, an immature girl smoking a cigarette. That, unfortunately is becoming too common in Canada, although not so common as I believe it is in some other countries. But I believe that when the evil has assumed such proportions that it attacks not only the boys but also the girls, it is certainly necessary for us to do anything we can to check it.

Now, Sir, I have my own views about the use of tobacco in any shape or form. I know that those views are not popular and not sympathized with by the great majority of the people. I do not use tobacco in any shape or way and it is very offensive to me, when, as the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) has said, I go down the street and have dirty tobacco smoke puffed in my face by passers by. I have sufficient faith in the decency and kindness of human nature to believe that the doing of this is largely due to thoughtlessness, and that those who do it do not appreciate in any way how offensive it is to non-users to have tobacco smoke and the flavour and smell of tobacco forced on them, not only in public but in private places, as it is only too commonly in our country. Still that is a proposition on which I do not wish to dwell at present. I sympathize with what has been said in regard to youth. I believe personally,—I cannot say that I have experience, because I have never used tobacco—and I am led to believe by observations and by conversation and discussion of the question with leading medical men who have the best opportunity of judging the effects of these things upon the physique of a large circle of patients, that the use of tobacco in any quantity or form is rather hurtful to the user. I believe that the degree of the hurt is measured by the amount of the use. But the grown-up individual may be supposed to take care of himself. He ought to have enough knowledge and enough judgment as I said to induce him to take care of himself and not to hurt himself by an immoderate or general use of the weed. But youth we cannot expect to have that carefulness, that feeling of self-

interest or that feeling of self-restraint and therefore it is the duty of the powers that be, whoever they may be, to try to protect the youth and surround him with those safeguards which we do in many other ways. There is no more deplorable thing than to see boys going through the streets smoking. I have often seen school boys just coming from school within a few feet of the school door stop and take out cigarettes and light them within sight of the school buildings, probably within sight of the masters. I do not know to what extent the teaching authorities do make an effort to restrain its use among the pupils, but I do think that evil has not been met sufficiently by either the home, the school or the church in this country to justify them in demanding from us, the parliament of Canada, the passing of legislation.

I am not prepared to wait for that time. Personally I am in favour of a law which might perhaps interfere with the privilege of the grown individual to use cigarettes if he wishes to, because in the interests of the youth of those who ought not to have this privilege it may be necessary, as in the case of other legislation, to restrict the privilege of some persons for the benefit of others, and I am ready to do this. As to the exact form of the resolution, I confess that as far as this motion is concerned, I do not feel that at this stage of the session we are in a position to draft and put through this House a Bill which would be likely to be a successful one. If my hon. friend would change his motion by making it read 'next session' I would hold up both hands for it and do all I could to see that the motion passed and that the legislation should be introduced and brought forward next session—speaking, of course, in my private capacity and not as a member of the government. I am speaking of course in my private capacity and not as a member of the government. It would be almost impossible to give this session that thorough ventilation to the whole subject which would be required in order to draft a Bill that would be effective. This session is coming to its close, and the time at our disposal would not be sufficient to enact practical legislation. If my hon. friend should propose this motion in the early days of next session, before Christmas, I should be glad to do all I could to put through a measure which would prevent the use of cigarettes by young people. Therefore unless my hon. friend should amend his motion so as to make it read next session instead of this, I cannot support it. I hope that a Bill of this kind will be brought in next session and passed unless we can find other means more effective than those now in force to lessen this evil.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). My hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) has forgotten the old adage: Procrastination is the thief of time. If we cannot enact legislation of this kind this session, I am very much afraid that we will not be better prepared next session than we are now. We all know that during the past few years there has been an agitation to lessen the evil, if not root it out altogether. During the past year various young women's associations have interviewed members of parliament to this end. So far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I do not believe there is a member here from that province who has not had correspondence urging him to support a Bill of this kind. Those desirous to stamp out this evil have gone further. They have endeavoured to exert their influence in the elections and obtain pledges from the various candidates. Under the circumstances, it seems to me the House is just as well prepared to-day to deal with this question as it will be at any future time. We know that the evil is increasing, and consequently every year it will be more difficult to deal with. It is no argument to say that the law now in existence in the province of Ontario has not proved effective. I think it has done considerable good. In my opinion our provincial law prohibiting the sale to minors of tobacco, cigarettes and cigars has greatly aided our school teachers in their efforts to stamp out this evil. Before that law was passed, our teachers had no power to prevent the children from smoking; but at present they can exert their influence against those who sell the cigarettes, they can follow their pupils to their homes, and the result is a considerable diminution of the practice. No doubt the importation and manufacture of cigarettes have increased during the last few years, but it must not be forgotten that our population has very largely increased, and I think it will be found that the use of cigarettes by our school children is diminishing. We have certainly accomplished something. And we have, as the result of this, a demand for more drastic legislation. This tobacco evil is no doubt responsible for many diseases among children and for many crimes committed by our youth. It is undoubtedly a source of decadence, and responsible for a good deal of physical and mental deterioration. I do not think that the plea put forward by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) should be entertained. If we do not legislate this session, how do these hon. gentlemen opposite know that they will have control of the House next session. We have heard rumours of the possibility of general elections before another session; and if there should be, the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite on this and other questions may possibly induce the people to elect a more aggressive government which will pay better heed to the demands of the people. Besides we have no reason to believe that this session will close for a month or six

weeks yet, and surely in that time—especially considering that this question has been before the House the last four or five years—we ought to be able to dispose of it. I am prepared therefore to support the resolution of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. R. N. WALSH (Huntingdon). I cannot agree with the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) when he urges that we should not go too hastily. I believe that we cannot go too hastily in legislating on this matter. Nobody who has paid any attention to the youth of this country can fail to be deeply impressed by the pernicious results of cigarette smoking. I am surprised that the right hon. the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should argue that we ought not to deal with this question because cigarette smoking is not injurious to adults. Anybody who has heard the opinions of medical men or who has seen men with shaking hands who must have a cigarette before breakfast to steady their nerves, must know that the habit is injurious both to adults and youth, though of course much more so to the latter. All those who have given any attention to school children have found that the great difficulty in curtailing the habit lies in the temptation to buy cigarettes when they are exposed for sale in every corner grocery. It has been said that so long as the elder people smoke pipes and cigars, the children will follow suit. But who ever saw, while cigars and tobacco were in general use and cigarettes practically unknown, boys smoking as we see them to-day? It is only since cigarettes have been put on the market that the tobacco evil among immature youth has grown to such an extent. I think that a Bill should be introduced this session. What is the use of leaving it over to another session, when we will just have the same difficulty? All the speeches in opposition to this resolution are practically in favour of the legislation asked for; and when all are in accord, why not introduce a measure and put it through the House.

Mr. CHARLES DEVLIN (Nicolet). I would like to explain why it is impossible for me to support this resolution.

I have no objection whatever to the first two portions of the resolution, but I decidedly object to the last clause—that is, that portion which forbids the importation, the manufacture and the sale of cigarettes, I object to that for the simple reason that I do not think that, even if you were to enact such a law it would be carried out. Of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken here to-day there are several who, I am quite sure, if they knew the attachment that one using tobacco has for that article, would soon be convinced that notwithstanding any laws we might pass upon the subject, the man in want of tobacco would find a way to get it. The resolution, if carried into effect would do away with the smoking of cigarettes in this country. Well, I do not think that there is much likelihood of such legislation being carried out in the immediate future. For my part, I do not think cigarettes are much more injurious than is tobacco in any other form. If we carry out this resolution, what shall we see in the future? Take, for instance, a social dinner: there are those who cannot smoke a cigar or a pipe, but can smoke a cigarette; there are those who can smoke a pipe but cannot smoke either cigarette or cigar. Carry this resolution into effect, and the pipe must be taken out and smoked instead of the cigar or cigarette, and to my mind such a sight at a great social function would be neither seemly nor artistic.

But what struck me most was the speech of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I was edified; and yet I could hardly believe that this was the same hon. gentleman whom I had known from 1891 to 1896 in this House. Then, he was in power; then he had the opportunity of passing this legislation. That was his time. No doubt, the evil was as great as it is to-day, and I am quite sure that it was brought to his notice. His feelings upon this subject, I have no doubt, were as strong then as they are now. But never once, from 1891 to 1896, although he was then Finance Minister of this country, did he undertake to pass legislation upon this subject. And, I put it to the hon. gentleman: some day, perhaps, he will be Finance Minister again; well, when he is Finance Minister again, when he is once more at the head of the department over which he presided so long, will he bring in legislation such as he advocated to-day? I am quite sure that his attitude then will be exactly what his attitude was when he was Finance Minister. I am sure that he will not rise here to-day and tell this House that if his party comes into power, he will introduce legislation forbidding the importation, the manufacture and the sale of cigarettes. I can readily understand that on almost everything he will advocate higher duties, but I do not think that he will advocate this prohibitory legislation. I was astonishesd therefore, to hear him twitting the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon that subject and that he was so anxious that the leader of the government should immediately adopt a Bill forbidding these things, which, in his day he had the power to forbid but did not forbid, and which, I believe, were he in power to-day, he would not forbid.

Again, in respect of this article, what authority have we for saying that the cigarette is any worse than the cigar, or pipe, or snuff, or any other use to which tobacco is put? Why not include all these also? The hon. gentleman says that he is aiming especially at the protection of the children.

But, if the child is so anxious to smoke it will smoke pipe or cigar as freely and as readily as it will smoke the cigarette. I have very little patience, I confess, with a good deal of the doctrine I hear preached with respect to this subject. I think this is one of the matters which can be very well left to the parent, for the parent is interested in the care of the child, and he will see to it, far better than the state can do it, that the child shall not injure himself. Or, if it is decided not to leave it to the parent, far better leave it to the police regulations of the municipalities, as suggested by more than one hon. gentleman.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I move the following amendment, seconded by Mr. Barker :

That all the words after the second paragraph in the resolution be omitted and replaced by the following :—

3. That is the duty of the government to introduce legislation at the present session of parliament to prohibit the sale of cigarettes to and the use of cigarettes by persons under sixteen years of age.

I cannot go as far as the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) proposes, but I think it would be easy for parliament to pass legislation in the direction suggested by this amendment. There is no doubt that the smoking of cigarettes does a great deal of harm among children, I can speak as having had the experience of school commissioner for the city of Montreal. As some hon. members has said, the children leave school, and, for a few cents they can buy a package of cigarettes ; and they acquire the habit of smoking, which is a great injury, as indicated by the second paragraph of this resolution. My experience of the children in the schools, which experience is quite extensive, leads me to the conclusion that, if the children knew that the law had declared against their use of cigarettes, if they knew it had been made an offence, they would refrain from smoking cigarettes. As has been said here to-day, we sometimes meet children in bands smoking cigarettes. And what is the remark that we generally make at such a sight ? We say it is regrettable that there is no law which forbids the practice of smoking by these children. The parliament of Canada has the power to pass a law which will make it an offence for people to sell cigarettes to minors; it can make it an offence for children to purchase and use tobacco in that form. And, as I have said, I have no doubt that while such a law possibly might not lead to the total suppression of such a pernicious habit among children, it would greatly lessen the evil.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the proposed amendment prohibit the sale of cigarettes to children ?

Mr. C. R. DEVLIN.

Mr. MONK. Yes, it prohibits the sale to children and the use by children of cigarettes. It would be easy for any grown person—school commissioner, policeman or anybody else—meeting children smoking cigarettes to simply warn then that they were breaking the law and so assist in putting down the practice. The effectiveness of the law, according to my experience would be in the fact, which would become known to the children, that this practice is an offence punishable by arrest and confinement. Of course as has been stated, it is the duty of the parent to watch the child. But I must say that I coincide in what has been said by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) that the power of those authorities which hitherto have been sufficient to prevent the evil, the church authority, the civil authority, and the municipal authority and the authority of the parent, is greatly diminished. There are many opportunities to-day for children to purchase and use cigarettes which did not exist in former times, or, at least, were not so numerous. I believe that it is a step in the right direction to make it an offence to furnish children with what is undoubtedly, upon the admission of everybody a very obnoxious thing for persons of immature age. It is well that children should know in the streets of Montreal, and all large cities where they are so numerous—we had 30,000 of them under our care in Montreal some ten years ago—that there is a law that can reach them. For that reason I would be sorry to see this discussion end without any result. As I am not prepared to go the full length of the motion presented and so ably advocated by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), I would still like to see something done, and done at once, which would mitigate an evil which all admit to exist, so far as children are concerned.

Mr. BARR. I regret that the amendment will prevent the House from recording their votes on the straight question proposed by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). In Ontario we have a law which prevents minors from purchasing and using tobaccos, including cigars and cigarettes. Although it has not been effectual, still it has been a step in the right direction. But it does not fully meet the desires of the people. Therefore, I regret that the members of this House will not have an opportunity of recording their votes upon the straight issue which has been placed before us by the hon. member for Peel. The amendment will practically have the effect of shelving the question and amounts to nothing.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). At the outset I desire to raise the question of the right of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to propose an amendment. The hon. member has exhausted his right to speak, because he has already

spoken upon the main motion. I raise the question that he had already exhausted his right to speak and could not rise the second time to propose an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think that the hon. member who moved the amendment should have done so at the conculsion of his original speech, and having failed to do that his right to speak ceased at the end of his first speech, and he was not in order in moving the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I understand, therefore, your ruling to be that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was not within his right in proposing the amendment. That being your ruling, I propose myself to offer an amendment, it being understood that there is no dissent from the ruling of the Chair. I am going to assume that my point has been well taken.

Mr. MONK. I understand my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is prepared to move an amendment if there is any irregularity in my own.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) will have an opportunity of moving an amendment to my amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is every day the practice of the House to permit a member to speak more than once, as a matter of courtesy. The Prime Minister speaks half a dozen times very often on one motion, and no objection is taken to it. If we are to have a strict ruling in this sense, we might as well understand it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. For my part I have always felt that it was not proper for us to make any departure from the rules of the House even in the case of the Prime Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that settles it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Whether that settles it or not, I am giving my own view on this subject, and in my judgment the business of the House would be conducted very well by adhering strictly to the rules. I propose to move an amendment.

Mr. MONK. I think the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Johnston) is taken too late. I think he cannot raise the point of order after you have put the motion before the House, and discussion has been allowed to proceed upon it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hardly think that point is well taken.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I propose to move that all the words after 'that' in the second paragraph of the main motion be omitted and the following be substituted therefor:

That it is the duty of the government to introduce legislation at the next session of parliament prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to and the use of cigarettes by, persons under sixteen years of age.

I may say one or two words in this connection. Certain persons have made representations to me along the lines mentioned by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), persons who are interested in remedying the evils that have been pointed out by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). They have suggested to me that steps should be taken to introduce legislation giving the provinces a right to legislate along these lines.

Mr. BLAIN. The provinces have that right already.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am not prepared to speak on that point; I am only speaking from representations made to me by various temperance organizations in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLAIN. Various provinces have already placed upon their statute-books legislation of that kind.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am not dissenting from that position, I am merely pointing out that temperance organizations in the province of Nova Scotia have represented to me that it was desirable that legislation along these lines should be submitted during the present session of parliament, and they have asked me to support it. As to the power of this parliament to legislate, I am not a constitutional lawyer, and would not venture an opinion.

Mr. S. BARKER (East Hamilton). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be necessary for me to put the amendment. It is moved by Mr. Johnston, seconded by Mr. Hughes, (King's, P.E.I.)——

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. No, I am going to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. So long as the hon. member does not rise he can second the motion and still have the right to speak. It is moved by Mr. Johnston, seconded by Mr. Proulx:

That it is the duty of the government to introduce legislation at the next session of parliament prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to, and the use of cigarettes by, persons under 16 years of age.

Mr. BARKER. May I observe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) has not only adopted very much the wording of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) but he has actually taken his paper.

Mr. FOSTER. Stolen his guns?

Mr. BARKER. As I was prepared to second the amendment of my hon friend (Mr. Monk) I also desire to move an amendment to the amendment, and I will restore the original amendment as far as possible and

perhaps improve it a little. I therefore move in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after the second paragraph of the main motion be omitted and replaced by the following: That it is the duty of the government to introduce legislation at the present session of parliament prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to, and the use of cigarettes by, persons under eighteen years of age.

I move that amendment although I was in favour and would have voted for the original resolution, but I see no prospect of the original resolution being adopted on this occasion, and as I think that some action should be taken at once I prefer supporting this amendment to the amendment. There can be no doubt that a great many people have very strong opinions upon this ques- of cigarettes generally. There is a far greater number, I think, who object very strongly to the use of cigarettes by young people under age. I do not know that it would be wise to go as far as to say that all under twenty-one years of age should be prohibited but I certainly think that young people under eighteen should not be allowed to use cigarettes. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that a great injury is caused in the province of Ontario because of the difficulty of enforcing the law there. But, I agree with what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has said that if young people knew that it was an offence to be found in the possession of cigarettes and if the sellers of tobacco knew that it would be an offence to sell to these people you would do a great deal indeed to make the law effective and do away with the use of cigarettes by young people. I move my amendment, although I agree with what has been said here that if cigarettes are allowed to be used at all you increase the difficulty of enforcing the law as to young people. I do not wish at this hour to occupy time and I shall therefore simply hand in the amendment prepared originally by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier which I have altered into an amendment to the amendment and I presume that I have as much right to use that piece of paper as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) on the other side of the House had.

Mr. MONK. I beg leave to move that the question be now put.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is moved in amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barker, seconded by Mr. Taylor:

That all the words after the second paragraph of the main motion be omitted and replaced by the following: That it is the duty of the government to introduce legislation at the present session of parliament prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to and the use of cigarettes by persons under eighteen years of age.

Mr. BARKER.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I would like to rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier had the floor first.

Mr. MONK. I move the previous question. I move that the question be now put. There can be no further discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, yes, there can.

Mr. MONK. There must be a vote on that motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Are we to have the closure here? Is this discussion to be choked off because the hon. gentleman wants the question put?

Mr. MONK. I have made the motion that this question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the motion that the question be now put is in order at any stage.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. That can be discussed?

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I desire——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Mr. Monk moves, seconded by Mr. Fowler that the question be now put. The question is on the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I certainly object to this motion as far as I am concerned. I think this question is worthy of discussion by this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Go on and discuss it.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I would like to know just what is the question under discussion. I am waiting for an opportunity to discuss the question.

Mr. MONK. There can be no discussion on the previous question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No other question can be put but there can certainly be discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the rule is not that there can be no discussion. Rule 42 provides that:

The previous question, until it is decided, shall preclude all amendment of the main question, and shall be in the following words: 'that this question be now put.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will recall an example to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), which I am sure he has not forgotten. In 1886, upon the Riel ques-

tion a motion was moved by the hon. member for Montmagny of that date, Sir Hector Langevin moved the previous question and we debated it for two or three weeks.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the question can be discussed. No other question can be discussed until that is disposed of.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker,——

Mr. MONK. Do I understand you to rule that it can be discussed on the motion for the previous question ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. What question have I the privilege of discussing ?

Mr. MONK. That the question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER. It must be confined to a discussion as to whether the question shall be now put.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. To that I am decidedly opposed. I certainly think that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier should not endeavour to choke off discussion in this House. I think that the question which has been brought up by the hon. member for Peel is well worthy of consideration and of discussion by the members of this House and that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has taken a strange way of showing his sympathy with this question by endeavouring to prevent discussion in this House and before the country.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that we have only three minutes to discuss that question and he wishes to talk it out.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I am certainly within my right in discussing it for those three minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Prince). If I had only two minutes I would feel it my duty to give expression to my opinion on this subject. I may say that I am very heartily in accord with the principles expressed in the resolution moved by the hon. member for Peel.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. That is out of order is it; then I will address myself to the motion made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, but in order that I shall make no mistake on this matter I will again ask your opinion, Mr. Speaker, as to what is the question now before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question before the House is as to whether the motion shall now be put or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With all due deference Mr. Speaker, I submit the whole question is now before the House. The moving of the previous question is simply to prevent any other amendment being made, and I submit that the whole question which is now being debated, namely, the main motion, the motion in amendment, and the motion in subamendment as now before the House are open to discussion. I think I could quote authorities in support of my views.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. If I have your permission Mr. Speaker, I shall proceed with my remarks.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister has taken up part of your time.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I cannot help that, but I claim the right as a member of this House to discuss the motion before the chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I repeat, that I think this is a very summary way to dispose of this question. I am certainly opposed to the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and if it comes to a vote I shall vote against it.

Mr. W. WRIGHT (Muskoka). I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. Wright) has moved the adjournment of the debate, and the matter will therefore come up again.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think no other motion can be made while the hon. member from Prince Edward Island has the floor.

Mr. BLAIN. It is only fair to me that I should have an opportunity of saying a few words——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BLAIN. I very courteously ask, whether this motion shall be allowed to drop now, or whether the motion of my hon. friend from Muskoka to adjourn the debate shall be accepted, so that this question can be again discussed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MONK. I will withdraw my motion for the previous question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has a perfect right to have an answer to his question. I think, that while the motion for the previous question is under discussion, and the hon. member from Prince Edward Island has the floor, any other motion is out of order.

Mr. MONK. But I have withdrawn the motion for the previous question.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The hon. member for Prince (Mr. Hughes) has the floor, and

he has not waived his right to the floor. Therefore, the hon. member for Muskoka has no right to move the adjournment of the debate while my hon. friend is speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the point is well taken.

Mr. BLAIN. With the permission of the House, I would like to say that this question was driven out of the House on a technicality in 1903——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Blain) can address the House with consent of the House and the hon. member from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. But I have the floor.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite willing to sit down if my hon. friend is in a hurry.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I have the floor and I wish to continue my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the House and the hon. member object, the hon. gentleman from Peel cannot interrupt.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the House will not object.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BLAIN. If that is the kind of warfare, I will accept it——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Peel sees that objection is taken to his proceeding now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. J. Hughes) who has the floor can move the adjournment of the debate, or he can conclude his remarks; that is the proper course.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman from Prince (Mr. J. J. Hughes) has not concluded his remarks.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I cannot conclude my remarks, if hon. gentlemen continue to interrupt me.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. J. J. Hughes) move the adjournment of the debate?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER. It being six o'clock, I now leave the chair.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

INSURANCE COMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before we proceed with public Bills and orders may I ask the Prime Minister when we may expect copies of the Report of the Royal Commission on Insurance to be laid on the table.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, I do not know, it is in the hands of the printers now, but it ought to be ready any day.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the Prime Minister kindly inquire so that he can let us know to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Thank you.

THE TRANSPORTATION QUESTION.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bennett.

That in the opinion of this House the report of the Committee on Transportation (of which J. H. Ashdown, Esq., is chairman), should forthwith be taken up, considered and acted upon by parliament.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, of all the important questions which are agitating the minds of the people of Canada to-day, I doubt if there is any which is of equal importance with that of transportation. Not only is that important question agitating the minds of the people of Canada but it is equally agitating those of the people to the south of us in the United States. On page 22 of the report of the Royal Commission on transportation the commissioners have divided the routes from the Georgian bay to the sea-board into three separate groups :

1. Via Midland, including the Grand Trunk Railway, double tracked as Mr. Hayes proposes, the Trent Valley waterway and in all probability the Canadian Pacific Railway.

2. Via Depot Harbour, including the Canada Atlantic and Intercolonial Railway, and

3. The all-water route, via either the proposed French and Ottawa rivers and canal system or the enlarged Welland canal.

The first of these via Midland has been very ably discussed by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and consequently I shall have nothing to say with reference to it. I may, however, say in passing that not only are the remaining two routes of importance but also all the other routes; those from Goderich, from Collingwood, from Owen Sound and from Meaford, will all be required if we are to carry the grain and the other products which are to be grown in the Northwest to the sea-board. First of all let me draw attention for a few moments to the route via Depot Harbour. This road was built and formerly owned by the Canada Atlantic people but of recent years it has passed into the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway. That railroad purchased it in order that it might be used as a through route in the carriage of grain from Port Arthur to the sea. When they took hold of the road it was not in the most

perfect condition by any means but they have set about improving it systematically to the highest state of efficiency. Bear in mind that this is one of the important routes which the Royal Commission have set before the public. At Depot Harbour we have a depth of 24 feet of water which is ample for any vessel sailing upon our great lakes. There is still another advantage at that harbour over most of the lake ports in that there is no river running into it and consequently no silt or foreign matter deposited in the harbour; whatever depth of water there is there to-day will continue to be there without any additional expense. Furthermore this road from Depot Harbour has the advantage that it is 36 miles nearer to Montreal than by any other route and it is 60 miles shorter from Port Arthur to Depot Harbour than from Port Arthur to any other bay port making a difference of 100 miles in round numbers in favour of this line of road. At Depot Harbour large improvements have been made by this government; they have built a breakwater there 525 feet long of the most substantial material, built in the most workmanlike manner, which acts not only as a breakwater but also as a splendid wharf on which has been erected one of the finest elevators we have on the lake front. When this elevator was first constructed its capacity was 1,500,000 bushels but it has since been enlarged so that it has now a capacity of nearly 2,000,000 bushels. In addition to that the Grand Trunk people, as soon as possible after purchasing this line, undertook most material improvements. At Madawaska, the divisional point, they erected last year a magnificent concrete and steel round-house capable of holding 13 engines and also one of the finest coal sheds on their road, all equipped with the most improved mechanical appliances; it is second to none on the Grand Trunk Railway. They are erecting a similar round-house at Depot Harbour so that when those improvements are made the road will be one of the best equipped in that respect in the province of Ontario. When the Grand Trunk Railway took over the Canada Atlantic the trestles were in very inferior condition and it has taken a long time to fill these up but most of them are now filled, and they are working on the grades so that from Depot Harbour to Rainy Lake, 75 miles, they will be able to mount with only a 1 per cent grade and after passing Rainy Lake, until they reach Montreal they can easily obtain a 4-10 per cent grade because it is down grade all the way. When these improvements are completed it will be one of the best routes for carrying our through traffic to Montreal. Between Ottawa and Montreal they have made vast improvemnts. They have erected new steel bridges capable of carrying the largest engines and trains that they have; they have increased their capacity at least 50 per cent on this road and it is now one of the finest in the land. In addition to that this road can be easily connected with Petawawa where the military camp is held and if the government sees fit to take advantage of its running powers over the Canada Atlantic they can not only get to the Petawawa camp and obtain a share of the traffic which is largely increasing every year but can also carry their share of the through traffic from Depot Harbour to St. John and Halifax.

Having said so much with reference to this road, let me proceed at once to the city of Montreal and, inasmuch as a good deal has been said with reference to the alleged want of action on the part of this government in giving proper railway and freight facilities, I wish to draw attention for a moment to some of the things this government has done. I shall take good care that I do not cover the same ground that was so ably covered by the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher). There are some things which of course the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher) did not mention, but of course he could not cover the whole ground in one speech. Perhaps not the least important was the appointment of this commission to take up all the various routes and report to this House. This I consider one of the best moves this government ever made. In addition it has spent $550,000 on a survey of the Georgian bay canal route. That was a most liberal expenditure, but an expenditure which will be well repaid. Let me take you to the city of Montreal and see what has been done there. There was a great deal of work to be done and a great deal has been done though there is considerable still left to be accomplished. To give you an idea of what the St. Lawrence channel from Montreal was like not long ago, let me draw attention to how the condition of that channel affected us in my own riding. Mr. Perrigo, one of our most successful cattle dealers, who sends large consignments to the old country, sent a consignment not many years ago to Glasgow. But after the cattle were got on ship board, the ship was caught in the low tide down the river below Montreal and went over to one side. The consequence was that Mr. Perrigo lost a large number of cattle through their being smothered. But how did that affect the county of South Renfrew? Well, when Mr. Perrigo came back he told the farmers that inasmuch as he had lost so much on that trip, it was impossible for him to give the same prices. Consequently the prices went down several dollars a head. That showed the direct loss to the people of South Renfrew caused by the lack of proper facilities for the navigation of the St. Lawrence. Let me draw attention once more to the situation in Montreal in 1901. Mr. Roddick, who was then representing that city in this

House, speaking on the St. Lawrence channel, used the following language:

Marine insurance to the St. Lawrence is more than double to American ports. For instance, where the insurance is 4½ per cent to, say, Baltimore, we have to pay from nine to ten per cent, and even eleven per cent, on the steamers employed in the St. Lawrence route, which means, on a vessel costing $500,000 making five voyages in the season, extra insurance of $5,000 per voyage, or $25,000 per year.

A little further on he said:

Seventy-five per cent of Lloyd's underwriters will not look to the St. Lawrence, either for hulls or freight.

That was a pretty serious state of affairs. The question now is what has this government done? Has it done anything to improve that condition? Has it made matters any better? To show you what this government has done, let me draw your attention to an address which was given on February 13 last, in the city of Montreal by Hugh A. Allan, before the Shipping Federation. Here is what he said:

Proceeding Mr. Allan directed the attention of members to the fact that the large expenditure by the government in improving aids to navigation has been justified by resulting in the reduction of insurance rates for seven years, from 1900 to the present time inclusive, of thirty-nine per cent on provisions and fifty-four per cent on grain.

This shows clearly that the work undertaken by this government has been beneficial to this country. Furthermore I am proud to know that during this last year, owing to the improvements on the waterway between Montreal and Quebec, not a single accident has happened on that route of any magnitude whatever. The consequence is that the rate of insurance is going down every year and every time the rate of insurance is reduced on our products, that means so much in the pockets of the farmers or those who are shipping to the outside world. You must bear in mind that this government has provided a channel thirty feet deep from Montreal to Quebec—a channel which is three hundred feet wide where it is straight to 500 feet at the bends. The consequence is that vessels sailing from Montreal have no difficulty navigating the St. Lawrence route, and insurance has been largely reduced, to the benefit of the whole community. Furthermore bear in mind that this reduction goes to the benefit of the freight shipper no matter where he resides in the Dominion and consequently is a direct advantage to everybody here. In addition this government has constructed one of the largest and most powerful dredges in the world to-day. This dredge was built all of Canadian material, designed by a Canadian engineer, built by Canadian workmen and in a Canadian port. Surely it is a source of gratification that we should have the most powerful dredge and the most efficient in the world made by our own workmen in our own land. Surely that is something we ought to give this government credit for. Then you must not forget that the acting Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) when he took this position in hand, found things in the department in a very peculiar condition. The old board of commissioners was doing the work, and on that board there was continual bickering and friction. One wanted one way and the other wanted another, and the consequence was the work was not advanced as it should be. But when the present Minister of Marine took charge, he took the most sensible and wisest course. He appointed three independent commissioners, experts in that line of business. These three, along with one of the best engineers of the harbour, talked the whole matter over, and ever since the work has been pushed with vigour, and I hope the time is not far distant when everything there will be in perfect order.

Mr. TAYLOR. After playing with it nine or ten years.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I must acknowledge that things have not gone on as rapidly as we would like. But it is hard to get things in this world to go as smoothly as we would wish. One thing is certain, that things are improved as compared with former times, and I hope from this on they will get better than ever before.

I wish to draw attention to a few things we would like to have done in the port of Montreal. We believe that the St. Lawrence river should be for the benefit of the whole Dominion. We hear a great deal in these days of railways, for the 'general advantage of Canada.' Why should not the St. Lawrence river be for the general advantage of Canada, and be so designated? The ordinary workman living in Montreal has not half the interest in the port of Montreal and the St. Lawrence river that the farmer living a thousand miles away has. The farmer is the man who is interested in having that river put in the best possible condition for navigation. The man who works for day's wages in Montreal has none of this interest. Therefore, the St. Lawrence river should be designated as a river for the general advantage of Canada and used as such. The great ports of the St. Lawrence, Montreal and Quebec, should be made free ports. In the state of New York, in the present session of the legislature, they are passing a law which will do away with all the dockage in the port of New York, which, last year, amounted to no less a sum than $13,000,000. The amount of wharfage and harbour dues paid in the port of Montreal last year was only $360,000. Surely, if the state of New

York can give up over $13,000,000, the Dominion of Canada can give up this $360,000 of harbour dues collected in the port of Montreal. If these charges were removed and Montreal were made a free port, and if Quebec were treated in the same way, it would be a great advantage to the shippers of this country. And not only should Montreal and Quebec be made free ports, but St. John and Halifax should be made free ports also. There are other matters that are backward in Montreal and that should be changed as soon as possible. I speak particularly of the carriers which take the grain from the elevators to the vessels. As it is now, when a vessel goes to Montreal to be loaded with grain, the grain must be taken from the car and be put into the elevator, from here it is put into the barge which has to be towed out to the vessel and the grain elevated from the barge to the vessel. All this costs money and involves delay. The difficulty with regard to these carriers is that the sheds on the wharfs of Montreal have not been completed, but I understand that arrangements have been made whereby they will be completed at an early date this year, by which time the carriers also will be completed, and when this is done things will move a great deal better than in the past. Now, what is the use of our spending $90,000,000 in canals and $400,000,000 in bonusing railroads, if, when we bring our products to Montreal, we cannot get them shipped? Why is it that last year 20,000,000 bushels of our grain was exported by American ports and only 21,000,000 by our own Canadian ports? The reason is that we have not, up to the present time, the facilities for taking care of the grain when it came to the port of Montreal. This is the thing we want to have remedied. We want every facility for the loading and unloading of grain. It is true that all this will cost money. But you must remember the old adage that it is where you scatter a large quantity that you gather a large quantity, and we want to do the scattering in order that we may gather a great deal. Before I leave this point, I wish to refer to this wonderful scheme which Lord Strathcona and his associates have proposed to give a quicker connection with the old country—this 25-knot scheme which he is bringing to the notice of the government. I understand that by the scheme they will be able to take passengers from Blacksod bay, in Ireland, to Halifax in a little less than three and a half days, or, from London to Montreal in a little less than five days; from London to Chicago in less than six days; from London to Vancouver in nine days; from London to Yokohama in seventeen days; and from London to Hong Kong, China, in twenty-two days. What is more important still is that they can take passengers from London to Halifax and on to New York in one day less time than can be done by any other route. If this can be done, surely it is something that the government should take seriously into consideration.

Now, allow me to draw your attention to the Georgian bay canal, which is the third noticed by the Transportation Commission. I know that it is said by some that the days of canals are passed. With this I certainly cannot agree. Let me give you the answer which the state of New York makes to that suggestion. They have granted $101,000,000 for the enlargement and improvement of the Erie canal to deepen it from 7 to 12 feet. If they can pay so much for a canal only 12 feet in depth, surely we should be able to pay something towards the Georgian bay canal, to make it a waterway of 20 or 22 feet in depth. We find that the amount of freight going through the Sault canal in 1905 was no less than 45,000,000 of tons. This was in seven months, and the amount was three times greater than what went through the Suez canal in the whole year. If you wonder where this great haul came from, allow me to remind you that the tonnage from the city of Chicago is almost equal to the tonnage from New York and that the tonnage from Duluth is greater than that of the city of Liverpool and almost equal to that of Liverpool and Glasgow combined. This gives an idea whence this great traffic comes. And consider the saving to the people of the trade going through the Soo canal. On page four of the report of the International Waterways Commission, I read the following:

> The total number of tons of freight which passed through the Sault locks in 1905 was 44,270,990 and it follows that in this year there was an aggregate saving through lake transportation on Lake Superior, through freight alone, of approximately $116,000,000. In other words, by transporting the Lake Superior freight on the Great Lakes $116,000,000 were saved in 1905 to the producers of raw materials to the manufacturer, and the consumer, and the saving to manufacturers has made it possible for them to supply the home market and compete in those of foreign countries.

Let me give a few further figures showing the freight carried on the St. Lawrence canal in 1902 and 1904 respectively:

—	Tons.	Tons.	Increase.
	1902.	1904.	
Coal	12,000	345,000	Nearly 30 fold.
Corn	13,000	73,000	" 5 "
Miscellaneous goods	8,000	41,000	Over 5 "
Total freight passing through	11,000	1,427,000	Nearly 2½ "
Number of vessels	566	617	51 vessels.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why do we want the Georgian Bay canal constructed ? We want it constructed because it will be a regulator of freight rates on the railroads. You must bear in mind that canals are the best regulators of freight rates that have been discovered. They are far better than any Acts of parliament we can pass. They are continuous, they are always effective, and in every instance they make railroads carry freight at a reasonable rate. Now, it is impossible for us to bring the cities of the western plains to the sea-board, but we can bring the sea-board nearer to the cities of our western plains. If this canal were constructed to a depth of 21 feet, it would bring the head of navigation to Port Arthur and Fort William, a thousand miles inland, and the consequence would be that the cities of our western plains would be that much nearer to the sea-board than they are now. But that is not all. It would bring Chicago, Duluth, Fort Arthur and Fort William as near to the sea-board as they are now to Buffalo.

There are in this country three principal systems of transportation, wagons, canals and railways. The wagons carry everything too and from the railways. You would perhaps naturally think that marine transportation would work in direct opposition to the railroads in the carriage of freight. But as a matter of fact the one assist the other. Canals carry everything which is heavy, which does not require expedition, where time does not enter so materially into the operation. Canals carry that class of goods which railways lose money on, and which they do not care to carry. For example, canals carry the coal, the ore, the lumber, the stone, the lime and all such heavy goods in which time is not an important factor. But the railways carry goods which are revenue producing. They take the passenger traffic, they take the express, the package goods, they take live stock, and all that kind of freight on which there is money, and they leave to the canals the carriage of the heavy goods on which they do not make so much money.

Now, if this canal were constructed it would give us an immense amount of water power in addition to what we have now. It would give us more water-power and more valuable water-power than Niagara Falls, for the reason that it is distributed throughout the whole length of the 425 miles of this canal. Consequently we would have industries starting up all along this canal route. Let me draw your attention to this fact. Why is it that we have the town of Cornwall, with its 8,000 inhabitants and 2,000 operatives in the mills? It is because, in the construction of the canal, a fine water-power was developed which is rented to these mills, and consequently you find that town full of cotton factories, paper mills, &c., which never would have had an existence were it not for that water-power. The same remark applies to Valleyfield, a town of 12,000 inhabitants and 2,500 operatives in the cotton mills. The same remark applies to Côte St. Paul where they have 15,000 inhabitants and 3,000 men employed in the shops.

Now I ask you to bear in mind the experiments which Dr. Haanel has made with reference to the electrical smelting of ore, and which is so hard to smelt in any other way. He has discovered that all those ores we have now lying so plentifully along this proposed canal route can be utilized by the electrical process. Let me read to you what Dr. Haanel says in a summary of the results of his experiments.

1. Magnetite can be as economically smelted by the electro-thermic process as hematite.
2. Ores of high sulphur content not containing manganese can be made into pig iron containing only a few thousandths of a per cent of sulphur.
3. The silicon content can be varied as required for the class of pig to be produced.
4. Charcoal which can be cheaply produced from mill refuse or wood which could not be otherwise utilized can be substituted for coke as a reducing agent, without being briquetted with the ore.
5. A ferro-nickle pig can be produced practically free from sulphur and of fine quality from roasted nickeliferous pyhrrotite.
6. The experiment made with a titaniferous iron ore containing 17·82 per cent of titanic acid permits the conclusion that titaniferous iron ores up to perhaps five per cent titanic acid can be successfully treated by the electric process.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we have all these ores in such abundance, which can be smelted by electricity generated by water-power, you will see what a great source of wealth would be opened to the country by the construction of this canal and its accompanying water-powers. At Sturgeon Falls on Lake Nipissing there is a paper mill producing fifty tons of paper per day. If this route were constructed they would be able to bring in all the coal they require by water instead of bringing it in at great expense by land and they would immediately double the output of the mill and the number of hands they employ. At Copper Cliff, near Sudbury, are located the richest nickel mines in the world furnishing employment to 1,500 men. These works represent an outlay of $2,000,000 and they produce more than half the nickel supply of the world. They use nearly 30,000 tons of coal annually all of which has to be brought at great expense by rail from Pennsylvania and Ohio. If we have this canal constructed they would bring in their coal at such a low rate that they would commence refining operations right at their works, they would double the number of men they would employ and instead of sending all our ore out to the United States to be refined all this work would be done in our own country. The same thing applies to Cobalt. There, we

have the richest silver mines that there are in the world. Why should not all these ores be refined in our own country instead of going abroad? If we had this canal constructed they would bring in coal and the refining would all be done there and not in the United States.

Now, let me draw your attention for a moment to the route itself. If this route is constructed it will be in length 425 miles. Of this length 395 miles would be lake and wide, easily navigated river. There would only be thirty miles of canal and these thirty miles of canal would not be the same as an ordinary canal because the banks are of rock and so constituted that vessels could go through under full steam from one end to the other. It is true that there would be a number of locks, but these locks are managed so quickly that it would take very little time to pass through them. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, for your benefit, and I have no doubt that the members of this House would like to have this information, to state that a single steamer has passed through the Canadian lock at the Soo in eight minutes, a single steamer has passed through the Weitzel lock in ten minutes, and a single steamer has been passed through the Poe lock in eleven minutes. It is gratifying to know that we have in our Canadian lock the best and most improved that there is in the world. Eight minutes is all the time that is required to pass a vessel through that lock. If we can pass a vessel through that lock in eight minutes surely the delay that there would be in going through the locks on this route would not, taking into consideration the fact that it is a small operation, count at all. You must bear in mind too that this is a direct route, that it is 378 miles shorter than by the St. Lawrence, and that it is 450 miles shorter than the Erie route. It is not only 450 miles shorter, but it is also four days shorter in time and inasmuch as time is an important factor in the carrying of grain and merchandise surely this would be a great advantage. We must bear in mind also that this is a shaded route, that it will be protected from wind and storms, that consequently we will get a low rate of insurance and that no foreign navigation laws can affect us as this route is all in our own country. You must know that we have an arrangement with the United States whereby no more war vessels may be kept on the upper lakes than those which are actually necessary for revenue purposes. We also know that we have strictly lived up to the letter of the law. We know that the United States have not lived up to the letter of the law. We know that they have now on the upper lakes no less than seven or eight war vessels. We know that last year they took a war vessel in halves to the lakes through the Erie canal. It is not nice for us to say these things when there is such a good state of feeling between the United States and Canada. We would hope to see the entente cordiale continue, but if it should not continue where would we be? If we have the Georgian bay canal constructed and if there should be a war or any difficulty between us and the United States we would be able to bring vessels from the coast through our own territory and place them on the lakes and the consequence is that if they had war vessels there before us we would be able to go in and effectually protect our shores. Then, it would enable us to produce sailors in time of peace so that in time of war we would have them to man our men of war.

Now then, I want to say a word in reference to the cost of grain carriage. According to a statement which was made by Mr. Richardson of Kingston, the other day when a deputation waited on the ministers here it cost six and a half cents to carry grain from Fort William to Montreal by water and rail. If this route were opened we would be able to carry grain from Port Arthur to Montreal for three cents which would make a difference of three and a half cents a bushel. You can easily see what that means to the farmers of the Northwest. Just let me take you for a moment on board a vessel which runs from Fort William where the grain is transferred from the railway. Upon going to Midland or Depot Harbour the vessel has to wait for some time to get in and many times they are not able to get in as soon as they like. They take the grain from the vessel to the elevator and the loading costs half a cent a bushel. When they go into Montreal there is another delay, they have to take the grain from the car, put it in the elevator which costs another half cent a bushel, then they take it from the elevator and put it on the barge, and from the barge into the ship. This costs another half cent. For loading charges alone there is a loss of one and a half cents a bushel all of which would be saved if we had this canal constructed. We have on the great lakes capacity to carry 100 million bushels a year. If we have that surely it would be a grand thing for us to have this route because at the present time we are not able to get the grain out from Manitoba. Only a quarter of the grain grown in the Northwest has yet been taken out and we want this route in order than it can be carried out quickly. Now, I do not think it is necessary to detain the House any longer, but I do hope that as soon as the report comes down from the surveyors who are making a survey of this route it will be found that the amount which will be required will be within the reach of this government and that the government will take the matter in hand and construct the route at the earliest date possible.

Mr. GERALD V. WHITE (North Renfrew). Mr. Speaker. Representing as I do a constituency which lies on one of our great inland waterways, the Ottawa river, I feel it is my duty to say a few words on this very important subject of transportation. We are blest in Canada with abundant agricultural, mineral and forest wealth, and nature has placed at our disposal splendid waterways by means of which we can transport these resources cheaply and quickly to the markets of the world. But it remains for us to assist nature and to render suitable for the needs of modern commerce the transportation routes so generously placed at our command. In view of our great development in trade and commerce, the transportation question is one of the most important which faces the people of Canada at the present day. We have discussed during this session of parliament a project to build a railway to Hudson bay, which, connecting with a line of steamers, would give us a new outlet to the European markets. I am heartily in accord with all such projects to develop the commerce of our country, but in my opinion the construction of the Georgian bay canal is the project that above all others will confer the greatest advantages upon our country: It is now about fifty years ago since the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian bay canal, a scheme to connect the great lakes with the sea-board, was first presented to the people of Canada, and during all the years that have intervened in the last half century, it has been occupying the attention of the people of this country. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have during this and previous parliaments, advanced many cogent reasons why such an important work should be constructed with the least possible delay, and I join my voice to theirs in the hope that the government of Canada may now proceed with this undertaking. Within the last few weeks, we have had expressions of opinion from such eminent authorities on our transportation question as Mr. Robert Reford, of Montreal, and Mr. H. K. Wicksteed, chief engineer of the Canadian Northern Railway eastern lines, strongly advocating the immediate construction of the Georgian bay canal. As I have said, we have been blest by nature with extensive and abundant waterways, as an instance of which I might cite the fact that the Georgian bay canal scheme opens up to us a navigable waterway of 425 miles, out of which only 30 miles require any artificial aid to make it an advantageous route. Mr. Reford declared that the construction of this canal would make Montreal and Quebec two of the greatest ports on the American continent, and he also said that on every bushel of wheat the western farmer produced it would lessen the cost of transportation by three cents, putting that much more money into the farmer's pocket. Let me quote a few words from Mr. Reford's statement :

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT.

We have all heard of the American invasion and know that there is a strong feeling for annexation in the west. There are many American farmers there, and they think they would have an outlet for their produce in the states if annexation were accomplished. But, if we show them that it is in Canadian routes to the sea that their interests are best served, we shall bind the west to the east by chains whose strength we little realize.

This is strong language from Mr. Reford in favour of the Georgian bay canal, and no less enthusiasm for the scheme is evidenced by Mr. Wicksteed, who, although a railway man, has pointed out that while within the last thirty years railway rates have decreased by 50 per cent; water rates have gone down 80 per cent. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Wright) has pointed out that from a military point of view the building of the Georgian bay canal would be of great strategic advantage to Canada, inasmuch as at no point along the route would it be less than 45 to 50 miles from the international boundary. This feature of the scheme will no doubt commend itself to many Canadians who may not be so particularly interested in it from a commercial point of view. But Mr. Wicksteed has pointed out its commercial advantages and he says that while the main object of railways was to connect the west with Lake Superior, the object of this canal would be to complete that chain of transportation and to carry the produce of the west from Lake Superior to the sea-board. I quote from Mr. Wicksteed :

It can do us no harm to have the American commerce sailing past our doors; it can do no harm to Montreal and Quebec to have this commerce transhipped in their harbours ; and it can do no harm, especially in a political sense to have Canada controlling the main gateway of the commerce of half this continent.

Let me point out some few of the advantages of the Georgian bay route in the matter of distance from the points of production to the great consuming centres. I shall mention the following comparative distances :

	Miles.
Fort William to Liverpool via New York	4,930
Fort William to Liverpool via the Georgian bay canal	4,109
Difference in favour of the Georgian bay route over the New York route	821
Fort William to Liverpool via the St. Lawrence route	4,410
Fort William to Liverpool via the Georgian bay canal	4,109
Difference in favour of the Georgian bay route over the St. Lawrence route	301

And, Sir, not only would the building of this canal secure the trade of our great Northwest for ourselves, but it would undoubtedly attract to Canada a considerable portion of the trade of the western states. We find that the grain trade through to Buffalo, at the present time, is about 150,000,000 bushels a year, and of this quantity some 15,000,000 bushels is the product of the Canadian Northwest. Is it not a patriotic idea to so develop our natural waterways as to ensure that at least all our Canadian trade should pass through an all Canadian route. There is another feature of the Georgian bay canal which well deserves the attention of this parliament and which must add immensely to the wealth of our country. The development of the Georgian bay route would place at our disposal enormous water-powers, so that along its banks industries of all kinds might be established. It is said indeed, that from 3,000,000 horse-power to 5,000,000 horse-power could be developed along the route of the Georgian bay canal, and such an immense quantity of power cheaply obtained must give enormous impetus to the manufacturing industries of this country. Then again, its beneficial effect on our mining and our lumber industry would be incalculable. The products of the new Ontario mines could be cheaply transported, and the necessary supplies would be cheaply brought to the mining centres. Then, in connection with the lumber trade, this transportation route would carry the lumber direct from the saw you may say to the English market and provide a most convenient outlet for the products of the great sawmills on the Ottawa river. Then the vessels on their return trips could carry the lumber more cheaply from the Ottawa valley to the west.

As I said before this project has been before the country for a great many years. Within the last few years the present administration has expended some $550,000 odd on surveys in connection with this great scheme. I find in the report for 1905 the latest report which I have been able to obtain—the final report for this year not yet being down—that Mr. St. Laurent, the engineer in charge of the survey says in conclusion, after referring to the weather conditions :

Notwithstanding these unfavourable conditions, good substantial progress has been made, and the field force certainly deserve great credit for their efforts in the interest of the work, and the amount of work already performed. It is hoped that most of the survey will be completed late in the fall, excepting on two or three sections, which are longer than the others, and where physical difficulties are such that they may be completed only some time in January or February next.

It is understood also that in 1906, while putting down on paper the final scheme as adopted, it will be necessary to send out one or two parties at different points to supplement the information, if required, where structures &c., will be located.

I think it is due to the people of this country that at a very early date we should have the final report of the engineers on this survey.

It must not be forgotten that great advantages to the country would follow from the opening of this canal through the benefits that would be given to manufactures by the development of the water-powers on this route. Flour mills, for instance, could be erected at many points, which would form great industries and afford a market for the small grain growers especially.

As has been pointed out, it would tend to hold the railways in check in regard to freight rates, as we can see by the experience of other countries. Last year the Erie canal carried some 20,000,000 bushels of grain with 7,000-bushel barges. Taking into consideration the dimensions of this canal and the capacity of the barges it could accommodate, I believe it would be quite safe to say that the barges which could be placed on this route could have a capacity of 100,000 bushels, and thus it would be an even more important factor in the regulation of rates.

I have studied the report in relation to the hydraulic part of the work, and I find that the water supply at the height of land is studied on the basis of a possible traffic of from 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 tons. The survey shows that the height of land is at a point at or near Trout lake, some four or five miles from Lake Nipissing. It has been proved beyond doubt, at least as far as the stretch from the Georgian bay to Lake Nipissing along the French river is concerned, that the scheme is quite feasible, and this part of the route has, I think, been pretty thoroughly surveyed. We find that Trout lake is some 23 feet above the level of Lake Nipissing, and the reports would indicate that it would be necessary to excavate to the level of Lake Nipissing at high water. It was at first thought that it might be possible to raise the level of Lake Nipissing, but this has been found impracticable, especially in later years, since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the building of towns along the lake front, which would be drowned out were the surface of the lake raised to any extent. I am sorry that I have not more figures to give to the House on this important question, but as the final report has not been laid before the House, it is almost impossible to come to any final conclusion, especially with regard to figures. However, if I may be permitted for a moment, I shall quote a few of the references to this great project made by some of the leading engineers of this country. We find, for instance, the late Walter Shanly says in part :

The Ottawa country abounds in iron ore of the richest description. Its forests of pine are

inexhaustible. Its water-power is not only unlimited in capacity, but it is available to its fullest extent at numberless stages upon the route. By the opening of the projected navigation this geat manufacturing agent would be brought into comparative proximity to the granaries of Lake Michigan, and would immediately be turned to account in preparing the cereals of the west for the markets of the east. With such a combination of advantages in possession or in prospect, it is surely not difficult of belief that the valley of the Ottawa is destined to be not only the workshop of Canada, but one of the chief manufacturing districts of America.

Then we find that Mr. T. C. Clark, a member of the Institute of Civil Engineers, in his report to the government of Canada, in the year 1860, says :

In the first place I have to report that the distances between Montreal and the mouth of the French river on Lake Huron according to the plans furnished me by the department, is following the line of investigation adopted, 430·76 miles, that of this distance 351·81 miles are already a perfect natural navigation and requires no improvements and that it is perfectly impracticable so to improve the remaining 78·95 miles as to convert the whole chain of waters into first-class navigation for steam vessels and to reduce the length of canalling to 29·3 miles or, exclusive of the Lachine canal, to 20·82 miles.

I do not wish to detain the House at any greater length, but before resuming my seat I would like to point out that the other evening, when my hon. friend the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fisher) spoke on this question, he referred to the assistance given by this government to such projects as the Trent Valley canal, the improvements at Port Colborne, the increased grant to the Canada Atlantic Railway and so forth, but I was rather disappointed to find that he did not make any allusion to this great canal scheme, because it is a scheme the accomplishment of which will not only tend to further the interests of the people in eastern Canada but also be a great advantage to the west. In conclusion I would like to impress on the government the importance of this great work, and I trust that within a very few days we will have a final report laid on the table. That report, I am confident, will point out that the scheme is a feasible one and one which should commend itself very heartily to the present administration.

Mr. JACOB SCHELL (Glengarry). When this matter was under discussion last session, I took occasion to make some extended remarks, and while I do not propose going over the same grounds this year, I desire to make a few observations both as regards the position in which we stand and what has been done since we last met. I was pleased to listen to the remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) also those of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) and the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) as well as those of the gentlemen who have spoken this evening. But each of these hon. gentlemen discussed the subject from a special standpoint and not from a Dominion standpoint. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) devoted most of his time to discussing the improvements of Midland harbour, the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) discussed the Trent Valley canal, and to-night we have heard the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) pointing out the advantages of the Georgian bay canal system.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you heard something too about a dredge.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. That did not call for comment. The great subject before us is the movement of produce from the west to the east and east to the west by routes which would be the cheapest and best in the public interest. Taking up this resolution and discussing this matter from the standpoint of the Transportation Commission, I would point out that the commission summed up its report as follows :

Your commission are of the opinion that the Canadian routes herebefore mentionned, viz.:

1. Via Midland, including the Grand Trunk Railway (double-tracked as Mr. Hayes proposes), the Trent valley waterway and in all probability the Canadian Pacific Railway.

2. Via Depot Harbour, including the Canada Atlantic and Intercolonial Railways ;

3. The all-water route, via either the proposed French and Ottawa rivers canal system, or the enlarged Welland canal ;

Should be taken and considered as the main Canadian routes by which the products of the west will reach ocean navigation.

Having given these as the alternative routes, so far as the government is concerned, I believe they are carrying out the suggestions of the report of that commission as fully as possible, in so far as they are now erecting those elevators at Port Colborne which will take care of all the grain they can possibly pour in there. It all depends on the amount of elevator capacity they have at Port Colborne, and if that is not sufficient then the deepening of the Welland canal. So far as the government is concerned, I claim they have carried out the requirements of the resolution moved by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett).

The whole transportation question now resolves itself to a question of railway or canal transportation. I claimed last session, and I claim still, that canal transportation will scarcely compete with railway carriage. It has not done so in the past ; and notwithstanding the remarks of the last speaker (Mr. White), who quoted Mr. Wicksteed to the effect that the reduction in the cost of carriage by water had been so much more than the reduction by rail. I shall give you a few statistics which will show what we may expect in the very near future from rail transportation. Up to the

present in the carriage of grain from the Georgian bay eastward, we have not got any railway, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway or the former Canada Atlantic, which is better than a one per cent road. Let me give you the figures from one of the leading railways on the continent of America as to the haulage capacity of their trains :

With loaded cars, engines of twenty by twenty-six cylinders, sixty-two inch drivers, pressure two hundred pounds—when you are running your train, I will take a speed of twenty miles per hour, being the average speed per train, and will compare that again with a rate of fifteen miles. On a dead level, engines of that class will haul 4,621 tons at fifteen miles per hour, 3,383 at twenty miles. At one third of one per cent at fifteen miles, 1,952, at twenty miles, 1,570. At one-half of one per cent 1,500 tons and 1,200 tons. And at one per cent 909 tons and 760 tons.

Now any one who is at all conversant with the haulage capacity of trains to-day will realize that 900 tons is about the capacity of the ordinary freight train on a one per cent road such as the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canada Atlantic. But when those roads will be reduced to a three-tenths of one per cent or even a four-tenths, they will, according to the figures given here which are authentic, haul on a four-tenths grade three times as much at the same cost as on a one per cent grade, or they will haul it for one-third of the cost. We all know that the Canada Atlantic has been hauling grain at two and a half cents a bushel from Parry Harbour to Montreal. Let us go further and say three cents a bushel. On a four-tenths road, they could haul that to the same advantage at one cent a bushel. That is equal to any canal route in existence—it is better than any canal route in existence. And, if the Georgian bay canal system were a waterway, it would be different, but the Georgian bay canal route has to climb up 450 feet and down 450 feet and go through thirty-seven locks. The cost of that canal can only be given approximately. I went over to the department to try to get the figures, but was told that they have not yet got them completed. But one engineer went so far as to say that the total would be about $120,000,000 when the figures were made up. Another point I would like to make is that when they made the surveys in the Georgian bay canal, they did not take the levels—the levels are not upon the plans as I saw them in the department to-day allowing for the extra low water, we had last year, that we have this winter and that we are liable to have in recurring years. The water in the Ottawa river last summer was four feet lower than at almost any previous time. I had a conversation with Mr. Booth on that subject, and he told me that in forty-four years he had never seen the river so low. He remembered, that about thirty years ago, it was within about a foot of the low level it reached last summer. When you reduce the depth of that canal to allow for this unusual, but quite possible lowering of the water, there is no saying what the cost will be, for not only would dredging have to be done in many places in the river, but where the canal portions are constructed would be, as the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) points out that these points would be in rock and the work would be expensive. I think my figures prove that the up-keep of the canal, as compared with that of the St. Lawrence canals added to the interest on the cost of the canal, would carry free every year 150,000,000 bushels from Georgian bay to Montreal. This says nothing of the unknown and practically unlimited cost involved in the reduction of the level by four feet more. If we allowed for this, I believe that the expense would carry absolutely free 300,000,000 bushels of grain from Georgian bay to Montreal. It must not be forgotten also that the canal will freeze up two or three weeks before the open lake, reducing the season of navigation by this route very considerably. So far as lake navigation is concerned, I think the proper course is that which the government have been pursuing to make the best possible use of the Welland canal, either by building elevators at Port Colbourne or by reducing the level of the Welland canal so that large vessels can come through to Kingston. Either way would cost practically the same amount of money, say between $10,000,000 and $15,0000,000. Then you would have lake navigation into December of every year, and sometimes even longer as in the season just closed. The Georgian bay canal, away north would, probably in all likelihood be frozen up two or three weeks before that. I say, let us make the most efficient use of the canal systems we have, and let us depend largely upon the railways—and, before I conclude, I wish to point out another fact in connection with the railways. When the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is built, and the possibility of the Hudson bay route is tested, it will be time enough to go on to the Georgian bay canal system. I hope the day will shortly come when we shall require all these routes in order to move the products of the Northwest; but, until that time comes, I think the government should confine their efforts to making the best use possible of the route we have by way of the great lakes. The other matter concerning the railways of which I spoke is the fact that another railway is projected and now building from the mouth of the French river to Quebec. That road, I believe, will be put under contract during the coming year nearly all the way through. It will have 4-10 per cent grade and over it

grain can be carried from the Georgian bay to Montreal, or to Quebec, for less money than by any road in existence coming from Georgian bay.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Which road is that?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The Canadian Northern. Carrying of freight on railways is much the same as carrying freight on the water. On a waterway you have no grades to overcome, but, when you come to canals it is about as expensive as to carry by railway. When railways reduce their grades to the level, it will be a question which of the two, water or railway, will supersede the other. As a matter of fact, you cannot point to any canal system on the continent of America, but there is a railway running along it, and in many cases they have a railway on either side, and these railways are doing the larger share of the trade. I am not opposing the Georgian bay canal route as a route, but I am opposing the spending of the money of the people of this country and pledging the credit of this country at the present time for this purpose. Let the present canal be developed as far as possible, and let the railroads have the opportunity to compete with them, and I think we shall arrive at a very low rate for the carrying of the produce of the west and the manufactures of the east, especially when the rates are, as they are now, under the regulation of the Railway Commission.

Then, again, this government are giving bonuses year after year for the development and expansion of the railway system, and as they do that, open and develop the waterways as far as possible, make them as useful as possible, and enable them to act as regulators of the railways. On the waterway system of the St. Lawrence, the great lakes and the Welland canal this country has expended $80,000,000, or as some say, $90,000,000. That system is used principally as a regulator of the railways so far as freight carrying is concerned. Just as the rates of carriage on canals in this country, the rates of carriage on the railways have been going down to meet them; and still the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway are running right alongside the waterways and carrying their full quota of traffic summer as well as winter So it will be along the Georgian bay and Ottawa river canal, if it is ever built. While it might, in course of time, become a regulator of freight rates, I do not think the time has come when the government should take hold of this matter. More than that, I think the government have carried out the suggestions made by the Transportation Commission, and have fulfilled all the requirements called for in the resolution of the hon. member for East Simcoe. At that point I would leave this matter in the hands of the government, contending that they are carrying out to the fullest extent the very ideas embodied in the resolution of the hon. member for East Simcoe.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I would ask the hon. gentleman one question. What would we do if the Sault Ste. Marie canal were closed to-day? Where would that 45,000,000 tons of freight go that is now carried through it?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. We are not discussing that phase of the question now.

Mr. C. A. McCOOL (Nipissing). I desire in the first place to express my satisfaction with what has been done by the present government, so far, in increasing our transportation facilities. While I cannot say that everything has been done that I would like to have seen done, or that could have been done, I do think that great strides have been taken in the direction of improving our transportation facilities. This is a subject of great interest to me, and I have listened with a great deal of attention to the discussion that has taken place upon it this session, and also during previous sessions. In the main I agree with most of what has been said. I have no objection whatever to improving the harbour facilities on the great lakes, for instance, at Midland, Parry Sound and the other chief ports. All these improvements will be needed in a very short time. I am also very much in favour of improving the terminal facilities at Montreal, also at St. John and Halifax. Improvements at all these ports are necessary in order to facilitate the development and progress of this great country of ours. I am a firm believer in the policy of railway construction, and would give a charter to any railway company who could show its ability to go on and build a road. Without putting them to the expense and bother of coming to the House for a charter, let them present their plans, show their route, and make application to the Department of Railways and Canals, and then give them a charter. We want all the railroads we can have in this country in order to meet the growing needs of our great west. I have been curious recently to look up the statistics of grain production in the Northwest and have been greatly astonished at the rapid advance. For instance, in the province of Saskatchewan I find that in 1900 a little over 5,000,000 bushels of grain of all kinds were grown, whereas in 1905, the last year for which we have a return, the product was almost 47,000,000 bushels, or an increase of about 900 per cent in the short space of five years. That was in one province alone. The products of all the western provinces last year totalled almost 200,000,000 bushels of grain. Ten years from now, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, improved as it no doubt will be then, perhaps double tracked, with the Grand Trunk Pacific completed, with

its easy grades, with the Canadian Northern completed, and possibly with a road to Hudson Bay, it may well be doubted if even all these roads will be able to handle the immense quantities of grain that will be produced in that country. It is simply impossible to figure out with any degree of accuracy what the production of that country will be ten years hence.

Now, Sir, I was very much surprised to hear my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. J. T. Schell) speak in opposition to the improvement of the Ottawa and French River waterways, commonly called the Georgian Bay canal. I consider that that canal, if constructed, would prove to be an immense boon to this whole Dominion. That project has been a live question in this country for fifty years, as was remarked by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) and we have been looking forward to it ever since. In my school boy days we heard nothing else discussed but the Georgian Bay canal, and we have been discussing it ever since, without getting much nearer to a realization of the project. The first practical step however in that direction has been taken by this government, when they arranged to make a complete and through survey of the whole route in order to get an estimate of the probable cost. I think that was a most necessary step, and the proper starting point in this great work. It would be of little use to start in and complete a small section of canal here and there. We have had some experience of that kind when a piece of work was done at the Chats a great many years ago, and more recently, some twenty-five or thirty years ago, at Chulbute Rapids. As I said, I am very glad that the government has made a survey of this proposed canal, but I am a little disappointed that the report has not been brought down this session. I expected that we would have had it before now. However, I would rather wait another year than to have an incomplete survey, and an unsafe estimate of the cost of the work. In undertaking a work of this magnitude we cannot be too careful to get all the information possible. For instance, consider what the United States are doing at the present time in the way of canal improvements and construction. They are expending a hundred million dollars on the Erie canal between Buffalo and New York, which when completed, will not at all compare in importance and usefulness with the proposed Georgian Bay canal. Although we call it a canal, that name is in fact a misnomer, because it is absolutely a waterway, and a waterway of immense depth.

All the obstructions have already been mentioned to you this evening. There are only about 37 locks in all and there are hundreds of miles of wide and deep river sheltered from storms such as would cause serious delay on the great lakes. There is nothing that the present or any future government could do to so much advance the general interest of the Dominion at large as the building of this canal. It will not be a competitor with any other line. It does not interfere with the St. Lawrence route. All these and more will be wanted. Talk about double tracking the Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern Railway; we will have to have four tracks on those roads inside of the next twenty or twenty-five years. I therefore say that I am more than pleased that we have at last taken this up in an earnest way as evidenced by the expenditure on the survey and I do hope that when next session comes round we will then have such full information as will enable us to discuss it in an intelligent way and possibly prevail upon the government to start this great work.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, this is a very great question indeed and it affects every province of this Dominion. It vitally affects, if I may say so, the province from which I myself come inasmuch as that province is cut off from continuous communication from the other provinces for a considerable portion of each year. Some few days ago an important delegation was here from St. John, N.B., bringing a branch of this question to the attention of the government, namely, desirable improvements at that port. I find, Sir, that statements were sent out from Ottawa, written by some person here I presume, to some of the newspapers in this country including newspapers in my own province. I refer to the Summerside 'Journal,' the Charlottetown 'Guardian' and the Charlottetown 'Herald,' misrepresenting and seriously misrepresenting statements of the right hon. Prime Minister of this country made on the occasion of the interview with that delegation. It is regrettable that these things should be done in considering an important question of this kind. It is regrettable that a political party in this country, and newspapers supporting that party should think it necessary to misrepresent the statements of any member of the government, and particularly the statements of the Prime Minister. I do not think I could do better than just read what these papers say. I may say that I spoke at considerable length upon a branch of this subject some few days ago and this is a reference to the particular question that was up at that time.

But some light was thrown on it twelve hours afterwards when the Premier met a St. John delegation asking for harbour improvements. Then the Premier told them that he had been asked to construct a tunnel to Prince Edward Island. He mentioned a possible cost which was about double the highest estimate given and spoke of the project as one that could not be taken seriously.

Now, I have his authority for stating that this is a gross misrepresentation of what he said on that occasion.

Mr. C. DEVLIN. What paper is that ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The Summerside 'Journal.' Similar statements appeared in two other papers to which I have already referred, I consider it a most reprehensible thing that in the consideration of most important questions of this kind that we cannot discuss them without bringing in tactics of that kind. I consider it a very unfortunate thing indeed that any of the correspondents of the newspapers should pursue such a course. I bring this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. A. CAMPBELL (Centre York). I have not had an opportunity of considering the report of Mr. Ashdown as thoroughly as I would have liked. It is a very voluminous report, enters into the subject with a great deal of minuteness, and no doubt is one that will be of very great service in enabling us to arrive at a right decision in reference to the great question of transportation. I notice that this report deals very fully with the means of transportation at present in existence and refers especially to the Welland canal, the improvements at Port Colborne, the improvements at the port of Montreal, the lighting and deepening of the channel from Montreal to the sea and also to Quebec. The report also refers to the necessity of more dredging at Port Arthur, Fort William, Midland, Collingwood and Owen Sound. The report very generally goes into the whole subject of transportation from one end of the Dominion to the other, going as far west as Vancouver and Victoria and also paying some attention to the conditions at Winnipeg. A great many valuable suggestions are made that will be of great assistance to us in arriving at a decision as to the proper methods of solving this great transportation question. It is a question that has been now, for a great many years, engaging the attention of the House and of this government. I remember that last session we had a very thorough discussion of this same question and that views of members on both sides were given very freely as to the best means of arriving at a proper solution. The motion which has been placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, I do not think does justice to the government or to the House of Commons. It says :

> That in the opinion of this House the report of the committee on transportation (of which J. H. Ashdown, Esq., is chairman), should forthwith be taken up, considered and acted upon by parliament.

The natural inference from a motion of this kind is that this report has never been taken up, has not been acted upon by the government and that therefore this is, in a sense, a vote of censure upon the government. In my opinion if nothing had been done towards solving this great question by the government of the day that motion would be justifiable, but in view of what has been done by the government in solving this great question I think this motion is not one that ought to receive the sanction of this House. Take for instance the St. Lawrence route ; it is well known that this government engaged at once in a vigorous prosecution of the work of deepening the canals to fourteen feet which was accomplished in a very short time. They also devoted their attention to solving the great problem by deepening the harbour of Port Colborne and by erecting a long breakwater there and they are now proceeding to erect an elevator of a million or two million bushels capacity. That is just what Mr. Ashdown suggests in his report, and in that respect the government have been proceeding with the solution of our transportation problem. At Montreal the government have spent very large sums of money in recent years, building new docks, and warehouses and a steel elevator of large capacity, and improving the terminal facilities generally. The channel of the St. Lawrence has been deepened to 30 feet, the St. Lawrence route has been lighted almost as well as the main street in the city of Ottawa, and now, at any time of the night or day, steamers can sail up the mighty St. Lawrence in perfect safety. The work at Montreal is still going on. At St. John, Halifax, and Quebec, large sums have been spent for the purpose of carrying out the suggestions made by Mr. Ashdown in his report. I am not familiar with the conditions in the far west, but I venture to say that at Victoria, Vancouver and Winnipeg, the government is proceeding systematically and energetically with the improvements pointed out by Mr. Ashdown. There is no question to my mind but that the St. Lawrence route is the ultimate highway to the sea. When we have large elevators constructed at Port Colborne so that the great vessels coming down the lakes can discharge their cargoes and return to Chicago, Fort William, and Duluth to reload, and when we have a fleet of lighter boats carrying the grain from Port Colborne to Montreal and Quebec, then I believe that no railway can compete with our water routes. It is because we have not sufficient facilities for handling the grain at Port Colborne that 40 per cent of our Canadian products finds its way through American channels to the sea. It is an anomaly that we should have spent $70,000,000 on our canal system, and yet that vessels only carrying 70,000 bushels of grain can enter the St. Lawrence canals or the Welland canal. I believe that when the works at Port Colborne are completed grain can be carried from that port to Montreal for one and a half cents a bushel, as against three or three and a half cents a bushel by the Buffalo-New York route, and

about the same rate via Midland, or Depot Harbour or Owen Sound. I do not wish to detain the House longer, but, inasmuch as the government have been spending within the last two or three years large sums of money to carry out the very suggestions made by Mr. Ashdown, I beg to move in amendment, seconded by Mr. J. J. Hughes, as follows:

That all the words after 'that' in the second line of the amendment be struck out, and the following be substituted in lieu thereof:

In the opinion of this House the report of the Transportation Commission (of which Mr. Ashdown is chairman), has been considered by parliament and is being acted on by the government with reasonable progress, having regard to the public service generally.

Amendment (Mr. Campbell) agreed to, on division.

Main motion as amended agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up the tariff resolutions in ways and means.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 5, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 104) for the relief of Osprey George Valentine Spain.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—Mr. Johnston.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada and to change its name to the Royal Accident Company of Canada.—Mr. Johnston.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the United Baptist Woman's Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—Mr. Johnston.

ADDITION TO LUMBER COMBINE COMMITTEE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That Messrs. Galliher and Crocket be added to the special committee appointed to investigate the alleged lumber combine.

Motion agreed to.

INSURANCE COMMITTEE EVIDENCE.

On the Orders of the Day being called.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could the Minister of Finance inform us when the evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Insurance will be ready for distribution?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that the report and the evidence will be ready for distribution to-morrow, a sufficient number for the use of the members.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask what becomes of that large body of material in the shape of documents, known as exhibits, &c., which are of course germane to the whole matter and include in them the gist of the relation of the evidence to the subject in hand.

Mr. FIELDING. I could not give any information upon this. My attention has not been brought to it, but I shall make inquiries.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will notice that these exhibits are not necessarily read, perhaps short extracts are read from them and perhaps they are simply referred to as exhibit so and so, and the evidence is practically useless in many cases unless we have the exhibit which is filed with it and to which it refers.

Mr. FIELDING. This is the first time this matter has been brought to my attention, but I shall take steps to find out why the exhibits were not included.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Might I ask how many copies we will be able to get? I have had a number of inquiries.

Mr. FIELDING. In view of the intimation given that there will be a large demand we have given directions for the printing of an extra number and I have no doubt a reasonable number will be available for each member.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY SURVEYS; NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). Is the Prime Minister yet prepared to state whether or not the government will lay on the table the latest reports in reference to the selection of the route of the National Transcontinental Railway through New Brunswick? I notice the government press has announced, since the discussion of this subject in the House some days ago that the commission has approved the engineer's recommendation of the back route and that the report is now before the government for approval.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am not aware that the report has come for the approval of the government. I have seen the statement in the press, but I think it is premature. I will inquire and let my hon. friend know.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if he would be good enough to expedite the bringing down of the returns which were asked for by the House with regard to some sales of lands in certain townships in the district of Algoma. I ask this in view of the desire intimated by the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) yesterday to bring the business of the House to a close early in April.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The returns are in process of preparation as rapidly as the Department of Indian Affairs in able to get them out.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would call attention also to the fact that returns asked for on February 11 for similar information have not yet been brought down.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). And I would put in a plea with the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), unless the returns have not already been brought down, to expedite the bringing down of the papers relating to the old drill shed in Halifax.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I am sorry that I have to make another excuse. The papers are in the hands of the Department of Justice. Tht deputy minister tells me that they will be completed in a day or two. He had a telegram from Halifax concerning certain conveyances which are necessary to complete the papers. I think I can promise them positively next week.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). I would like to inquire when I may expect the return asked for respecting Blairmore town site.

Mr. OLIVER. These returns, I think, are ready to be presented to the House.

WAYS AND MEANS—ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL LAW.

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

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I beg to move in amendment the motion of which I gave notice on January 25 last as follows:

> That in the opinion of this House the government of the day is responsible for the due enforcement of all federal laws; and that if any further legislation is necessary to secure such due enforcement and the punishment of violations thereof, it is the duty of the government to forthwith introduce such legislation.

I have also a similar notice of motion which appears on page 386 of the Votes and Proceedings, which is made applicable to the Railway Act and which will come up later on. The reason that I make this motion is that I think it is really one in which the country is more vitally concerned to-day than almost any other coming before parliament. A very strange thing has happened. It has been laid down in this House by hon. gentlemen speaking on behalf of this government that while we pass laws in this parliament we are not bound to enforce them, but the enforcement is to be left to somebody else. I shall not take up much time in dealing with the subject, but, in order that I may make good my statement, let me quote from the official utterances of members of the government in this House. At page 1127 of the unrevised 'Hansard' of this year the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) laid down his position as follows:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order. The hon. gentleman is referring to a past debate.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then I will refer to the matter more generally. It has been laid down in this House by the Prime Minister, by the Minister of Justice and by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the enforcement of the federal law is not within the scope of the Dominion government, but is within the scope of the provincial authority, that, while we pass laws year after year, it is no part of the duty of the government to enforce them. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) even went so far that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) had to correct him. I believe that instance had been cited of the Attorney General of the United States being held responsible and having to enforce the federal law. But the Prime Minister argued that our constitution was different from that of the United States, and that the enforcement of the law depended upon the local authority. The Minister of Justice did not quite agree with that, but made the argument that the Attorney General of this country—who is the Minister of Justice—enforced the federal law only when the duty was specially imposed upon him, and that except in these cases he looked to the Provincial Attorney General to perform that duty. And the Minister of Finance when he defended the conduct of the government in its non-enforcement of the Inland Revenue law against adulteration said that everybody knew that the enforcement of this Act was a part of our criminal law administration and came under the jurisdiction of the provincial authority. And so we have this peculiar attitude taken by the responsible government of this country—that they do not consider it their duty to enforce the federal law unless that duty is specially imposed upon them by Act of this parliament. My contention is that the

government of the day is responsible for the enforcement of all these laws. It is to clear up this point that I propose this motion to-day.

Now, I would like to give an instance from the literature of imagination of the authorities taking a position similar to that of this government. The great poet of our language tells us how important it is to hold the mirror up to nature. It is to Shakespeare that I go to find a justification for the Prime Minister and his colleagues, and I think I have a quotation which illustrates their position on this matter most perfectly. I refer to the words of the celebrated Dogberry on the subject of the administration of justice. And I think the right hon. Prime Minister will see some resemblance to himself, and the gentleman to his left (Mr. Fielding) will see some resemblance to himself, the Minister of Justice some resemblance to himself, while the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) will find that he is the counterpart of one of those in the drama I quote from, scene 3 act 3, of 'Much Ado About Nothing.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We shall see whom this ado is about. We shall see how close the portraits are, including that of the Minister of Railways and Canals. Here is the scene:

Enter Dogberry and Verges, with the watch.

Dogberry. Are you good men and true ?

Verges. Yea. . . Give them their charge, neighbour Dogberry.

Dogberry. First, who think you the most desartless man to be constable ?

First Watch.

Our friend the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Hugh Oatcake, Sir, or George Seacoal. For they can write and read.

Dogberry. Come hither, neighbour Seacoal. . . . You are thought here to be the most senseless and fit man for the constable of the watch ; therefore, bear you the lantern. This is your charge : You shall comprehend all vagrom men ; you are to bid any man stand, in the prince's name.

Second Watch.

This is the Minister of Justice.

How if a' will not stand ?

Dogberry. Why then, take no note of him, but let him go ; and presently call the rest of the watch together, and thank God you are rid of a knave.

Verges. If he will not stand when he is bidden, he is none of the prince's subjects.

Dogberry. True, and they are to meddle with none but the prince's subjects : You shall also make no noise in the streets, for, for the watch to babble and talk, is most tolerable and not to be endured.

Second Watch. We will rather sleep than talk ; we know what belongs to a watch.

Dogberry. Why, you speak like an ancient and most quiet watchman ; for I cannot see how sleeping should offend ; only, have a care that your bills be not stolen : Well, you are to call at all the ale-houses, and bid those that are drunk get them to bed.

Second Watch. How if they will not ?

Dogberry. Why, then, let them alone till they are sober ; if they make you not then the better answer, you may say they are not the men you took them for.

Second Watch. Well, Sir.

Dogberry. If you meet a thief you may suspect him, by virtue of your office, to be no true man; and for such kind of men, the less you meddle or make with them, why, the more it is for your honesty.

Second Watch. If we know him to be a thief, shall we not lay hands on him ?

Dogberry. Truly, by your office, you may, but I think they that touch pitch will be defiled : the most peaceable way for you, if you do take a thief, is to let him show himself what he is, and steal out of your company.

Verges. You have been always called a merciful man, partner.

Dogberry. Truly, I would not hang a dog by my will ; much more a man who hath any honesty in him.

Verges. If you hear a child cry in the night, you must call for the nurse, and bid her still it.

Second Watch. How if the nurse be asleep and will not hear us ?

Dogberry. Why, then depart in peace, and let the child wake her with crying : for the ewe that will not hear her lamb when it baes will never answer a calf when he bleets.

Verges. T'is very true.

Dogberry. This is the end of the charge. You, constable, are to present the prince's own person ; if you meet the prince in the night, you may stay him.

Verges. Nay, by'r lady, that, I think, a' cannot.

Dogberry. Five shillings to one on't, with any man that knows the statues, he may stay him : marry, not without the prince be willing : for, indeed, the watch ought to offend no man, and it is an offence to stay a man against his will.

Verges. By'r lady, I think it be so. . . .

Second Watch. Well, masters, we hear our charge : let us go sit here upon the church bench till two, and then all to bed.

Now, the Dogberry method is apparently the method this government have adopted in regard to the enforcement of federal laws in this country. If you apprehend a thief, or a man who has done wrong in connection with a federal law, why, you are to let him go ; if the maid will not stop the crying child, you are not to interfere; and if you arrest a prince in the night time, and he protests, you are to let him go. I hold that is not a doctrine that ought to apply to a federal law in this country. I know that is the proposition that has been put forward from time to time in regard to federal laws. Time after time the law has not been enforced, time after time men who have been caught in wrong doing have been allowed to get out of the country. If, as the Prime Minister has pointed out, we are not to enforce federal law, if we are to leave it to other powers to enforce it, they have reached

the Dogberry position in regard to the application of Canadian law. This is not the position the federal government ought to take in the administration of law. I am going to the United States for some illustrations, where they have a somewhat similar constitution to our own, and there they have discovered the absurdity of passing a law and not enforcing it. We find to-day that the government of the United States, under the lead of the present president, and of the Attorney General, and of the Secretary of State, have decided that federal laws must be enforced, and they have reached the stage over there that in every federal Act they put a clause that it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to enforce that law, and furthermore they make a money provision for the enforcement of that law. Now, I wish to read an extract which shows the position of American statesmen on this question. In the United States statutes dealing with combinations in connection with the tariff law, it is declared to be crime to make combinations to enhance the price of an article which comes under the Tariff Act. Then it goes on to say: The several circuit courts of the United States are hereby invested with jurisdiction to prevent violations of section 73 of this Act.

It shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States, whenever the Attorney General shall direct, either of his own motion or upon the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to institute and prosecute such proceedings.

Then the law goes on to provide that the sum of $500,000 is appropriated to the service of the Attorney General of the United States to enforce this law. That is the way they are reaching these combinations in the United States, combinations in restraint of trade, whether in connection with the tariff or not; it is by the Attorney General of the United States being made responsible for the enforcement of that law, and a large sum of money being placed at his disposal to enforce that law. I believe the Attorney General of Canada this session is asking power to enforce the law in our Railway Act, and that money be given him for that purpose. I believe there is a feeling on the part of the government that in some way they are responsible for the enforcement of law, but only to the extent that they may be instructed in a special clause. My contention is that if a law is a federal law its enforcement by that very fact rests upon the Attorney General, and he ought to have all the money he requires to employ counsel, to employ special agents to work up his case. But here he says—and his confession is on record—I will only enforce the law when parliament imposes it on me by special Act. Now, I want the House and the country to listen to that. The Minister of Justice has stated that he will only enforce a federal law in this country when he is instructed by a special Act of parliament to do so.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

Now, in the United States they have a Railway Act such as we have here, but they handle it in a very different way from the way we handle it in this country. Take their Railway Act and you will find these clauses occurring in it:

The commission——

That is the Railway Commission.

—is hereby authorized and required to enforce the provisions of this Act.

Then it goes on:

And the Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed to institute, in any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction, civil action to recover such money.

On the next page you will find a statement of the instructions to the Attorney General of the United States to enforce the Railway Act:

It shall be the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to inform the Attorney General of all such cases of neglect or refusal and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to proceed at once to judicially enforce the forfeitures hereinbefore provided.

It runs all through that Act and it runs all through other Acts they are passing in the United States, that it is the duty of the Attorney General to enforce the law. But we have the confession here that the Attorney General will only enforce the law when he is so instructed and taking that view he is asking for a special instruction from the commission in order to employ counsel and look into the express company phase of the Railway Act. Surely that is a confession of weakness that the people of Canada never expected from the government. They thought that we were passing laws in the public interest and that whether they were in connection with railways, the tariff, the Criminal Code or anything else they would be enforced by the government. We have been talking year after year about the purity of elections in this country. We have been passing laws to secure the purity of elections but the government do not undertake to enforce the law. They leave it to the local authorities, to the provincial governments, and if a provincial government happens to be friendly to the party in power nothing is done. If a hostile party happens to be in power, although it may be an honest party and determined simply to enforce the law, it puts the law in operation and we get revelations in regard to misconduct in elections. An instance which illustrates the truth of this is the case of the London election. As long as J. M. Gibson was Attorney General of the province of Ontario there were no revelations with regard to the conduct of elections in that province, but there came in a new Attorney General and then we had these revelations. I contend that the Minister of Justice should enforce the

law and that he should instruct his attorneys to enforce it. He should have power to enforce the law, to employ counsel, to institute proceedings and have the law vindicated. Take this Railway Act again—and I must appeal to the Minister of Railways and Canals to bear me out in this—when you go through it it comes down to this that the only enforcement we have to-day, except in one or two instances, is at the instigation of the man who pays the freight, or who is the passenger or the traveller. The ordinary citizen is the litigant in that case and he is called upon to enforce this great Railway Act. I contend that the Attorney General and the Minister of Railways ought to be enjoined in that Act to enforce it at every point to see that it is enforced and that the Railway Commission ought to have power to ask him in every case to assist in the enforcement of it. But, as far as I can see, I can only find one clause of the Railway Act under which you can go to the Attorney General and ask his view in regard to certain breaches of the Act and under which he can proceed to recover a fine. But in no case is that done. Under the law that is the only enforcement of it that is placed upon the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Railways. It is left to the private suitor. I am going to read a few words from the present Secretary of State in the Roosevelt cabinet as to what is happening in the United States. He is claiming great credit for the Roosevelt cabinet for the enforcement of federal law. Formerly that was not the case in that country, but as Mr. Root explained a new condition of things has arrived in the United States. He spoke as follows:

> For the accomplishment of this due measure of control, which from time immemorial our laws have recognized as necessary, the government of the United States has taken up the task where the several states have failed, and is performing and purposes to perform its duty not beyond but to the full limit of its constitutional power.

And then on another page he says:

> The obstacles to the enforcement of the federal anti-trust Act thus removed are obstacles which stood in the way of all proceedings, and they had to be cleared away before any proceedings of the same character against the same class of corporations could be successfully maintained. They have been removed, not by newspaper headlines and denunciation, but by skill, ability and energy of the highest order.

The cabinet of the United States found that they had these laws to administer and they found obstacles in the way, but the energy and legal talent of that cabinet succeeded in removing these obstacles with the result that the law has been enforced. Mr. Root goes on to say:

> Thereupon the Department of Justice began active prosecutions for the enforcement of the law. Fifty-three indictments have been found against hundreds of defendants and covering many hundreds of transactions.

That is what has happened in the United States. They have made these federal laws. They have made the Attorney General responsible for their enforcement and the government over there claim for themselves the greatest credit and they certainly deserve credit. Look what they are doing to-day. The great investing public not only in America but in Europe are simply dumbfounded by the revelations which the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States are now unfolding by the aid and at the instigation of the Attorney General of the United States. They have exposed a condition of things that is simply frightful in the way of the worst kind of a fraud perpetrated on the investigating public. Statements have been made showing how this man Harriman has wrecked investors, how he has wrecked railways, how he has profited by the process of watering stock, and the result is that the financial interests are filled with dismay by reason of these revelations. They would have been discovered long ago if the federal law had been enforced, but in the past it has not been enforced, these things were going on and these men gathered strength in their attack upon the public. But, to-day, by reason of the attitude of the government, by reason of the activity of the Attorney General, by reason of the Congress of the United States insisting upon the government being responsible for the enforcement of the law, these things are now taking place and the public are getting what President Roosevelt says he is determined to give to the public—a square deal. In that case the law is being enforced because somebody in the administration is held responsible for the administration of the law. I suppose you could impeach the Attorney General of the United States if he did not enforce the law when it is so clearly set out that he must enforce it. In that way they are getting enormous reforms over there. They see that if the United States is to hold its own they must have an enforcement of the law in regard to transportation.

The United States is achieving that, and we can only achieve it by giving effect to the resolution I propose, namely, that the federal government must be responsible for enforcing federal laws, and that the responsible man in the government is the Minister of Justice. If, up to the present, we have been relying on the local authorities, or on the efforts of individual suitors, to enforce federal laws, that practice should cease, and we should in future rely on the great departments of state. If we are dealing with transportation problems, we have the Minister of Railways, with his legal officers and his numerous staff, and

we have the Department of Justice, which is generally presided over by the ablest counsel in the land; we have the machinery already established, and it is that machinery which should enforce our laws. It was a private suitor who had to proceed against the Grand Trunk Company to get his rights in regard to passenger rates, and when I appealed to the Prime Minister about it he referred me to the Attorney General of Ontario. I wrote to the Attorney General of the province and he acknowledged my letter, and that is all I know about it. Why should not the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways aid this individual suitor to get his rights from the Grand Trunk corporation? What is the government for anyway? Is it to help the corporations or is it to help the people of Canada? Apparently the energy of this government, and probably the energy of this parliament, is on the side of the corporations, when it should be on the side of the people. I called the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that frauds of the most enormous kind are being perpetrated in connection with our inland revenue, and that the revenues of the country were defrauded because the Compounders' Act was not enforced. I can get all the evidence the government wants in that direction, but the Minister of Finance referred me to the Attorney General of the province for the enforcement of our criminal law. I give credit to the Minister of Customs that he does not wait for a provincial attorney general to enforce the Customs Act. He has his own special officers to enforce it, and he does not allow his department to be defrauded. But the Inland Revenue Department, by the non-enforcement of the Act with which it is charged, allows the country to be deprived of very considerable revenue. I stand here, and I stand before the country, and I say that if a federal law is worth passing it is worth enforcing, and if it is worth enforcing it should be enforced by the federal Minister of Justice. It may be that our practice in this respect has been wrong from the very beginning, but whether that is so or not, it is high time that we should make a new departure, and we should here and now, by a special enactment if necessay, declare that it is the duty, not only of the Minister of Justice, but of the minister presiding over any department concerned, to enforce the laws of this parliament. I enter my protest against this absurd practice which makes the federal officers not responsible for the administration of federal law. If the right hon. gentleman pleads that such is our constitution, then, for heaven's sake, let him go to the source of our constitution and have it changed. For my part, I believe that this House has the power to declare now, in the words of the resolution, that the enforcement of federal laws lie with the federal authorities. The Prime Minister told us that we had no federal courts in which the laws could be enforced; but, if that be so, let him establish federal courts and give them jurisdiction. It is worse than a comedy; it is a crime that we should go on passing laws session after session without making any provision for their enforcement. The United States found out their mistake in this respect, and it is now a characteristic of all their laws that the federal government is responsible for the enforcement of all laws passed by the Congress. If our law is faulty in that respect, then it is the duty of this government to correct the fault. I am not attacking the government of the day, I am attacking the system, and I am asking that the government of the day should change that system. And, Sir, in order to help the government in changing that system, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Walsh (Huntingdon), the resolution which I have placed in your hands.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). From the observations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean), I should have found it difficult, if not impossible, to understand whether this was an amendment to our constitution that he was urging this government to obtain, or whether it is his view that this government, or this parliament, had it in its own power, without any amendment to the constitution, to accomplish the end he desires. But, judging from the language of the resolution, it would appear to be the view of the hon. member that this parliament has the whole subject in its own hands, and that nothing else is necessary than some legislation by this parliament to bring about what he wishes. Indeed that idea is furthered by the frequency of the hon. gentleman's references to the course taken by this government in this matter, thus implying that this government has been, in some sense, remiss in its duty and has adopted some line of policy in this matter different from that of previous administrations. If that be the impression entertained by the hon. gentleman, it is an entirely erroneous one. Whatever in this respect may be the policy and the practice of this government or of whatever minister may happen to be in charge of the Department of Justice, that exactly was the policy and practice of the previous governments and previous Ministers of Justice from the days of our first Minister of Justice, the Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald. There could be no other course possible under the British North America Act because any attempt on the part either of the government or any particular Minister of Justice to adopt the line of practice which the hon. gentleman recommends would, in my humble opinion, be a distinct infraction of the provisions of the British North America Act and a

distinct encroachment upon provincial rights. Under the British North America Act the administration of justice within the provinces is in the hands of the provincial authorities and with regard to that subject the provincial legislatures alone have jurisdiction to legislate. The constitution of the courts and everything connected with the administration of justice in the various provinces was placed by those who framed our constitution in the hands of the provincial authorities. If the views of the hon. gentleman were to be carried into practice, such a state of confusion would result as would make it impossible to carry on the government of this country. Frequently he referred to the Minister of Justice and his attorneys. I scarcely know what idea lay behind the words that he used. But if there was any such idea as this, that the Minister of Justice or the Department of Justice has at its disposal officials permanently appointed as attorneys of the department then the idea was utterly fallacious and erroneous.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I did not make that statement regarding our own department, but was speaking of the attorneys of the United States government and I was quoting United States precedents.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That explanation just serves to mark the difference between the two systems. In this country the Department of Justice has no attorneys permanently appointed under its control; but whenever it has any particular piece of business to do in any particular locality it, like any other business organization, simply retains for the conduct of that particular piece of business the services of some qualified attorney. In any other sense the department has no officials of the character of the government attorneys in the United States or of the Crown attorneys of the various provinces in this country. The whole system of the administration of justice within the provinces in Canada is in the hands of the provincial authorities. The attorney general of each province has various crown attorneys for each county, who hold office under statute, whose duties and revenues are defined by that statute, who receive the regular fees provided by it for their services and who have the standing of officials of the administration of justice. The various provinces have the right to appoint the various officials of the courts except the presiding official, the judge, whose appointment, by special exception under the British North America Act, is vested in the Dominion government. But the whole jury system, the method of summoning juries, the qualifications for jurors and the means whereby juries are constituted for the trial of cases, whether civil or criminal, is exclusively within the legislative authority of the provinces. All the trial courts, with the exception of the Exchequer Court, are of provincial jurisdiction and constitution. And when we find the fathers of confederation deliberately adopting a system different from that in the United States, with the experience of the United States system before their eyes—when we find those who framed the British North America Act, in the light of such experience, deliberately adopting a policy entirely different and deliberately assigning to the various provinces of the Dominion authority over the administration of justice in those provinces, is it to be supposed that they acted inadvertently and without consideration? and are we now, after forty years experience of the working of the Act, to be told by my hon. friend that it is all wrong and that we should at once take means to set it right? We have a system applicable to the conditions of this country. We have in the great province of Quebec a system of law, founded upon entirely different rules at all events, if not entirely different underlying principles, from the systems obtaining in the other provinces. And it was a wise provision of our constitution which left the administration of justice in the province of Quebec not to the Department of Justice at Ottawa—which might, as likely as not, be presided over by an official who had no familiarity with or knowledge of the peculiarities of the system which obtains in Quebec—but to the department of justice of that province. And in like manner it was a wise provision which left the administration of justice in the other provinces, not to the Department of Justice at Ottawa—which might be presided over by an official who had intimate knowledge of the Quebec system, but was not versed in the principles and practice of the common law of England,—but to the departments of justice of those provinces. At all events whether it was necessary or not to have such a provision for the administration of justice as we have in the British North America Act, we find it there, we have had experience of its workings during forty years, during that time it has worked well, and I can see no object in making any change. But the hon. gentleman says that the administration of justice ought to be under the control of the Dominion authorities, and he instances particularly the provisions of the Railway Act to which apparently he has, of recent times, paid particular attention. I wonder did he consider what his proposition would involve, I wonder if he means that the enforcement of our criminal law should be in the hands of the Dominion authorities rather than of the provinces, and that every murder trial and every case of common assault should be under the direct supervision and control of the federal Department of justice. That certainly would be a most revolutionary proceeding, and I have tried to point out how entirely foreign to our whole system of administration

are the ideas of the hon. gentleman and how radical a change they would necessarily lead to. There is not only under our constitution no machinery provided for the carrying out of any such ideas as he has been offering, but those ideas I venture to think, if applied to the ordinary everyday work of enforcing the criminal law of this country, would be found to be utterly impracticable. The whole machinery for that purpose is with the provincial authorities, has been deliberately, designedly, of set purpose, so placed and no reason for any change is now suggested by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not done in the Northwest Territories?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The Northwest Territories were in a very different position until they were constituted as provinces. There were no provincial authorities there who could be charged with the administration of justice. Since they were made provinces they have been in the same position as the other provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to argue that it was inconsistent with our constitution that the Dominion should enforce criminal law and I merely cited the Northwest Territories as an illustration.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I said in the provinces where there is provincial machinery, and therefore the exception which the hon. gentleman suggests, the Northwest Territories, where there was no machinery, is not in point. At the present time the Department of Justice necessarily has to enforce criminal law in the unorganized territories of the Dominion, simply because there are no provincial authorities to be charged with it, but once there are provincial authorities whose duty it is, under the constitution, to have practically the constitution of provincial courts in their charge, to have the sole power of legislating in regard to the whole machinery of these courts that surely is the appropriate place for the jurisdiction to lie.

Reference has been made to the exceptional cases in which by some special provision of the law a responsibility has been put on the Attorney General or the Minister of Justice of Canada and whereas those are cases of an exceptional character they have been pointed out, not specifically but by general allusion, as though they were the class of cases which should govern. Let me say simply that with regard to certain cases such, for instance, as the deporting of aliens, one of the instances which occurs to my mind at the moment, the wisdom of this parliament saw fit to enact that the Attorney General for Canada should take certain action. It was in regard to a subject with respect to which this parliament was at the time legislating.

I have never for a moment questioned the perfect competence of this parliament, if it saw fit to do so, to impose any duty on any of its officials or any department of the government it chose to select for that purpose. That is the undoubted right of parliament within its jurisdiction and legislating with regard to any of the subjects which by section 91 of the British North America Act are assigned to the competence of the Dominion parliament; it is in the judgment and discretion of the Dominion parliament to impose any duty it may see fit upon any minister of the Crown. Where such a duty is imposed the minister of the Crown, if he is to discharge the duties of his position will endeavour, to the best of his ability, to discharge that particular duty; but I say that unless he is so authorized, unless he is so directed, he would be encroaching on that which it is important in the constitution of this country should not be encroached on, if he went out of the line of his duty and endeavoured to do the duty of some other and provincial official in this country.

The instances which have been given by the hon. gentleman from the United States are surely not in the least degree in point. As I have pointed out and as was said by the First Minister on a previous occasion, in the United States, federal courts were constituted for the very purpose of enforcing federal laws and federal courts being so constituted with the necessary and incident machinery of the courts attached, with federal district attorneys under the Attorney General of the United States to discharge, each in his district, the duties pertaining to his position, there was not only no anomaly but there was every reason why there should be in the United States federal statutes the directions which have been referred to, that the United States federal attorney general should prosecute. In this country, on the other hand, it would be distinctly an anomalous thing and distinctly out of line with the whole traditions of the constitution if the amendment to it which is suggested should be enacted. I am not for a moment meaning to say that if any good reasons for making such a complete reversal of the whole policy which has obtained in this country for forty years were given by the hon. gentleman it would not be entirely competent to this House to address His Majesty asking that an amendment should be made by the imperial parliament to the British North America Act which would adopt the line of policy which has been suggested, but no reasons that I have heard have been given in favour of making any such reversal or of attempting so far as this parliament could do it, to depart from the policy that has been adopted by this parliament and that has prevailed in this country ever since confederation.

Reference was made also to other departments of this government, contrasting the activity of some of them in enforcing laws for the protection of the revenue or otherwise with what was said to be the inactivity in other respects of the Department of Justice. Let me say to the hon. member, what possibly has not occurred to him and what possibly may be information to other hon. members as well, that in that respect our friends have not correctly understood the position of the Department of Justice. The relation of that department to other departments of the government is not different in principle from the relations which exist between any business man and his solicitor. The Department of Justice can know nothing and does know nothing of what goes on in the ordinary administration of daily or routine business in the other departments of the government. Suppose there is a contract of the Public Works Department or the Railway Department which has been broken and in regard to which the Crown, as represented by that particular department of its service, wishes to resort to the courts to enforce its rights; suppose there is some breach of the customs laws, some failure to pay duty or some breach of the laws in regard to the collection of inland revenue or of the laws with regard to the administration of the postal affairs of this country, the Department of Justice, unless it is informed of the facts, unless it is instructed to take action by the department concerned, is in no different position as to its ability to act than the ordinary practising solicitor is in regard to the affairs of his client. Upon any such case arising the course of business is simply to refer the matter to the Department of Justice with the instructions of the department concerned, as to the course which ought to be taken and in any such case, in cases for instance where the revenue of the country calls for protection or where the interests of the Crown are involved the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General for Canada acting as any other solicitor would act, resorts to the court in charge of the case for the department concerned, or if the Crown is assailed by any suitor the defence of the claim is referred to the Department of Justice and is conducted under the direction of that department in ordinary course.

These are surely very different things from such as are struck at by the observations if not by the resolution of the hon. member. His proposition is simply that whenever a federal law is passed, that law should contain a provision that its enforcement rested with the Department of Justice of Canada, or that the constitution should be asked to be amended in order that without special provision it should cease to be the duty of the provincial authorities and become the duty of the federal authorities to enforce all Dominion laws. As I have tried to point out, that certainly is an altogether radical proposition, that certainly is something the need of which has not yet been seen in this country unless the observations which we have heard to-day point to that need. Complaints have not been heard unless we are to take the observations which the hon. gentleman has made this afternoon as complaints with regard to any lack of zeal or any injustice in the prosecution of offenders under the control of the provincial authorities. In regard to the great majority of offences against the criminal law there is a private interest at stake. In regard to most offences, which, in the interest of the general public, ought to be prosecuted there is some one particularly aggrieved who may be trusted to bring the facts to the knowledge of the Crown authorities. Nothing more is needed than the bringing of the facts to the knowledge of the proper authorities—who, under our constitution are the provincial authorities—to start the proceedings.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Aylesworth) pardon me a moment? Would that apply to the Railway Act of Canada? Is the provincial attorney general, the man, in the opinion of the Minister of Justice, to enforce our Railway Act?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I can only answer that if there is any offence against any statute which is of a criminal character, it is undoubtedly the right of any person to lay the facts before the duly constituted authorities of the province; and it would be the duty of the authorities, in that case, to take such action as they saw fit. If the machinery of the law is put in motion, the law itself is sufficient. Therefore, I respectfully submit that there is no occasion for the amendment which the hon. gentleman has suggested.

Mr. E. GUSS. PORTER (West Hastings). I do not rise for the purpose of supporting the resolution moved by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), but to say a word or two concerning an illustration brought forward by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). That hon. gentleman spoke of the Alien Labour Law which is now in force in the Dominion as illustrating the argument that he was advancing that it was proper and right that the administration of that Act should be in the hands of the provincial authorities. I wish to call attention to a case which came within my own observation showing how this Act works. It is provided by the Act that, before a prosecution can be commenced, the consent of the attorney general of the province, or of a superior court judge, or of a county court judge, must be obtained. In the case to which I have referred, which was a most flagrant breach of the

Act, application was made to the attorney general of the province. But the answer received was that this was a federal law and that he did not see fit to interest himself in the administration of federal law; and so the consent was refused. The application was then made to a county court judge, and his answer was: This is a local matter and one in which I am well known by all the parties and there is somebody in authority over me—the Attorney General and the Superior Court judge; and I will not interfere, and so will not give the consent. Application was then made to a Superior Court judge. He said that consent had better be got from somebody else. But on the fourth application, I succeeded in getting consent for the prosecution, and eleven of the people against whom the prosecution was instituted were convicted and fined a considerable sum. Now, while I do not agree with the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) as moved, yet in the case of the Alien Labour Law it does not seem to me that it is well that consent should be obtained in the way now provided. It is a matter in which, I think, the jurisdiction might properly be exercised by the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General. And there should be only one person to apply to for consent, if consent is made necessary at all. It is said, and perhaps correctly, that the consent is necessary in order to prevent frivolous prosecutions. I think, that, perhaps, the police magistrate or the county judge, before one or other of whom the charge is to be investigated would be perfectly conpetent to judge upon the facts being laid before them, whether the prosecution should take place or not. It seems to me that the object of the Act is, to a very large extent, defeated by the provisions requiring consent in the way now provided. I make these remarks to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the facts, in order that he may consider whether it is not advisable to make some alteration in the law.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) be good enough to tell the House whether any federal officer was associated with him in the prosecution of the ballot frauds in the county of Hastings, and why that federal representative intervened?

Mr. PORTER. There was none.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What had Mr. Shepley to do with it?

Mr. PORTER. I do not know how Mr. Shepley was engaged, but I am informed that he was engaged by the Dominion government to watch the proceedings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I sympathize with the purpose which I believe, the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has in view, but it seems to me that he has made his resolution too comprehensive. The terms of his resolution would impose the duty upon this government of taking over the enforcement of the criminal law all over the country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I can modify it to that extent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty is that it is not modified to that extent. If it had some qualifying clause, I should be prepared to support it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) suggest a qualifying clause?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will, after I sit down. I would have suggested one before if my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) had told me that he was going to move it today.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have had it on the order paper for nearly two months.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the duty of enforcing the criminal law has been accurately stated by the Minister of Justice. It has been laid down by the courts over and over again that administrative functions and executive power follow the division of legislative power between the parliament of Canada and the provincial legislature. It therefore follows that the function and power of administering the criminal law belong to the province and that, for the purposes of the criminal law, the 'Attorney General' is the Attorney General of the province and the Attorney General of Canada, in the absence of special provision to the contrary. The position then, is this: If the resolution passed in its present form, we should not only be laying down a principle which is contrary to section 92, subsection 14 of the British North America Act, but we should be undertaking that which has been the duty of the province ever since confederation and has been carried out altogether by the provincial governments.

So much for that. But in the idea, though not in the language, of the resolution I am very much disposed to concur. In fact, the government of this country has already concurred in the idea, though not in the words of my hon. friend. It has introduced a Bill No. 75 of the present session, which provides for the enforcement of the Railway Act through application made by the Board of Railway Commissioners to the Minister of Justice for the Dominion. This is the idea, as I understand it, that the hon. gentleman from South York had in mind.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have given notice concerning the enforcement of the Railway Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman gave notice, but I am sorry he did not consider the terms of this resolution a little

more carefully. What he has said about the administration of laws of purely federal concern, I am disposed to agree with almost altogether—in fact altogether. There are many laws, such as the customs and the inland revenue laws, which are enforced by the government because they concern the public revenues of the Dominion. As the Minister of Justice has already said, the modus is this—that the department concerned applies to the Minister of Justice for the enforcement of these laws whenever there has been a violation. Now, that is good so far as it goes. But we are getting a body of legislation in this country that requires a little more special provision. We have the Railway Act, which no doubt the hon. member for South York had in his mind; we have the Alien Labour Act and we will have in a little while, I suppose, an Act relating to the development of electrical power and energy which will contain some provisions the violation of which would be of public concern. As to all these matters that are of special and peculiar federal concern, I would be disposed to support the idea put forward by the hon. member for South York that there should be a legislative provision for their enforcement by federal authority. So far as his motion has that end in view, I entirely favour it, although, for the reasons which I have already stated, I am unable to support the resolution in the form in which he has presented it to the House.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would take this opportunity of saying that it seems to me an anomaly in our constitution that the administration of the criminal law should be saddled upon the provinces. It has seemed to me particularly since our provinces have been obliged to assume so large an expenditure in connection with education, public works, institutions of charity and a variety of other matters, which were not carefully calculated or foreseen at the time of confederation—I say it has seemed to me a great hardship for the provinces to have to undertake the administration of the criminal law. I have never been able to understand this situation in our Dominion, except as stated by the Minister of Justice, that since confederation that situation has prevailed, that the provinces have named the crown prosecutors, and generally have borne all the expense of the administration of criminal law. I suppose it is founded on subsection 14 of section 92 of the British North America Act, which says that the administration of justice in the provinces, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts, shall belong to the provinces; and upon that foundation the whole of the expense of the administration of criminal law has been laid upon the provinces. If that criminal law is developed, if we provide new offences and more expensive system of procedure, if we create new penalties and an expensive mode of collecting them, the provinces that have nothing to do with the edicting of criminal law, must nevertheless bear the whole expense of carrying out that law. That is the reason why in the province of Quebec, where I think the administration of justice in respect to the criminal law costs perhaps more than half a million dollars, it has seemed to us an injustice, and that it would be better from many points of view if the administration of criminal law were left in the hands of the Dominion government. For my part, I do not see in that subsection I have just read an absolute justification for saddling all that expense on the provinces. The question I admit is one of doubt, not so far as custom exists, because it has always been so interpreted, but there is a doubt as to the proper interpretation of that subsection. To give the House an instance I would refer to the case of Mousseau & Bate, where that question has been raised in our own province. It is reported in volume 27 Lower Canada Jurist, and it was decided that the provincial Attorney General had not power to call in question, by a writ of scire facias, the validity of a patent. It was a question of the interpretation, or the application, of a federal law, and it was decided that the attorney general for the Dominion not the attorney general for the province, was the right party to apply the law in that instance. I mention that as an instance where it was decided in the province of Quebec in one of our courts that the administration of the patent law belongs to the Minister of Justice, and not, so far as it is a public matter, to the provincial attorney general. Mr. Clements in his work on the constitution, says:

> It seems difficult to appreciate the distinction between proceedings for breach of the criminal law and proceedings founded on a breach of the Patent Act. The former, perhaps, fall more properly within the common notion of the administration of justice.

The reason we have always considered that the administration of criminal justice belonged to the provinces is because it falls under the common notion of the administration of justice. But I do not see anything strictly laid down in our constitution which says that the prosecution of criminals, who are liable to be prosecuted under the criminal Act, should fall upon the provinces rather than upon the Dominion authorities, so far as expense is concerned. That has been the interpretation from the beginning, but as the Prime Minister is aware, more than once in our provinces, and probably also in the province of Ontario, it has been suggested that the provinces should be relieved from that burden, and that the administration of the criminal law would more properly fall under the control of the Dominion. It would relieve the provinces from

a very heavy expense, and would solve, at any rate it ought to solve, without any other change in our relations with the provinces the great question of the need of further financial assistance on the part of the provinces at the present time. I think there is nothing in the constitution which could prevent the Dominion government, by arrangement with the provinces, undertaking that great expense, and the responsibility which, as the Minister of Justice has said, has been borne since confederation by the provinces themselves. They have run away with that notion. It is illogical it is not the proper way of administering the criminal law. I do not think there is anything in the constitutional Act which would prevent the Dominion government from assuming that charge, leaving, as by that subsection 4 we must leave, to the provinces the constitution of the tribunal the procedure in civil cases, the organization of the jury; all other matters to be left under the control of the Dominion government, and the Dominion government to defray the expenses. It is for that reason that I am rather disposed to favour the motion of the hon. member for South York.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) advocate that the maintenance of the court should be upon the Dominion?

Mr. MONK. Well, the maintenance of the court, the payment of the judges, certainly, the nomination of the Crown prosecutors and their appointment. There is where, for instance, in the province of Quebec, there could be an immense saving. I do not see what is to prevent our naming the judges. Take, for instance, in the city of Montreal; we have magistrates paid by the province to administer the criminal law. There are judges of sessions. It seems to me that it would be far preferable if the courts were constituted otherwise, the judges named by the Dominion and paid by them and the Crown prosecutors and everything connected with them paid by the Dominion government. As I stated a moment ago, and I speak subject to correction, as it is a long time since I looked into the matter, I do not see anything in subsection 14 of section 92 except these words 'administration of justice' which would prevent us from doing that. We pay the judges of our highest criminal court, the court of King's Bench, when they sit in Montreal or Quebec, for the hearing of criminal cases. The province pays the Crown prosecutors and pays the expenses of trial but in other courts the cases are tried by the magistrates in Montreal with juries. The court of sessions sits with juries and all the expense is saddled upon the province. I do not know of anything in the Constitutional Act which prevents the government from assuming that expense and one of the reasons I advance for doing that is that at the present moment the expenses of the province have become very great—much greater, no doubt, than was anticipated at the time of confederation, and if we can, by assuming them without violating as I do not think we do violate the provisions of the Constitutional Act, if we can relieve the province and it can be done legally and constitutionally, I would be strongly in favour of it. I think it would be much better to relieve them in that way, to build railways and to construct public works in the provinces than to adopt a system which must become general of having the provinces coming for financial assistance from this government. The day we begin giving money to the provinces to help them out of their financial difficulties provincial autonomy will be gravely endangered.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has been anticipating a debate upon an important question which will come up at a very early day now, but I may remark to him at once that whilst he deprecates in advance the policy which has been announced in the speech from the throne of interfering with the provincial subsidies and of giving money to the provinces it seems to me that he does nothing else but affirm that course. He deprecates all interference with the arrangement in regard to the payment of provincial subsidies——

Mr. MONK. I deprecate the placing of the provinces in dependence upon the federal power and I am urging a mode by which we can come to their assistance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend suggests that we should relieve the provinces of the expenditure which belongs to them at the present time and which has been placed upon them. If we do that it is certainly equivalent to giving a payment to the provinces and it is doing the very thing which he deprecated a moment ago.

Mr. MONK. I think it is very different.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is very difficult, I admit, but I do not follow the argument of my hon. friend at all. Section 92 of the British North America Act says:

> In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated.

'May exclusively make laws' and amongst these classes of subjects in regard to which the provinces may exclusively make laws is the one which my hon. friend cited a moment ago and which is to be found in subsection 14 of this section:

> The administration of justice in the province, including the constitution, maintenance, and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and of criminal jurisdiction.

While this comprises all laws concerning juries and all laws incidental thereto my hon. friend states that there is no provision in the Act which would prevent the federal authorities from appearing as prosecutors in provincial courts. I differ from him altogether. The section says that the provincial legislature shall make provision in regard to both civil and criminal jurisdiction. In courts of criminal jurisdiction it is essential that there should be a prosecutor and the prosecutor is the sovereign—the King. Who should be the prosecutor? Should it be the King, represented by the Attorney General of Canada, or should it be the King, represented by the Attorney General of the province?

Mr. MONK. It has been held that it is a matter of procedure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly, it is a matter of procedure. The section says:

And including procedure in civil matters in those courts.

He refers to the fact that procedure in criminal matters is left to the federal authorities. I admit it is. But, in my interpretation of this Act the prosecutor in criminal matters cannot be the Attorney General of the Dominion but must be the Attorney General of the province. To go one step further: let us assume that we should take the administration of justice away from the provinces and place it in the hands of the Dominion authorities. Is my hon. friend of the opinion that it would be conducive to good government if the administration of justice in criminal matters were taken away from the provinces and vested in the Dominion? If that is his opinion, and I gather from what he says that it is his opinion, I dissent from him altogether. I say it is of the utmost importance to the welfare of the community that the administration of justice in every province should be left to the authorities of that province. My hon. friend knows that there is nothing so delicate as the administration of criminal justice in certain matters. Take the law of libel, for instance; take other matters which bear upon political questions; is my hon. friend of the opinion that as to such questions the Dominion should step in and enforce its own views which perhaps might be very different from the views of the community where the law would be administered? Take a case which would, to some extent, be confined to political matters—the case of a riot, for instance, into which politics might come to a certain extent; is my hon. friend of the opinion that under such circumstances it would be conducive to the liberty of the people if the Dominion could come in and enforce its own views upon the people in the locality where the riot took place? It seems to me that it is essential to liberty, as we understand it, that the law should remain as it is and as it was contemplated at the time of confederation; that is to say, that the administration of justice ought to be vested in the provinces and not in the Dominion.

Mr. E. BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). While I agree with what the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said in his observations that the administration of criminal law is a matter of provincial jurisdiction, I agree also with the principle of the motion proposed by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), because my hon. friend from South York is perfectly right when he says that there is a great deal of federal legislatioin which is not criminal legislation, but which is legislation of the Dominion which should be enforced, and a breach of which is not a crimnal act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It may or may not be.

Mr. BRISTOL. It may or may not be. For instance, take the Alien Labour Act, the Labour Disputes Act and Acts of a similar character affecting the Dominion. I think it is the feeling of the country, if not of the House, that Acts of parliament passed by the Dominion legislature should not be a dead letter, and that it should be the duty of the Attorney General of the Dominion to enforce any of our laws for which other provision has not been specifically made, so as to avoid the possibility of the provincial authority saying: This is not our business; this is a federal law.

Mr. MONK. If the Prime Minister will seek the opinion of the magistrates of my province, who are called upon to administer the criminal law, he will find they will confirm my view, that no danger can arise from changing the responsibility for administering the criminal law from the provinces to the Dominion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have presented this principle to-day in its widest sense. As a rule, whenever I do propound a principle in that wide sense, some one invites me to present it in a narrower sense. I shall later on present this principle in the narrower sense, in connection with the Railway Act. I repeat, that we are building up a lot of special legislation in this country in connection with federal affairs, and the responsibility of administering this legislation ought to be placed on some one. If we have attorneys general, and attorneys under them, to enforce the Criminal Code, why should there not be some attorney on behalf of the people to enforce the railway law?

Amendment (Mr. W. F. Maclean) negatived on division.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to, and House went into Committee on Ways and Means.

39. Starch, including corn starch, potato starch, potato flour, rice flour, sago flour, tapioca flour and all preparations having the qualities of starch, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty per pound, 1 cent, 1½ cents, 1½ cents.

Mr. FIELDING. We propose to strike out 'rice flour, sago flour and tapioca flour' from this item, and to make a special item for them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you strike them out?

Mr. FIELDING. All these articles were included in one group because of their similarity, and it was represented to us that the duty proposed upon these three items was burdensome, and so we intend to make the rate lower.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are they used for any manufacturing purposes?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; in the manufacture of cotton.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are rice flour, tapioca flour and sago flour manufactured in Canada?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by 'potato flour'?

Mr. FIELDING. We had the word 'farina' in the previous tariff, but that is the name of a special preparation, and so we have to distinguish the different items.

Mr. SPROULE. You refer to corn starch, potato starch and potato flour; of course, you make starch from potatoes, but I was not aware you made flour.

Mr. FIELDING. They are practically the same article, though they are sometimes known under the different names; they have the same rate of duty.

Mr. PATERSON. Potato flour is a product of Prince Edward Island.

46a. Dutiable bread stuffs, grain, flour and meal of all kinds, when damaged by water in transit or prior to importation into Canada, 15 per cent; 22½ per cent; 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. This is intended to meet special cases. It was 20 per cent in the old tariff. In the drafting of the resolutions the item was omitted. We are now inserting it and making the duty 25 per cent instead of 20 per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why?

Mr. FIELDING. We think 25 per cent is a moderate rate.

70. Flax seed, 7½ cents per bushel; 10 cents; 10 cents.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

Mr. FIELDING. We held that over because we desired to take up for further consideration the question of the encouragement of the flax seed industry in Canada. Therefore, we held over this and several other items which relate to it, for example, the duty on linseed oil, paints, white lead ground in oil, oil cloth and linoleum. These all have relation to the foundation item of flax seed. Flax seed has hitherto been free. But it is becoming an industry of some importance in the west and also in quite a group of counties in Ontario. We had a deputation before us, including quite a number of members of parliament on both sides, who represented strongly that the time had come when we should not allow flax seed to remain on the free list, but should impose some duty on it. We have come to the conclusion to recommend a change in the scale of duties, beginning with flax seed. Instead of having the item free we propose to charge a British preferential tariff rate of seven and a half cents per bushel, an intermediate tariff rate of ten cents per bushel, and a general tariff rate of ten cents per bushel.

Mr. SPROULE. This is done apparently for the protection of the industry.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall not quarrel about the name, provided I have my hon. friend's approval.

Mr. SPROULE. For the benefit of the hon. gentleman an open confession would be good for the soul.

Mr. FIELDING. I am happy to have my hon. friend's approval. I want to call attention to the fact that this change will necessarily lead to several other changes in the duties on the articles I have referred to, which will come up in their proper order.

71. Seeds of timothy and clover, 5 per cent; 10 per cent; 10 per cent.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is there any supervision over the quality of timothy and clover and other seeds of that nature so as to bring them into line with the Seed Control Act which we passed some years ago? We had a failure in our crop last year and there is now a large importation of these seeds. Are they coming in subject to supervision under the seed control law? That is a very important matter, as I understand some of the foreign seeds are not at all up to the mark. Does the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) supervise that or does that come under the Department of Customs?

Mr. FIELDING. The Department of Customs does not exercise any special supervision as to the quality of the seeds. Whether that inspection comes within the scope of the Minister of Agriculture I should not like to answer in his absence.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have seen some samples which were not at all up to the standard provided by the Seed Control Act. They should be supervised in the interests of first-class Canadian seed.

Mr. FIELDING. That seems reasonable, and I shall call the attention of my colleague to it.

Mr. LENNOX. If there is any supervision it would probably have to be exercised by the Customs Department. Would the Minter of Customs (Mr. Paterson) instruct the committee whether there is any such supervision?

Mr. PATERSON. As far as the Customs Department is concerned we have not exercised it.

73. Garden, field and other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, n.o.p., sunflower, canary, hemp and millet seed, when in packages weighing one pound each or less, 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I wish to make some representations about the classification of seeds under sections 72 and 73 into packages of a pound or over and a pound or under. Seeds in packages of a pound or over come in at 10 per cent, but in packages of a pound or under they are charged 25 per cent. With regard to many seeds such as flower seeds and cauliflower seeds a pound would be a wholesale order. Cauliflower seeds are worth as much as $25 a pound, and at 25 per cent on small orders this would be a duty of $6.25, as against $2.50 on packages over a pound. I do not believe that more than ten pounds of cauliflower seeds would be used in Canada in a year. The effect of this might be to cause dealers to overstock and consequently to sell stale seeds.

Mr. FIELDING. There may be exceptional cases such as that cited in which this will work some hardship, but as a rule experience has shown that it works out well. As the duty is an ad valorem one it adjusts itself and the high priced article pays only in proportion to its cost, so I do not think there is any grievance in that way, but as to whether we could have a better distinction between wholesale and retail that question is worthy of consideration. The officials inform me that the present definition works as well as anything we could have.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Owing to this difference in duty on packages over and under a pound, you may have the duty $2.50 per pound on wholesale lots and $6 on retail, a difference of nearly $4 on one pound.

Mr. FIELDING. The reason for the distinction is obvious and one which I am sure the House will approve of, that is, we want to distinguish between seeds brought in in bulk or large quantities and seeds put up abroad and brought in in small packages. A man importing seeds in large quantities and putting them up in Canada is, in a sense, a manufacturer, whereas, if they are brought in in small packages the labour is done abroad. I should be pleased to receive suggestions as to a better definition of wholesale packages, but a man bringing in a small quantity of cauliflower seed would pay very little duty and it would not be burdensome.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know if the practice has changed since I was connected with the seed business, but then seeds came in small packages, and if the practice of the trade is the same I think that this article at 25 per cent would about cover the seeds that came in in small quantities. These packages came in from the other side and at the end of the season the parties who sold them used to come around and take back the seeds not sold. To take the different seeds and have a separate item for each one, would give you a very long list.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The greatest objection that I have to these items is that it gives the wholesale man a profit of fifteen per cent to start with in this difference between ten per cent and twenty-five per cent, whereas the farmer or ordinary market gardener cannot purchase in small quantities without paying the extra fifteen per cent.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The Minister of Customs spoke of the conditions of the trade when he was in it. I believe the same conditions prevail to-day. A large proportion of seed comes in small packages. A approve the doctrine of taxing the small packages more than the large, but a pound package of cauliflower, I may tell the minister is not a retail order, but a wholesale order.

Mr. PATERSON. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) favour making a special item of this?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think there should be a special item of high-priced seeds fixing a limit at $1.50 or $2 a pound. But, as I have said, I approve of the idea of charging for small packages a higher duty than the large one, and, in that respect I do not quite agree with my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). My reason is that there is a great deal of labour involved in putting up these packages, and such labour in our own country should be protected. Packages of cauliflower seed contain very small quantities, and the making up of these packages involves a great deal of labour which warrants higher taxation. But the point I make, and the one concerning which seedsmen have written to me, is that a pound of cauliflower seed is not a small retail quantity, but rather a wholesale order.

Mr. PATERSON. Has the hon. gentleman any suggestions to make ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would suggest that the price as well as the quantity should rule. Of course, if I am asked to name a list, I can do so. But the cauliflower seed is the principal item, though there are many flower seeds which should be included under the same head, and perhaps a few others that are considered garden seeds. On the other hand, there are seeds in which case an order of a hundred pounds would be a small order—these seeds come in five hundred pound lots, or even ton lots, and I believe there are as many tons of beans used for seed as there are pounds of cauliflower seeds. To mark the division between wholesale and retail at the same quantity in each case would be unfair.

Mr. PATERSON. Would it suit the hon. gentleman if it were made one half pound ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. One half pound would be more suitable in the case of cauliflower seed, but not in all cases.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Carried.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Mr. Chairman, I understood the minister to suggest to reduce it to a half pound.

Mr. FIELDING. It would be better to carry the item now, but, before it is finally passed, if we can find a way of improving the situation we can adopt it. I do not see anything we can do about it at the moment.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understood the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to ask if I would suggest a change to one half pound.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say that I see now any objection to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt). But experience has taught me that it is better not to make these changes suddenly. We can learn how the change is likely to work out, and then, before the item is finally passed——

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would be willing to hold the item over——

Mr. FIELDING. It would be better not to hold it over. There is possibility of further consideration, but I would rather avoid holding anything over.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understood the Minister of Customs to suggest that.

Mr. FIELDING. No, not to hold the item over. But, before it is finally passed, if further light comes to us on this subject we will avail ourselves of it to make any necessary modification.

Florist stock, viz.: azaleas, rhododendrons, pot grown lilacs, araucarias, bulbs, corms, tubers, rhizomes and dormont roots, n.o.p.; seedling stock for grafting, viz.: plum, pear, peach and other fruit trees, free, free, free.

Mr. FIELDING. I move to add after the words 'seedling stock' the words 'and rose stock.'

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the object of that ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is suggested by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith.)

Amendment agreed to.

Tomatoes, fresh, 20 per cent, 27½ per cent, 30 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. There was considerable discussion over the duty on tomatoes, and we came to the conclusion that this was a case in which an ad valorem duty would best meet the general sense of the House, so we have adopted these rates of 20, 27½ and 30 per cent instead of the specific duty which stands on the original schedule.

Mr. FOSTER. How do these compare?

Mr. FIELDING. The prices vary so much that we found it exceedingly difficult to make a calculation. But our information is that an ad valorem duty will meet the varying conditions better than the other. Early in the sesason when tomatoes are brought in at a tolerably high price, the ad valorem duty will be a moderate rate. Later in the season there is no foreign competition.

Amendment agreed to.

Dates and figs, dried, per hundred pounds, 40 cents, 55 cents, 62½ cents.

Mr. FIELDING. We made a slight reduction in these rates, as we found on closer examination that the duties were rather high. These fruits do not come in competition with anything in Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries, strawberries, cherries and currants, n.o.p., the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, per pound, 1½ cents, 1¾ cents, 2 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a new one.

Mr. FIELDING. That was held over at the request of some hon. gentlemen, I do not remember whom. There is no change in it except in a fraction of the preference.

Mr. SPROULE. How would you apply that in the case of strawberry packages? Is one package of strawberries just a pound ?

Mr. FIELDING. The weight is to be included, so as to avoid the necessity of separating them for duty purposes.

97a (plums). Strike out the figures 20 in the general tariff rate and insert the figures 30.

Mr. FIELDING. The general tariff is increased from 20 to 30 cents per bushel.

There is a question as to the application of the French treaty to this item, which does not arise here as respects the general tariff. We propose to increase the general rate from 20 to 30 cents, the other rates remaining the same.

135. Sugar, n.o.p., not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms, sugar concrete, and molasses testing over fifty-six degrees and not more than seventy-five degrees by the polariscope, per one hundred pounds, 34 cents, 45 cents, 52 cents.

And for each additional degree over seventy-five degrees, per one hundred pounds, 1 cent, 1⅓ cents, 1½ cents.

Provided that fractions of five-tenths of a degree or less shall not be subject to duty, and that fractions of more than five-tenths shall be dutiable as a degree.

Provided that all raw sugar, including sugar specified in this item, the produce of any British colony or possession, shall be entitled to entry under the British preferential tariff, when imported direct into Canada from any British colony or possession.

In item 135.—Strike out all the words after 'direct' to the end of the item and instead thereof insert the words 'by ship to a port in Canada, from any British country, and not otherwise.'

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Have there been any representations from the refiners in regard to the sugar duties? I understand that they complain of an advance in the charge on raw sugar, and not giving them sufficient on the refined article.

Mr. FIELDING. We shall have something to say when we come to the item of raw sugar. We are not changing the duty on the refined. This definition of No. 16 Dutch standard is one of long standing, and I think has been accepted by all who understand the sugar question as the proper line of division.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the minister would give us generally an idea of what he proposes to do on the sugar items as a whole, and what it involves. It is a matter about which representations are made, and the changes are rather drastic, I think, in some respects.

Mr. FIELDING. We have made no change with regard to the duty on refined, though a change that has been made in the duty on packages affects the refiner a little, perhaps to the extent of 1½ cent per hundred pounds. The package, which was formerly dutiable on refined sugar, now becomes free under a general classification. To that extent, the duty on refined is a little less.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the first effect is that 1½ cents per hundred pounds is taken off the fine sugar by the change in the package?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. While there is no change in the rates, the effect of that change on the package is equivalent to about 1½ cents per hundred pounds, and we propose to take that into consideration in adjusting the duty on the raw. With regard to the duty on the raw, we propose to change the rate. We increased the rate on raw sugaar as described in this item to the extent of 7⅓ cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. FOSTER. In the general?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the preferential, because raw sugar comes in very largely under the preferential tariff. Representations have been made to us that we have imposed a considerable burden on the refiner, and after consideration we have concluded to reduce the duty on raw from 34 cents per hundred pounds under the preferential tariff to 31½. To that extent the refiner will be somewhat better off than he was under the arrangement proposed some weeks ago. It will not entirely meet his criticism, we are aware, but we think it will to some extent meet his criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the old tariff?

Mr. PATERSON. 51⅔, now it will be 56½, on raw sugar.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean the preferential duty on raw sugar?

Mr. PATERSON. You mean 99 or 100 degrees, do you not?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean what was exactly the corresponding duty under the old tariff, corresponding with the 34 cents you propose here.

Mr. PATERSON. If you bring it up to the 100 degrees, that would be the case. There is 31½ for 70 degrees and 1 for each additional degree.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the 70 degrees under the old tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. It was 40 cents under the general tariff, subject to one-third off, which would make it 26⅔. We increased that to 34. We are now proposing to reduce it to 31½.

Mr. FOSTER. You are increasing it from 26⅔ to 31½?

Mr. FIELDING. As compared with the tariff of three months ago.

Mr. FOSTER. What will that give you on 100 pounds?

Mr. FIELDING. It increases it from 26⅔ to 31½; 4⅚ cents is the actual sum instead of 7⅔, which we had contemplated adding to the rate on sugar when we presented the budget some weeks ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the Minister of Customs said that you added one cent for every additional degree, which brought

the duty upon the sugar ordinarly imported to a certain higher amount. I would like to know what that higher amount is on the various grades of sugar ordinarily imported. The Minister of Customs will understand that I want to get at the practical working out of the two tariffs as applied to the way in which business is done.

Mr. PATERSON. Refined granulated sugar will run 99 to 100 degrees; 100 degrees is perfect. Raw sugar will be 31½ cents under the preferential rate testing 75 degrees. For every additional degree over 75 one cent is added. As there are 25 degrees over 75 necessary to make 100, if you add 25 to 31½ it makes 56½. That is 56½ cents per 100 pounds on sugar that will produce 100 pounds of granulated sugar. The previous duty was 51⅔ cents on the same test, and therefore it is practically an advance on the raw sugar which the refiner buys of not quite 5 cents, or 4⅚ cents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is an addition for every additional degree; so that you add one cent for every additional degree, and you in that way reach 56½ cents per 100 pounds. Is that right?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; except that I think the purpose that my hon. friend has in view will be met if we do not attempt to enter into the question of how many pounds of raw sugar go to make 100 pounds of refined. Formerly the duty was 40 cents under the general tariff, subject to a reduction of one-third, which would make it 26⅔. We increased that to 34, which would make an increase of 7⅓ cents, but we now propose to go back a little, and instead of increasing it from 26⅔ to 34, we will increase it from 26⅔ to 31½. It will give the refiner about 5 cents per hundred pounds less advantage than under the old tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that, but I cannot quite understand the Minister of Finance in saying that we should not take the other matter into consideration, because I am only applying the principle which he laid down this afternoon. He referred to sago flour, or rice flour, or something of that kind, as subject to a low duty because it is used in a certain manufacture in Canada. Raw sugar has to be used in a certain manufacture which is carried on very extensively, and in order to see what the proportion is between the duty on the raw material and the duty on the manufactured article, I thought it would be proper to find out, as far as we could, just what is the duty upon the raw material which is necessary for the purpose of producing 100 pounds of the manufactured article. I do not know how many pounds of the raw sugar of the quality referred to by the Minister of Customs are necessary to produce 100 pounds of the refined article. Is it 100 or 108 pounds? Perhaps the Minister of Customs could tell me, if he is following me.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. R. L. BORDON. I wish to know how many pounds of raw sugar upon which a duty of 56½ cents is levied will be necessary to produce 100 pounds of the refined article? Do I make myself clear to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. PATERSON. I think perhaps you do. But the trouble is that the raw sugar is imported of varying degrees of saccharine strength. Supposing sugar is imported of only 60 degrees of saccharine matter——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was referring to 100 degrees.

Mr. PATERSON. You cannot import raw sugar testing 100 degrees, but if you import it at 75 degrees and add 25 to that it would give you a saccharine strength of 100.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I only want to get the information for the purposes of comparison. As I understand the minister's statement, you in practice do not get sugar containing 100 degrees of saccharine matter?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But for the purpose of comparison, we can deal with it as if it were practicable to obtain that article. If you have 100 pounds of sugar which will make 100 pounds of refined sugar, you will levy 56½ cents per 100 pounds of duty?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes; that would be on 100 degrees of saccharine matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Am I right in assuming that the difference between that and 72 cents would be the measure of protection which you give to the industry of manufacturing refined sugar?

Mr. PATERSON. Is 72 cents the preferential rate on refined sugar?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. No; I think it is more than that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is 72 on this.

Mr. LENNOX. Item 134.

Mr. PATERSON. It is 72, and for each degree over 88 degrees it is a cent additional; so that you have to add the difference between the two. The difference between that and 84 is the protection that the refiner gets.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difference between 56½——

Mr. PATERSON. And 84.

Mr. FIELDING. We have another proposition which bears a relation to that, though we will refer to it later. It is in regard to the beet sugar industry. We have several beet factories in Canada which have been turning out a considerable quantity of sugar. There has been some discussion, and I think some debate, as to how far this industry may hope to be permanently successful. At all events, we know that they are turning out a large quantity of sugar and that they are consuming a large quantity of beets grown in Canada. It is claimed by farmers, or a large number of them, that the beet is a very profitable crop to them, and that they are very much interested in having this beet sugar industry remain with them. One of the difficulties of this beet sugar industry is that the mills in Canada all operate by one process from the raw beet to the refined article. There is no intermediate process. The consequence is that they can only work during their season; that when the beets come in from the farm they have to be converted quickly into refined sugar, and that when their campaign—I believe that is the word that is used—is over the beet factory has to close up. It has exhausted all its material and nothing further can be done. It has been suggested that the industry could best be carried on if it is to become permanently successful with us by having factories established for the intermediate process of converting beets into raw material in a form which would permit it to be stored, and then it would become the raw material which could be used by the beet factories when their ordinary campaign is over. There are none of these intermediate factories in Canada at present. It is thought that those interested in the industry would be willing to establish these factories, and we propose to allow, for three years, this concession to the manufacturers of beet sugar. We think that will be long enough to enable them, if they will, to establish these intermediate factories. We propose to allow the beet sugar manufacturers, for a period of three years, to bring in at the British preferential rate two pounds of foreign sugar for every pound of refined sugar they produce from beets grown in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would be foreign beet sugar?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, because their machinery would not enable them to use cane sugar. This is an experiment intended to encourage them to continue the industry, so that when their ordinary campaign with the Canadian beet is ended, they can continue the operation of their factories for a longer period than is now possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this amendment set out in the notice?

Mr. FIELDING. I mentioned that I would have one or two proposals which are not set out in the notice and this is one of them. I think the object is one with which the House sympathizes. The Ontario government granted a bounty to the beet sugar industry, but it received no special consideration from this government, other than the permission to import, free of duty, the machinery for establishing the factories. It is now represented to us that the chief disadvantage of the beet sugar manufacturers, is, that they can only operate for a short season of the year, and that something should be done to provide them with means whereby they can operate during a longer period. Their present facilities will enable them to run the Canadian beets for say two months, and if we allow them to bring in this raw material, which is what might be called a half-way house in the process of manufacture, the factories can be employed for five or six months in the year. At all events, this is the form in which we have concluded that we can give some encouragement to the industry.

Mr. FOSTER. The factories, as I understand it, will not require any new or different machinery to continue the process on this raw material which is to come in under the preferential tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. It is conceded that they will not have to go to any additional expense. Is it the idea, that instead of working the Canadian beets into refined sugar, they shall simply work them up to the raw sugar stage, then store it, and later on work their own raw sugar and the imported raw sugar into refined sugar?

Mr. FIELDING. They will go on refining their own sugar.

Mr. FOSTER. The admission of this two pounds of foreign beet sugar for one pound produced by the factories, simply enables them to carry on their process longer than they otherwise would, unless of course they could get a sufficient quantity of beets from our Canadian farmers. Has the Minister of Finance, or has the Minister of Customs, thought of the effect this proposal will have upon the urgency the Canadian beet sugar refiners will use, towards getting our farmers interested in producing sufficient beets for their demands. Will not the foreign producer of beets reap the advantage of this, to the disadvantage of the Canadian producer, and will it not do away with the idea we had when we proposed to encourage the beet root industry in this country. We never would have gone into the beet

sugar industry if the refiners alone were concerned. The idea was to promote the culture of beet in Canada, and so give our farmers another branch of industry for which the land was well suited. How far are you carrying out that idea if you put it into the power of the beet sugar manufacturer to get his raw material much more easily than he does now. Will the manufacturer take all the trouble he has hitherto taken to induce the farmers of Canada to grow the best kind of beets in the largest quantity ? This is a new thing sprung upon us just now, but the thought comes to me, whether you are not removing the necessity for persistent effort to spread the culture of the beet amongst our own farmers, and, putting the beet sugar refiner in the position of the cotton manufacturer who must get his raw cotton from abroad. Will not this proposal make it so that the beet sugar refiner is no longer dependent on the culture of the beet in Canada, and that consequently, he will not be so persistent in his efforts to aid our farmers in producing beets.

Mr. PATERSON. The proposition impresses itself favourably on me from this point of view—we have two or three beet sugar refineries established at great cost, possessing very expensive plants, and which can only be run for a limited period of the year, because the beets produced in Canada must be worked up within that short season. This proposition, then, is to allow them to bring in what might perhaps be described as raw material for their factories, and as a result, instead of running a refinery two or three months as at present they will run it seven or nine months. If a refinery can run nine months instead of three, with the fixed charges that are inevitable in either case, it follows as a matter of course that the cost of production will be lessened. The argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is that we should look after the interests of the farmer rather than the refiner. We guard that by providing, that the refiner is only allowed to import two pounds for the one pound that he produces from the Canadian beet. If he slackens his efforts in getting beets from the farmer, he reduces his import, and can only import so much less. His interest is to get all he can from the farmers because it pays him better than to refine the raw. Instead of discouraging the farmers, the refiner will encourage them, for the more he will produce from the Canadian beet the larger amount he will be allowed to import. Those who know say, there was a mistake made in starting the complete plant at the beginning, and that the better way is to establish smaller subsidiary plants which have not a refining capacity up to the extent of producing the pure sugar. These different subsidiary factories could be established at points one or two hundred miles distant from refinery, and their product could be shipped, at a low cost, to the central refinery where the process of manufacture would be perfected. The importation of the raw beet sugar will, in a sense, take the place of those subsidiary factories and furnish the refinery with sufficient material to enable it to operate for the greater part of the year.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. W. McIntyre.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BERGERON. At six o'clock I wished to ask the minister why the item originally brought down had been changed. I understood that after a long study, a year's study the government had seen fit to bring down the tariff as it was at first introduced this session. What has happened since to open the eyes of my hon. friend ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think the Minister of Finance explained that on consideration it was thought that we had raised the duty on the cane sugar, which is the sugar that comes in under the preferential rate, rather more than would be justified and so there has been a reduction of 2½ cents. That is the only change.

Mr. BERGERON. Does that give more protection or less ? What is the principle ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is not the principle, it is the interest they are looking after.

Mr. PATERSON. It is in favour of the refiner.

Mr. BERGERON. Will it make sugar cheaper or dearer ?

Mr. PATERSON. It does not affect it because the sugar of commerce is the refined sugar the duty on which is unchanged, but the refiner has less difference, which is his protection, between the raw and the refined. There is more difference now when you have lowered it 2½ cents as we have done on his raw.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Did the minister notice that the day after this was announced, the price of sugar was increased 10 cents ?

Mr. PATERSON. It did not remain at that.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister was going to explain a third point in reference to indirect importations ?

Mr. FIELDING. We propose to amend that so that it will read as it did before. That is it will require a direct importation but the use of the words 'direct by ships' are to be withdrawn. The question of direct importation generally will come before the committee at a later stage but I think the only item on which there are changes that I did not mention is on that point. The words with regard to the importation of refined sugar direct by ship will be modified so as to stand exactly as they did before in the old tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the government abandons its proposal to make the shipment to Halifax or St. John obligatory ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, for the moment. Probably before we are through with this matter a general proposal dealing with direct shipments will come before the committee.

Mr. AMES. Then the minister does not intend to introduce on this one commodity a principle not applied elsewhere, but if it is proposed to allow the preferential rate only on good coming to Canadian ports it will be on all goods and not on sugar alone ?

Mr. FIELDING. I propose that this shall read as it has read for several years past; the general question will come later.

Mr. AMES. The words 'into Canada from any British colony' are struck out ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the words 'by direct ship' only.

Mr. AMES. 'By ship to a port in Canada from any British country and not otherwise.'

Mr. FIELDING. These words of which notice was given will be dropped so that the item will remain as it has been in the tariff for several years.

Mr. AMES. By the dropping of these words does it revive the words 'into Canada from any British colony or possession' ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, these will remain. They have been in the tariff for several years, there is no change. It is the difference between a direct shipment by a ship to a Canadian port and a direct shipment in the customs sense of the word, on a through Bill of lading. The words 'direct shipment from any British colony or possession' will remain but they will be interpreted in the customs sense of shipments on a through bill of lading even if they do not come in a direct ship. That has been the system for several years and we propose it shall remain for the present unchanged.

Mr. AMES. That is to say, if sugar from the West Indies came from New York on through bill of lading to Montreal by boat and rail, it would be entitled to the preference ?

Mr. FIELDING. That has been so for several years, and the words as we shall leave them will leave that matter in the same position for the present.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the beet root sugar, I do not understand quite what the idea was as stated by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). Do I understand that the sugar not wholly refined will be shipped from the other industries to a central refinery ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the minister propose to carry that out ? I can quite see how that might be advantageous to the central refinery, but I do not see in what way it is supposed to help the individual refineries which traffic directly with the farmer, stimulating him to produce the material and buying it when he has raised it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Before the discussion on the beet sugar is taken up, I wish to continue the discussion which had begun with regard to duties on the refined sugar. I understand that the refiners have made special representations to the Minister of Finance with regard to the proposed changes in the tariff. I would like to ask the minister if he has received information as to their view of the changes in the duties on the refined sugar ? I have before me a pronouncement from them, which, I presume, has been sent to many members of the House including, no doubt, the Minister of Finance. It says :

1st. On raw sugar, the duty is increased 7⅓ cents per one hundred pounds.

2nd. On the quantity required to produce one hundred pounds of refined, the duty is increased 8 cents.

3rd. On the refined imported from Great Britain no advance is made.

4th. So a change is made, against the Canadian refiner, and in favour of the British, of 8 cents per one hundred pounds.

5th. The effect will be to depress the Canadian manufacturer, to stimulate the British, and to diminish the Canadian trade with the islands.

6th. In totals the Canadian duty is as follows :

On the raw to produce one hundred pounds of refined, 59½ cents.

On British refined, per one hundred younds, 83 cents.

The argument appears to be that the duty on the raw material is greater than on the finished product by ½ of 1 per cent. That is not a serious item, but I think it just to the refiners to lay this before the House, as the minister did not do so. As to the duty on the refined sugar I do not think we got to the bottom of this question in the discussion before dinner. The question was asked in the House three or four weeks ago, by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) as to the duty on refined

sugar, and the Minister of Customs at that time stated the duty at $1.24—the highest duty.

Mr. PATERSON. It would be $1.26 at 100 degrees.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) took it at 99 degrees.

Mr. PATERSON. At that it would be $1.24.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. There is not much difference, but I myself had given it at $1.26 while the minister gave it at $1.24. In order to show that the duty of $1.26, has been paid I brought here several entries I had made, paying $1.26 on refined sugar. These may be inspected by the Minister of Customs or any other hon. member who doubts my statement. I gave the figure off-hand, and had not the means of proving it at the time, but I have brought the documents here to establish what I said—that the duty on granulated sugar of 100 per cent purity is $1.26.

Mr. FOSTER. That is under the general tariff ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Yes, the general tariff, beginning at $1.08. The minister of Customs explained how the polariscopic test works out. It seems to me that this test does not work out very well in the interest of the country when applied to refined sugar as the minister explains it. The purer the article a man imports, the higher duty he has to pay. That is hardly a good thing if the principle of a pure food law is to be regarded favourably. A man should not be fined for selling the pure article. The minister begins the polariscopic test at 88 per cent of purity and adds 1½ cents for every degree of purity between that and 100, making a difference of 18 as between the lowest at 88 degrees and the highest at 100 degrees. The man who imports the impure sugar pays the least duty. This is a feature, it seems to me, that would stand revising. The polariscopic test, I believe, was introduced by this government. The country did not understand the advance put on refined sugar by this method, though it taxes the refined sugar a good deal heavier than before. I am not saying that refined sugar is taxed too high, when we look at the rate on the raw sugar. The duty on the raw has been raised, and I think that perhaps the refiners have a grievance in that—certainly they think they have. The government have raised the duty on raw sugar 8 cents per hundred pounds, and given them no corresponding advantage on the refined sugar. I submit that the duty on the refined article is quite high enough, and that other sources of revenue should be available instead of taxing this great staple article as high as the government propose to tax it. I do not know whether the minister has had reports from the refiners and others to say whether the duties he proposes are satisfactory or otherwise in advancing raw sugar, I would like to know whether the refiners are satisfied that the change will work out without disadvantage to their business.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that I cannot give my hon. friend the assurance that the refiners are entirely satisfied.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that the minister announced some modification just as the committee resumed after recess. I would like to understand what is the duty upon the raw material sufficient to produce 100 pounds of sugar and the duty on the refined article, I do not know that we got an absolutely plain answer to that.

Mr. PATERSON. There is 31½, add to that 25, and you have 56½ as the duty on raw sugar. Now, the refined is 72 for 88 degrees, and 1 for every degree over which is 12 ; that makes 84. 56½ will produce 100 pounds of pure sugar of 100 degrees purity.

Mr. FOSTER. But is there not a modification to be made in that ? A certain amount of raw sugar brought in does not produce an equal amount of refined.

Mr. PATERSON. It does not produce it, and therefore it does not pay the tax. The polariscope regulates that. For instance, if the sugar is 75 that pays so much duty ; but suppose that sugar produces 85 or 86, it would pay 10 more.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is a wastage in the refining process. If you take 100 pounds of raw sugar and put it through the process of refining, it does not give you 100 pounds of refined sugar. My hon. friend wanted to know how many pounds of raw sugar would make 100 pounds of refined. Now, the refiners make a calculation that it takes about 108 pounds, so when they pay the duty on raw, and in this case an increased duty, they have to pay on more than 100 pounds of raw to make 100 pounds of refined. Therefore when you come to strike the difference between refined and raw, you have to make some allowance for wastage. Now, the minister has raised the duty on raw sugars for what purpose ? That is a rise in the duty which the consumer absolutely must pay.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. If you put a duty on a raw article coming into this country, and which you do not raise here, do you mena to say that every cent you put on the raw does not raise the refined product exactly by that increase of duty ? It may be said that the duty you put on a manufactured product coming in is not always paid by the consumer, that internal competition may reduce it. But with reference to the duty on raw sugar coming into this country, every cent of duty you put on raises the

price of that sugar to the consumer, there is no getting out of that. Now, while the minister has not raised the duty on the refined he has raised it on the raw, and he has therefore disturbed the amount of protection that was formerly received by the refiner to the amount that he has raised the raw greater than it was under the old duties, the refined being just the same as it has been. Besides that, you have taken off a certain amount of protection in the wrapper duty, amounting, I think the minister said, to 1½ cents per hundred pounds. So you have disturbed the amount of protection that in 1897 you thought was necessary for the work of refining in this country. Now, why has the minister done that? Has he satisfied himself that he is not attacking an industry in this country and reducing it to far below the amount of protection which every other great protected industry in this country enjoys? I think he will find that that is the case.

Mr. PATERSON. With reference to the first proposition of the hon. gentleman, that a rise in the duty on raw comes out of the consumer, he says you cannot get outside of that. Well I am outside of that all the time. Raw sugar is not the sugar of commerce. The sugar of commerce which the hon. gentleman and every consumer buys, is sugar of about sixteen Dutch standard in colour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want to understand—the duty will enter into the cost of production?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I am speaking simply on this point, that the advance we have made in the duty on raw sugar does not come out of the consumer because the sugar of commerce, whether it be yellow, or has reached a further stage of advancement and has become refined or granulated, is the sugar that is bought and used in our homes by the people. That is not advanced in price, that is actually lowered in price by the effect of the change in the packing clause. That will reduce the duty on refined sugar by about 1½ cents per 100 pounds. So the sugar that is bought by the consumer will be no dearer to him whatever, because the duty upon that sugar is not advanced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is in so far as it is imported.

Mr. PATERSON. So far as regards the imported or the home article either. The refiner, if you leave out the barrel question, pays $1.26 per 100 pounds. If he charges more than that price, sugar comes in from the outside. The refiner is at liberty to take the advantage he has between the cost of the raw and the refined to the full extent, if he sees fit. We need not argue now whether he does or does not, that he can do if he wants to. Under this tariff he has 4½ cents and a fraction more to pay upon the sugar that he has to buy to refine and there is no higher duty upon the refined article, therefore it is 4½ cents additional which does not come out of the people, but out of the refiner.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend will find out that practically the statement I made will be proved true. The very moment that this tariff was brought down sugar raised in this country. If you raise the raw material and you make the home refiner pay an increased duty on raw material there is no getting out of the fact that he must have his compensation, and he gets his compensation out of the increase in price; in some way or other it will be brought about. He may perhaps lose a little of his protection but he resides in the country, he is closer to the sources of demand and he will make out of the retailer and the wholesalers of sugars in this country sufficient to countervail that increased duty on the raw material. In the end it will work out that way. Well, now what is the protection that the refiner gets what is the percentage of protection that he gets? You take your cotton manufacturer, there is the raw material and it comes in free. You take out certain small items to lessen the duty, because you want to give more protection to the cotton manufacturer. In a dozen different ways in this tariff you have increased the protection upon cotton goods. Take woollen goods which have a lower protective duty compared with what the duties are generally in protective countries. Take your other articles which this government protects by what they think is an adequate duty and the percentage between the amount of duty on the raw material and on the refined or finished product, you will find is away and above what you allow the refiners of sugars in this case.

Now, in the 1897 tariff, you started out and gave them an advantage of about 50 cents a hundred. You have reduced that to about 27 cents a hundred. Twenty-seven cents a hundred is 1-27th of a cent per pound. You take into account the lessening by the free package, you take into account the wastage in refining and the actual increase in the raw while giving him none on the refined and you have reduced the refiner's protection. If you calculate it on the ad valorem basis you will see that you are giving him scarcely any advance at all on his refined over his raw sugars. When you commenced in 1897 with 50 cents of an advantage and have brought it down until today it is about 26 and a fraction, either you must have been wrong at first or else there is a pressure to-day which does not seem to be an equable pressure when you take into account the protection you give to other great industries, some of which we have had under review and some of which we will have under review. Will the hon. Minister of Customs give us the ad valorem protection that the sugar refiner gets in his opinion?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not reducing it to an ad valorem basis, but in reference to the first point, which, I think, the hon. gentleman ought to have clearly in his mind, he seems to think that by raising the duty on the raw sugar we raise the price that the consumer will have to pay for the sugar that is used in the household.

Mr. FOSTER. Practically you have done that and the course of trade proves it.

Mr. PATERSON. We have 56½ cents duty on the raw. Suppose we reduce that to 40 cents but still leave the duty at $1.26 on the refined sugar, will the refiner reduce the price of his refined sugar 16½ cents when he does not need to ?

Mr. FOSTER. No, but competition will do that.

Mr. PATERSON. He will have no competition until he gets up to $1.26. Let the hon. gentleman face it. Will the refiner reduce the price if we reduce the duty to 40 cents ? It is the duty on the refined sugar that determines the price that the consumer has to pay.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Why does the minister say there is no competition ? There are a great many refiners in Canada. Does he say there is no competition among them ?

Mr. PATERSON. There may be competition, but the fact remains that you cannot get outside competition if they see fit to take advantage of the protection which the tariff gives them.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Is there any reason to suppose that they do take advantage of it ?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if there is no reason to suppose that, is there any reason, without doing them any injustice, for putting them in a position to take advantage of it if they thought of doing it? Now, the minister has put a question. Let me put a question to the minister : If the minister had had the interests of the consumer entirely in his mind why did he not keep the duty on the raw sugar the same as it was before and reduce the duty on the refined sugar by a small amount ? That was open to the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. That was.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there would have been no difficulty at all in either theory or practice. Then the consumer would have been benefited absolutely. As it is to-day the minister may refine his theories as long as he likes, but I tell him that the practical course of trade as it was, as it is now and as it will be, proves that this increase in the raw will increase materially the price that will be paid for that sugar. From the revenue point of view, how much revenue does the minister hope to squeeze out of the consumers of this country by the increased duty on the raw ?

Mr. PATERSON. We do not expect to squeeze out of the consumers of this country on refined sugar—the sugar we use—one cent—not one cent.

Mr. FOSTER. I am asking the minister how much duty he expects to get out of the duty on raw sugar. We will leave the squeezing process out for the present and discuss it afterwards.

Mr. PATERSON. On this raw sugar ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. It will be somewhere between $150,000 and $200,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the budget speech the Minister of Finance said $300,000.

Mr. FIELDING. But we have reduced it since.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much ?

Mr. FOSTER. Have you reduced it one-half ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then your calculations are wrong somewhere. How much raw sugar was imported last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. About 400,000,000 pounds.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it would be $250,000.

Mr. PATERSON. Not quite that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think the position of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is absolutely correct that this tax is bound to come out of the people. The consumers will have to pay that increased duty. The hon. Minister of Finance in making the announcement in the first place, said that there would be an increase in this duty of $350,000.

Mr. FIELDING. My recollection is that I said about $300,000.

Mr. FOSTER. You have reduced it from 7⅛ to 5⅜.

Mr. FIELDING. We have taken 1⅛ off and I would say that $200,000 would about represent the amount of increased revenue that will be raised out of this reduced tariff.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think the minister said $300,000, although I am only speaking from memory.

Mr. FIELDING. Possibly I did. I have not looked up the budget since.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. But the fact remains that the duties are being disturbed to the extent of 7⅛ cents per 100 pounds and the refiners declare that they have to pay 8 cents extra per 100 pounds. Either the refiners are going to lose that or the public

are going to pay it. Does the minister think that he can take $200,000 out of the pockets of the refiners without them feeling it? It must come from one source or the other. The refiners must lose that much profit or the consumer must pay it, or else they are going to divide it. The minister says it cannot come out of the people because it is not a refined article or an article of commerce. I beg to take issue with him. Part of it is an article of commerce. Demerara is a raw sugar and it is used without any refining process at all. That is what comes from the West India islands. Speaking for myself, I have used it on my table for years. Every household consumes more or less raw sugar because it is wanted for certain purposes. For certain purposes in cooking no other sugar will do as well. That part of it is a commercial article and that is the kind of sugar that the minister spoke of. Then, take his argument in regard to which I must say they are endeavouring to evade the question although not successfully and that is that it does not follow that because the duty on raw sugar has been raised there must be a raise in the refined article. The very fact that an advance of 10 cents took place immediately after the changes were announced is a sufficient answer to that. At the same time the refiners are not here to issue a plea on their behalf. They are probably able to look after themselves, and if they see fit they can come to Ottawa and interview the minister. But the consumers should not be misled into thinking that they are not going to pay this duty. Somebody will have to pay this $300,000 additional duty, and my contention is, notwithstanding what the minister may say, that it will come out of the purchasers of refined sugar for the most part. The raw, is the basis of the refined, and unless we are going to have all our refined sugar imported, and no raw sugar imported, the duty must come out of the refined article which our refiners are selling to the jobbers and the jobbers to the retailers. The Minister of Customs should admit at the start, that that money is going to come out of the consumers.

Mr. PATERSON. I will not admit that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. There is no shadow of doubt but that the whole of that money will come out of the consumer, or at all events as much of it as the refiners can take.

Mr. PATERSON. I will not admit that in the slightest degree; I deny it right from the start.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The minister says, no raw sugar is used as an article of commerce.

Mr. PATERSON. The quantity of sugar under number 16 Dutch standard in colour, which is used, is very insignificant in comparison with the whole importation. The duty on the refined sugar determines the price the consumer has to pay for his sugar. On the basis of 400,000,000 pounds imported last year, there would be $200,000 and that seems a large sum to take out of the refiners, for it is out of the refiners it comes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the refiners take it out of the farmers.

Mr. PATERSON. If it does not come out of the refiners why need they care about it? The question may be asked then: have we been giving the refiners, under the tariff, $200,000 a year more than they should have had? Let me tell you this: About three years ago when the preference was given to raw sugar, British grown, in order to help our West Indian brethren and to reduce the duty as well, the preferential scale reduced the duty on the raw sugar materially. But we also provided for a like reduction on the refined sugar made in Britain from British grown raw material, so that such imported British sugars are only subject to a duty of 84 cents, and not $1.26. It was a problem at that time as to how it would work out. We recognize that if the English refiner would go into this business of refining sugar from wholly British raws and exporting them to Canada, then the Canadian refiner would have a competition that I am free to say I do not believe he could have struggled under. We did not know what the effect might be, or how soon that effect might come. Two or three years have passed, and in the present revision of the tariff we have the benefit of knowing just how the tariff framed three years ago has worked, and we find that the English refiner, for one cause or another, has not taken or availed himself of the advantage given him under the tariff, and that only a very, very small quantity of English sugar refined from British grown sugar has come into this country.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Does the minister say that the Canadian refiners have not taken full advantage of the duty on refined sugar?

Mr. PATERSON. You cannot get away from the fact that the duty on refined sugar determines the price. Why does the hon. gentleman advocate an additional duty on some things, if it is not that he may get a higher price?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Not at all.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it is reported to us time and again that they cannot exist without a higher duty. Is not the contention of the refiners, as voiced by my hon. friends opposite, that under the $1.26 duty, they cannot get along if the duty on the raw material is placed at such a rate?

Mr. E. D. SMITH. It is contended by some that there is no protection given to refiners under the new schedule, and if that is so they have a right to complain.

Mr. PATERSON. If the British refiner were sending us large quantities of refined sugar, the Canadian refiner would have a very, very close margin to work upon; closer than I would be disposed to advocate. But when we find that in the past two or three years our Canadian refiners have not had that competition, we feel it our duty to lessen the amount of protection that was afforded them under the old tariff, and give them what we believe will enable them to make a good profitable business under the rates we are substituting, and in order that the revenue may get an increased amount from the enhanced duty on the raw, without burdening the consumers of the country to the extent of one cent per 1,000 pounds on the sugar they buy. That is the explanation; that is the reason why, during the past few years, the refiners have had more than we consider they were fairly entitled to. We could have taken the line suggested by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster); we could have left the duty as it was upon the raw, and we could have lowered the duty upon the refined. To the refiners the result would be precisely the same.

Mr. FOSTER. But, to the consumer?

Mr. PATERSON. If the duty on the refined was lower, the consumer would get the sugar somewhat lower.

Mr. FOSTER. You have no bowels of mercy for the consumer.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes we have, and therefore we have removed the duty from rice, and fruits, and many other things.

Mr. FOSTER. The poor man eats rice for his breakfast, and rice for his dinner, and rice before he goes to bed.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know whether my hon. friend eats rice or not, but there is a great deal of it consumed in Canada. There is the admission of the hon. gentleman himself, that if we had reduced the duty on the refined, the price would come down to the consumer. Why can it not come down without our reducing the duty on the refined, if the refiner desires?

Mr. FOSTER. Is it or is it not the fact, that after this tariff was brought down the price of sugar went up 10 cents per 100 pounds? Is it or is it not a fact, that, as the minister has stated to-night, under the old tariff all the increase he put upon sugars was 7⅓ cents, and therefore when he raised the duty on raw 7⅓ cents, the response to that was an increase of 10 cents per 100 pounds in the price of refined sugar? And I am informed the price has not materially gone down since. An ounce of experience is worth a pound of theory, especially such kind of theory as my hon. friend is giving us to-night. Here you have a government doubling the taxes of the country, as this government has done, taking millions from the people, yet on an article which is used by every home in this country, especially the poorer homes, you take from the tax-payers $250,000 by this increase of duty, when you might have left the raw sugar as it was and saved the people this taxation upon one of the prime necessaries of life. A free trade government, even a slightly protectionist government, with an overflowing treasury, would have done that. But my hon. friend did not choose to do it. He prefers to add to the price of the raw sugar. He has got a response from the commercial world, and that response is a rise in the price of sugar over and above the tax he levied on the raw material. He does not seem to have benefited anybody. He may take a little pleasure in squeezing the refiner, but the people will see that he had an excellent opportunity of relieving them of a little of their load; and had he done that, to a certain extent that would have covered some of his sins.

Mr. PATERSON. What a hard-hearted government this must be, and what a wonderful power it must have, when it can arrange the sugar duties in such a way that it raises the price of refined sugar 10 cents per hundred pounds, not only to the people of Canada, but to the people of the United States and the rest of the world as well, because the price of sugar went up 10 cents all the world over and not in Canada alone. By what we did we raised the price, not only 10 cents here, but all over the world!

Mr. FOSTER. At that particular time?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes; I am informed that at that particular time the refiners in Canada followed exactly the New York quotations.

Mr. FOSTER. Your information is wrong.

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, my hon. friend will say so. In view of the fact that the English refiner should not take advantage of the preference, and that there was consequently an extreme amount of protection under the old tariff, we were face to face with the question whether we should not take that public money and put it into the treasury instead of letting it go into the pockets of the sugar refiners. That was the whole question. In reply to hon. gentlemen opposite, I deny totally that the change has been the means of raising the price to the people at all, because that is governed by the refiners' prices.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you not lower it? Suppose you reduced the duty on raw sugar to about one-quarter and then maintained the same relative advantage to the refiner, would not that have resulted in a reduction in the price of sugar?

Mr. PATERSON. We would reduce the refined duty in equal proportion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose you had reduced the duty on raw to ten cents per 100 pounds, and then, in order to maintain the relative proportion on the refined, you would have a duty on refined of 37½ cents, because you say the present protection is 27½ cents per 100 pounds. That would give the same protection and would have greatly reduced the cost of sugar to the consumer.

Mr. PATERSON. I admit the general proposition that if we reduce the duty on raw and proportionately reduce the duty on refined, we would reduce the price of sugar.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you not do that?

Mr. PATERSON. That is a fair question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And it deserves a fair answer.

Mr. PATERSON. We have chosen to do it this way.

Mr. TAYLOR. So as to get $200,000 out of the sugar consumers?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So that instead of handing back to the consumers some part of the $12,000,000 or $15,000,000 surplus, you take $200,000 more out of them.

Mr. PATERSON. What does my hon. friend mean? I think I have heard him say time and again that we do not make ends meet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am referring to the boasts made session after session here that first there is a surplus of $8,000,000, and then $10,000,000, and then $15,000,000.

Mr. PATERSON. You admit that?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am taking the hon. gentleman's statement. Does he think it is not worthy of credence?

Mr. PATERSON. As we put it, absolutely worthy of credence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, taking that statement at its face value, why do you not remit to the consumer some part of that $12,000,000 or $15,000,000 surplus, because the minister agrees it could easily be done? He says he does not do it because he does not choose to. Surely he has some better reason.

Mr. PATERSON. If I might give an individual reason, it would be this: I am very anxious, not only that we should have sufficient revenue to defray all ordinary expenses, but that we should also, if it be possible without unduly burdening the people, have a surplus over and above that which we can devote to capital account, such as enlarging transportation facilities, without having recourse to borrowing and adding to the public debt, as hon. gentlemen opposite did when they were in power.

Mr. FOSTER. You will not live much longer without having to borrow, and borrow very largely.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) will have to borrow $200,000 less.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) makes things large when he wants them to be large and small when he wants them to be small. Does he not remember that at the last general election in Toronto he told the people of that city one night that he would only require $13,000,000 to build the Grand Trunk Pacific, and that one year's surplus would do it? Now, he has had two years' surpluses. He has therefore paid for the Grand Trunk Pacific and has $13,000,000 in his pockets; let him turn out his pockets and give the people a little.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) said he did not use the $350,000 I spoke of. Well, I now have the item. On November 29th, page 326 of 'Hansard,' he said:

> That does not affect the consumer because it does not touch the question of refined sugar. The increase is very slight, but as sugar is an article of enormous consumption in Canada, we shall receive about $300,000 additional revenue from this source, which will be almost enough to balance the loss to which I have called attention.

Those are the words of the Finance Minister in introducing the resolution, $300,000.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly, that is what I stated a moment ago.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The Minister of Customs placed it at $150,000 or $200,000.

Mr. FOSTER. He is generally wrong.

Mr. FIELDING. I was speaking of the item as it stood, the Minister of Customs was giving an estimate of what would be the increased revenue as now proposed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. About one-third off.

Mr. FIELDING. About that. I fixed $300,000 and my hon. friend said $150,000 to $200,000.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The minister spoke of British grown sugar?

Mr. PATERSON. We speak of the British preferential tariff, and we take it——

Mr. COCKSHUTT. But it is not grown in Britain, it is a product of beet sugar imported from European countries.

Mr. FIELDING. Not under the prefertial tariff.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It is not British grown, what he meant was British refined, but he used 'grown' three or four times.

Mr. PATERSON. If any refined sugar comes from any but British owned countries, if the hon. gentleman will follow he will find that the refiner has a protection of 69½ cents per hundred instead of 50 cents as before, and that is where he had his great savings in the last two or three years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. About how much refined sugar was imported last year?

Mr. FIELDING. About 28,000,000 pounds.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much of that was entitled to the preference?

Mr. FIELDING. 26,500,000 pounds.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Customs stated that the British refiner did not avail himself very largely of the preference?

Mr. FIELDING. Not to any large extent, proportionately that is not a large sum.

Mr. PATERSON. As against 400,000,000 pounds.

Mr. FIELDING. 420,000,000 pounds, That would not make quite 400,000,000 pounds refined but very near it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much refined sugar was imported ten years ago?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not those figures at hand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Roughly has it increased or decreased?

Mr. FIELDING. I think lately the importations of refined sugars have decreased. There is only about 5 per cent or 6 per cent of the refined sugar produced in Canada imported. The home industry has 94 per cent of the trade to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand the Minister of Customs was disappointed that the British refiner had not proved as active as he should in competition in this country?

Mr. FIELDING. As he might.

Mr. FOSTER. Or as he might in importing sugars into this country and consequently he has thought it better to diminish the amount of protection. Is that the principle on which the minister builds up his tariff? And if it is, has he received a promise from the British refiner of sugar that he will now live up to his opportunities and export more of his refined sugar to this country? For if he does not, where will this competition come from on which the minister relies to keep the prices down, so that the refiners will not be able to make out of the consumers of the country the extra amount that they are taxed on their raw sugars. Has he any promissory note from the British refiners that they will now send in more than they are sending?

Mr. PATERSON. We have the word of the British refiners' agent that they cannot send in refined sugar under the existing tariff. He has an advantage of nearly 5 cents a hundred pounds over the United States, as against the Canadian refiner. Whether he will be able to accomplish more I do not know. I am afraid he will not be able to do a great deal better, but he will have that advantage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observe that the Finance Minister in his budget speech used this language:

> We reduced the duty on refined to $1, and left the duty on the raw 50 cents, so that the difference in favour of the refiner became 50 cents. It has been our idea, all through, to give the refiner about that much advantage. Of course, he has to take into account the loss in manufacture and the cost of manufacture.

Has there been any departure from that in the proposal which has been made?

Mr. FIELDING. The Canadian refiner had, rougly speaking, about 50 cents advantage—protection if you see fit to call it so—subject to the preference. The preferential tariff would be somewhat less. If you take the rate to-day on refined sugar under the general tariff at about 99—allowing for some importations of a lower grade —the duty is $1.24½. Now, if you take the average of raw sugar, I am not speaking of the quantity of raw sugar that will make one hundred pounds, when we speak of 50 cents we mean 50 cents as between raw and refined, roughly defined without reference to the particular strength. Taking the same rule on the raw sugar we find it pays on an average 77½ cents, so that the net result will be that the protection to the refiner under the general tariff of which I am now speaking would be about 47 cents, which would be pretty close to the original 50 cents. This in both cases will be subject to the preference. I think the figures quoted showing the advantage to the refiner have been somewhat extreme, although there has been some reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. 27½ cents the minister figured it.

Mr. FIELDING. That was by taking 100.

Mr. FOSTER. That is taking 100 per 100.

Mr. FIELDING. Not taking the average raw sugar.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. 84 cents on refined and 56½ cents on raw.

Mr. FIELDING. I am dealing with the general tariff, my hon. friend did not have reference to that.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole competition is with reference to that.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is going back to what we allowed on that some years ago. That was under the general tariff, that was made subject to the preference. The refiner received the advantage in the shape of lower raw material, but the refiner was hurt by the reduction on refined sugar. Under the general tariff the duty on refined is $1.24½ and on raw 77½ cents, making the advantage to the refiner under the general tariff, 47 cents. Practically, however, the competition today is coming from Great Britain and when you come to make your calculations on the basis of the preferential tariff, undoubtedly the advantage to the refiner is somewhat less. Still there is this striking fact, that whatever has been done only about 5 per cent or 6 per cent of the refined sugar used in Canada is imported.

Now, we do not aim to have a prohibitive tariff in any line. I think we might all agree that we wish to leave the bars down sufficiently to allow of a reasonable degree of competition. The conditions under which British refined sugar is obliged to be made for the purpose of the preference are rather difficult for the British manufacturer to comply with. He must make his refined sugar from raw sugar grown in a British country. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) stated that the British sugar that comes in under the preference is made from German raw sugar. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in that; such sugar does not come in under the preference—it must be British-grown. The result of it all is that the refiners in Great Britain do not appear to have equipped themselves to make particularly for the Canadian market. I agree with the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) that if they change their policy and manufacture from British-grown sugar, under conditions which will enable our inspectors to certify that it is British-grown and British-made sugar——

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Do I understand him to say that all British refined sugars are the product of raw cane sugar?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I did not say that. I stated that that which came in under the preferential tariff—and, of course, it is the degree of protection afforded the Canadian manufacturer under the preference that has been quoted—is British-grown sugar; that is, the raw sugar was produced in a British country and it was refined in Great Britain. If the British manufacturer makes sugar from the foreign product, as undoubtedly he does, he is not allowed to bring it into Canada under the preferential tariff. The difficulties in the way of bringing in British-grown sugar and so getting the advantage of the preference are such that they cannot bring in much, and consequently there is but little brought in to compete with the Canadian refiner. But if the refiner in Greenock confines his work to cane sugar, if he excludes the use of beet sugar and foreign grown sugar, and makes in his factory British-grown sugar, and especially for the Canadian market, he will be able to subject our refiners to much keener competition than in the past. And, if that should turn out to be the case, there would be need in the future for reconsideration of this tariff item. But, in view of the fact that ninety-four per cent of the refined sugar consumed in Canada to-day is manufactured in Canada, and only six per cent imported, it will be seen that there is not at the present very keen competition.

Mr. BRISTOL. To what extent does the proposed tariff benefit the British manufacturer of refined sugar over the old tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not touch that at all.

Mr. BRISTOL. I gathered from what the Minister of Customs said that the British manufacturer had a better chance under the present proposed tariff than before.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not because of this tariff, but because he has not hitherto equiped himself for compliance with the terms of our Act. This Act has been on our statute-book for some years, but a very small quantity of British-grown and British-manufactured sugar has been brought in.

Mr. BRISTOL. Is it not a benefit to the British manufacturer, that the Canadian manufacturer has to pay seven or eight cents more for his raw material?

Mr. PATERSON. He lost sight of that.

Mr. BRISTOL. Then, the present tariff benefits the British manufacturer, at the expense of the Canadian manufacturer to the extent of 8 cents per 100 pounds. That is what will be the result, because it is certain that the consumer will not get this sugar for any less. The question is, how much of this $300,000 will go to the British manufacturer, and how much to the customs revenue of his country?

Mr. FIELDING. That is another way to state it. But the consumer will not be called upon to pay a fraction of a cent more. It is true that the Canadian refiner is placed, to the extent of the difference, at a disadvantage as compared with the British refiner, and, to that extent, the British producer is in a better position to compete in the Canadian market.

Mr. BRISTOL. I understood from what the Minister of Customs stated that three years ago he had put the British manufac-

turer on a much better basis, a basis, which, as minister, he thought was almost unfair, and would induce competition, but, for reasons not indicated, the British manufacturer did not exert himself to do more business than 26,000,000 pounds out of a total consumption of 400,000,000 pounds. But, now the British manufacturer is getting a benefit of 7 cents per 100 pounds as against the Canadian manufacturer.

Mr. FIELDING. The Canadian manufacturer is getting that much less.

Mr. BRISTOL. He has to pay that much more for his raw product.

Mr. FIELDING. We have admitted that, to the extent of this increase, the home manufacturer is placed at a disadvantage. That is unquestionably the case. But any suggestion that the British or home manufacturer can get a higher price out of the consumer is strongly denied by the Minister of Customs, and I agree with his view.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. How does the minister ascertain whether the British refined sugar coming in under the preference is produced from foreign beets or from British West India cane sugar ?

Mr. FIELDING. In the first place our law requires that it shall be so, and the parties must make the usual customs declaration that the sugar imported complies with the conditions of the law. Besides, we sent an inspector to visit one of the factories in order that we might have an additional check.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) occupied a great time in trying to prove that the consumers of sugar will not pay any more for that product than they did before the introduction of this tariff. But the facts are all against the hon. gentleman. And the Minister of Finance has not said that the consumers would not pay more. I think the Minister of Customs should rise and admit that he was in error. The fact is that, as soon as this tariff was introduced, the price of sugar went up 10 cents per 100 pounds and it still remains there. The $200,000 will go into the treasury. It will not come out of the refiner, but it will come out of the consumer. The minister might just as well admit it and let the item pass.

Mr. FIELDING. No, he must not admit it, for if he did I should have to contradict him and we must not have any divisions in the cabinet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like the Minister of Customs to inform me if he can, how much refined sugar is produced in Great Britain which might, if imported into Canada receive the benefit of the British preference ?

Mr. BRISTOL.

Mr. PATERSON. I fancy that is what came into Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. minister thinks that all of it comes to Canada ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has no definite information on that ?

Mr. PATERSON. No. But their objection to get the benefit of the Canadian preference is that they work sugars which would not come in under the preference, and they do not want to clear out their refineries and run a special batch for Canada. The conditions have been such that, apparently, they have not felt in a position to take advantage of the preference. Lately the one in Greenock did undertake it, but I think even they have found it difficult to comply with the conditions, so that it is only once in a while they make the attempt.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, Mr. Chairman, it is not carried. There is a good old rule about making haste slowly. There is one more question I would like to ask the minister. I put the question some time ago, but the Minister of Customs was not able to give me the information on the subject. But I think the computation I refer to is one that we are entitled to. What I desire to know is what would be the equivalent ad valorem duty in the case of refined sugar and raw sugar, taking both the general tariff and the preferential tariff ?

Mr. PATERSON. What would be the difference——

Mr. FOSTER. The duty is a specific duty. The question is what ad valorem would this represent in each case ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know the figures, suppose it was $3 in England and you had 50 cents per 100 pounds. That would be about 16 per cent, would it not ?

Mr. FOSTER. Where do you get your 50 cents a hundred ?

Mr. PATERSON. The refiner has 50 cents a hundred protection, he has 27½ advantage over raw sugar. Over other sugars that come in, other than cane sugars, he has 69½ cents ; add the 27½, and he has 97 cents, divide that by 2 and it gives him 48½ cents, just where he was before.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that on the imported refined the duty amounts to about 29 per cent, that is, under the preferential tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. No one can tell without he knows the values.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Take the price of sugar as it stands to-day, the price of refined sugar cannot be a subject of much mystery.

Mr. FIELDING. What we need is accurate figures.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what the ministers ought to have when they come down with a tariff, which has now been three months before the House. We want to know what the specific duty translated into an ad valorem, means.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister will give us the information the next time the committee meets.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a difficult matter to answer, but we will make an effort.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is one other matter about which I would like a little explanation. In explaining this duty the minister put it on two grounds. In the first place, he explained that the original refiner had an advantage of about 50 cents. Then he explained the application of the preferential tariff to both raw and refined sugar, and of course that simply meant, I suppose, a reduction of about 17 cents from the protection which the refiner previously enjoyed, assuming that British-grown refined sugar could be produced in any great quantity in the British Isles to which the preference could apply. He said, as the Minister of Customs has just stated, that very little such sugar is produced and in that way the refiner got an ,advantage which was perhaps a little more than the government intended at the time they framed the tariff. The next point the minister made was that in framing this tariff he was entitled to take into consideration, and did take into consideration, what he called the double freight, that is, the freight from the British Isles across the Atlantic to Great Britain and the freight, from Britain back to Canada. I would like to know whether there is very much in that item. I understand that there is very little or nothing in it, although the minister evidently relied on it. Would he tell me what importance is to be attached to that supposed advantage to the Canadian refiners ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think there is a material advantage but I cannot give exact figures. The British refiner has to pay freight from the West Indies to Greenock, then he has to pay freight from Greenock to Montreal ; whereas the Montreal manufacturer can get a cargo of raw sugar direct from the British Isles. I think that would mean a good deal in some of our ports. But the hon. gentleman knows that on a combined ocean and rail carriage through freights are sometimes pretty low. I have understood that the refiners claim that if a through rate, boat and rail, was to be given from Greenock to Winnipeg, it would be about as low as you could get a rate from Halifax or Montreal to Winnipeg. In my judgment there must be a considerable difference in the freight.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is labour cheaper in Greenock than in Halifax or other points in Canada, and does not that overcome the difference in freight ?

Mr. PATERSON. It has not had that effect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have read a printed memorandum pointing out that the rate on raw sugar from the West Indies to Great Britain, and then the through rate from Great Britain to Winnipeg or points east, was of such a figure that really there was no advantage whatever to the Canadian refiner. I do not know whether the calculation is correct or not, and I am asking the government for information.

Mr. FIELDING. That was one item which entered into our consideration to some extent, though I think the main consideration is to be found in the very small imports in comparison with the very large consumption. When we are speaking of two freights we mean two ocean freights. The question of inland freights opens up many complications because figures which would be quite correct as to one point in Canada would be entirely incorrect as to another point. When I spoke of two freights I had reference to two ocean freights. The English manufacturer would have one ocean freight from the West Indies to Great Britain and another ocean freight from Great Britain to Canada. But once you get into the question of inland freights the figures will vary at different points in Canada. It would be one item in the calculation but not a very material one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not amount to much.

Mr. FIELDING. It is distributed especially on the long distances.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it not a fact that the freight from Greenock to Winnipeg is about half what it is from Montreal to Winnipeg ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, it is about the same.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know that you can ship freight from a point in Ontario to London for a good deal less than you can ship it to St. John, N.B.

Mr. FIELDING. It is time you got after the Railway Commission.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have a summary of the freight rates as presented by the sugar refiners and it completely nullifies the argument the hon. Minister of Finance made in presenting his budget when he spoke about the reduction in freights. It is as follows :

Freight—ocean and land.

On sugar carried from the West Indies to Great Britain, and thence to Winnipeg ; and

the same to Montreal and thence to Winnipeg.

1st. Via Great Britain—summer—

	Cents, per 100 pounds.
Freight to Liverpool or Glasgow, average..	14
Freight from Liverpool or Glasgow to Winnipeg..	70
Total..	84
2nd. Via Montreal—summer—	
Freight to Montreal, partly via St. Lawrence, partly via Atlantic ports..	17
Freight, rail to Winnipeg..	66½
Total..	83½
3rd. Via Great Britain—winter—	
To England..	14
Thence to Winnipeg..	85
Total..	99
4th. Via Montreal—winter—	
To Montreal..	21
Thence to Winnipeg..	82½
Total..	$1 03½

Summary.

Summer—	
Via Great Britain to Winnipeg, costs..	84
Via Montreal to Winnipeg..	83½
One-half cent less via Montreal.	
Winter—	
Via Great Britain costs..	99
Via Montreal costs..	$1 03½
4½ cents more via Montreal.	

That shows that the refiner of Canada is actually in an adverse position as far as freights are concerned in the winter season to the extent of 4½ cents and at an advantage to the extent of half a cent in summer time. That nullifies the argument that the Finances Minister made when he presented his budget speech in saying that there was an advantage in freight on sugars imported from the West Indies into Canada. Winnipeg controls not only the local trade but the trade of the west.

Mr. FIELDING. When I spoke of double freights I had reference to the ocean freights and I did not enter into the question of inland freights. If you push the argument further and fix a point west of Winnipeg you make it much stronger and if you fix a point east of Winnipeg you make it much weaker. Inland freights raise another question altogether.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These inland freights we have to take into consideration when we are endeavouring to come to a conclusion as to what advantage there is on the part of the English refiner as against the Canadian refiner.

Mr. FIELDING. We cannot affect the inland freight question in this tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs will answer my question as to what the specific duty translated into ad valorem would be for the different grades of raw and refined sugar ?

Mr. PATERSON. If I make a statement will you accept it ? You seem to be doubtful about my calculation.

Mr. FOSTER. We will exercise our best judgment upon it.

136. Molasses produced in the process of the manufacture of cane sugar from the juice of the cane without any admixture with any other ingredient, when imported direct from the place of production or its shipping port, in the original package in which it was placed at the point of production and not afterwards subjected to any process of treating or mixing, testing by the polariscope not less than thirty degrees, nor more than 56 degrees, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs, per gallon, intermediate tariff, 2½ cents, 3 cents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I see that you propose, after the word 'thirty' to insert the word 'five'.

Mr. FIELDING. The old rate was forty, we reduced it to thirty and upon depresentations that we had made it too low we have thought it advisable to make it thirty-five.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You add it together and divide by two.

Mr. FIELDING. In this case it is logical although I do not know whether it was in the other case.

Mr. FOSTER. You have spent two years to find out what it should be, you say it should be 40, then you say it should be 30, and then at the end of three months more you come down and say it would be 35.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman remember the fun we used to have when he spoke about his clerical errors?

Mr. FOSTER. The temperature never went from 40 to 30.

Mr. FIELDING. This is not a clerical error.

137. Molasses, testing not more than 56 degrees by the polariscope, the produce of any British country entitled to the benefits of the British preferential tariff, when produced from sugar cane and imported direct by ship from the country of production, or from any British country, in the original package in which it was placed at the point of production, and not afterwards subjected to any process of treating or mixing, free.

Provided, however, that the said molasses may be transferred in bond under excise regulations for purposes of distillation.

New item 137a. Molasses of cane, testing under 35 degrees by polariscope when imported for use exclusively in the manufacture of compressed food for live stock, free.

Mr. FIELDING. This was free before. It is a very low grade of molasses which is used for the manufacture of cattle feed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you require a new item ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was left out before and it fell under a general clause. On further consideration we thought that the encouragement of that class of material for the manufacture of cattle feed was desirable.

Mr. FIELDING. A salutary provision.

Mr. FOSTER. A sanitary provision ?

139. Glucose or grape sugar, glucose syrup and corn syrup, or any syrups containing an admixture thereof, per one hundred pounds, 35 cents, 45 cents, 50 cents.

Proposed amendment 139. Strike out the several rates of duty and insert the following rates instead thereof. British preferential tariff rate, 40 cents ; intermediate tariff rate, 55 cents, general tariff rate, 62½ cents.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason for all this change ?

Mr. PATERSON. We thought we had it a little too high.

Mr. FOSTER. But you are making it higher.

Mr. PATERSON. It was 75 before and we brought it down to 50 ; now we make it 62½.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you get at that by adding them together, and dividing by two?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That seems to be the principle upon which the whole tariff was framed. How much does the ad valorem amount to.

Mr. PATERSON. Between two and two and a half.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is it imported from ?

Mr. PATERSON. The United States generally, but it is made in Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is made at Cardinal. Why was it reduced from 75 to 50 ?

Mr. PATERSON. We thought it a little high.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why did you think it high ; are there not articles in the tariff higher than that ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. How much less is the duty as proposed now, than under the previous tariff ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is 12½ per 100 pounds less than before.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have a long statement which was sent to me pointing out that the duty as proposed in the original resolution, was absolutely too low to enable the industry to live. I quite agree with the proposal made by the government to increase the duty now, and if they made it higher still I would vote for it.

141. Sugar candy and confectionery of all kinds, including sweetened gums, candied peel, candied pop-corn, candied fruits, candied nuts, flavouring powders, custard powders, jelly powders, sweetmeats, sweetened breads, cakes, pies, puddings and all other confections containing sugar, 22½ per cent, 32½ per cent, 35 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. There was an ad-valorem and specific before, and we dropped the specific.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister think this gives a fair protection for that business ?

Mr. FIELDING. We think so.

Mr. FOSTER. It is contended that this is pretty hard on the confectioners.

Mr. PATERSON. The competition from Great Britain will be pretty close, but they can stand it I think.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a pretty widely distributed industry, and it is a luxury rather than a necessity.

167. Malt and malt flour, upon entry for warehouse subject to excise regulations, per one hundred pounds, 40 cents, 40 cents, 40 cents.

Mr. FIELDING. In the old tariff malt flour was included in this item as was also all flour containing any proportion of malt. The new duty of 45 cents per 100 is about five cents per 100 higher than the old malt duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did you make this change ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is a complicated question. The malt flour was susceptible of being turned into spirit, and the question of excise and customs came in. Malt flour is used by bakers, and the old rate on it made it exceedingly high. We had to try to keep that duty down, and to so divide the item that the article could not be used for any purpose in contravention of the Inland Revenue Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the duty been increased on acetone ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change.

Mr. FIELDING. It was not specifically mentioned in the old tariff, and there was dispute as to how it should be classified and sometimes it was classified under the 'unenumerated.' It is now included in a special item.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a statement sent to me which says :

Acetone was dutiable at 20 per cent under the unenumerated ; it has been raised from 20

to 30 per cent, which is an increase of 50 per cent. About fourteen tons of acetone is imported during the year. It is used for absorbent purposes; it is not made in this country except of late by the Standard Chemical Company, and the duty has been raised in order to give a fillip to the work of that company.

The statement further is, that it is impossible to get pure acetone from this company; that my correspondent has not been able to get a satisfactory article; that he has to get it from the United States as before, and that the heavy increased duty will practically wipe out his business. Has the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had representations made to him in that case? It is pretty rough to raise the duty and so bear hard upon those who have been importing the article for use in this country, when the only company in Canada which pretends to make it does not make an article that is fit for use.

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed that the article is made at two places in Canada—one in Ontario and one in Quebec. There has been some difficulty in properly classifying it. At one time it was treated as a spirit and rated accordingly. In other cases it was treated as unenumerated at 20 per cent, and no doubt the gentleman referred to was getting it in at that rate. On the other hand, for that class of article, the by-product of wood alcohol, 30 per cent can hardly be said to be excessive.

Mr. FOSTER. It is an increase which, according to the representations made to me, will bear very hardly on those who are importing and carrying on their industry by means of that importation. Here is what my correspondent writes me:

With a view to assist in developing Canadian manufactuers, I wrote to the different chemical works during the past summer for prices and samples of pure acetone. Only one concern apparently, the Standard Chemical Company of Canada, were attempting to manufacture it, and they furnished samples, which, on being tested, were found imperfect and useless for our trade, namely, the absorption of acetylene gas for storage purposes in railway car and other lighting. Pure acetone has the property of absorbing twenty-five times its own bulk of acetylene gas, while the imperfect Canadian article submitted to us could not make the absorption, and the impurities in it involved a dangerous compound in connection with acetylene gas. To the best of my knowledge, the acetone imported into Canada is for the manufacture of chloroform and other anaesthetic compounds, and the relative proportion of importations for those purposes is practically in pounds while our importations are in tons.

Mr. PATERSON. That industry, under the changes which are taking place, will have difficulty both here and in the United States.

170. Freight rates for railways and telegraph rates and time tables of railways outside of Canada, bound in book or pamphlet form, 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. That is intended to include the time-tables of foreign railways distributed, which can hardly be regarded as advertisements, but rather as information to the public. We give them the same rates as the other items mentioned.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a communication which was sent me regarding these time-tables. I understand they came in heretofore free.

Mr. FIELDING. No; the complaint was that, not being particularly mentioned, they were classified under another item, which made them dutiable at 15 cents per pound as advertising matter. We have put them in at a moderate rate, and I think that those concerned will be reasonably satisfied.

Mr. TAYLOR. Here is the letter I have received:

St. John, New Brunswick, February 18, 1907.
To hotel proprietors and managers—

Dear Sirs,—We regret to have to advise you that, owing to increasing expenditure and no corresponding increase in revenue, we shall be compelled to withdraw our cases and discontinue the distribution of railway and steamship time tables unless the government revise the duties on the time tables of foreign lines.

The local railways and steamship lines cannot afford to pay us sufficient to maintain our service, and we have to depend largely upon the patronage of foreign lines, upon whose time tables Canada practically charges 100 per cent. As a comparison we may state that the United States duty is 20 per cent on railway time tables and Canadian duty is 20 per cent of freight tariffs, and, at fifteen cents per pound, practically 100 per cent on time tables.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the complaint was with regard to the old rating, and most of the parties will be satisfied with this.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was there any change in the duty on sago flour?

Mr. FIELDING. We had that up this afternoon. We reduced the duty.

Mr. PORTER. I desire to call attention to items 183 and 184. When going through the tariff before, I took occasion to point out an apparent anomaly existing in the working out of the tariff in this respect, that magazines in completed book form came in from the United States free of duty, whereas the same material in an unbound and unfinished form, and omitting the American advertisements that are usually inserted in the American completed magazines, were, under the present tariff, obliged to pay 25 per cent. Upon calling attention to this, the hon. minister asked me to produce a case of that kind, or some evidence of it. I have now obtained a

sample of two books that I referred to then. Here is one, the October number of a magazine called the 'West End Magazine.' That magazine, in the first sixteen pages, contains advertisements and cuts of celebrities, and the latter eight or ten pages contain American advertisements. On the other hand, I have here an uncompleted magazine. All the articles appearing in the completed book appear in this—the same matter, with the exception of the American advertisements and the cuts I have been referring to. This material is published in large numbers by a syndicate in the United States, and they sell it to the different publishers. The matter came to my attention in this way. Some gentlemen in Ottawa desired to start a publication to be called 'The Ottawa Magazine,' and were intending to start that industry in this city, procuring the material that would be printed in the book, with the exception of the advertisements, from the syndicate in the United States. They did bring in some of that material for the purpose of starting it, and found that they had to pay 25 per cent duty. Of course, that put an end to the enterprise. It seems very strange that the completed article, containing the American advertisements, cuts and the same reading material, should be admitted into Canada free of duty, when the article in its incomplete state, being completed here in Canada and about one-third to one-half of the expense of publication put upon it by Canadian labour, should be compelled to pay 25 per cent duty. That case exists. I have the two books here, and I would be very glad to have the minister look at them.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will send over the books I will refer them to the Customs Department and I think probably by a proper interpretation of the customs law the anomaly can be remedied.

Mr. PORTER. When this material was brought in before and an application was made to the Customs Department to have it released, the importer was told that it was unclassified and that is why he had to pay 25 per cent duty.

Mr. PATERSON. We will have the Board of Customs take the question up and give a decision.

219a (new item). Non-alcoholic liquid preparations for disinfecting, dipping or spraying, n.o.p., British preferential tariff, 20 per cent; intermediate tariff, 25 per cent; general tariff, 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a special item intended to make a lower rate for these articles when used for disinfecting, spraying, &c.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. I do not know whether item 217 has been disposed of or not but I have been requested to ask the government if it is possible to lower the duty on sulphuric acid. There is a large firm in my riding interested in this and they claim that there has been a very strong combine and that they have very much increased the price of late. They claim to use about 600,000 pounds per annum, probably half the total importation of this article. I do not know whether there are manufacturers of this particular commodity in Canada, but if all of the acid used is imported I think this firm would be fairly entitled to some consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. The article is made in Canada in several places and I do not recollect any representations to the effect that the duty is excessive or along the lines of my hon. friend's suggestion. If it is a home industry and the duty is not excessive I do not see why there should be any change.

Mr. NORTHRUP. In the county of Hastings $500,000 has been spent on one sulphuric acid establishment and nearly the same amount on another.

244. White lead ground in oil, 30 per cent, 35 per cent, 37½ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. This is one of the items affected by the change which we made on flaxseed and it is proposed to make the rates 30 per cent, 35 per cent, 37½ per cent. I mentioned that there was a group of items the duties on which would be affected by the increased duty on flaxseed. These items are 244, white lead ground in oil, 247, liquid fillers; 249, varnishes, lacquers, &c., and an item further on in relation to linoleum, oil cloth, &c. These are all items in which oil is concerned and the increase in the duty on flaxseed necessitates an increased duty on the articles in which linseed oil is used.

Mr. BLAIN. Will that increase the price to the consumer?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, this is one of the cases where I think we will have to admit that it will increase the price to the consumer.

247. Liquid fillers, &c., 20 per cent, 27½ per cent, 30 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. What difference will this increase make?

Mr. PATERSON. An increase of five cents a gallon.

Mr. FOSTER. And all people who use those paints and varnishes all through the country will have to pay five cents a gallon more for what they use?

Mr. PATERSON. Well I guess so.

Mr. LAKE. How much additional revenue does the minister expect to get from the various oil items?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not looked upon them as likely to give us much revenue, but they seem to be the necessary consequence of the re-adjustment as to flax seed.

Mr. LAKE. And there is no calculation as to how much revenue they will yield?

Mr. FIELDING. No. I would not like to rely upon them yielding much additional revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. Could not the duty on flax seed be increased and the duty on the finished article be kept as it was, as in the case of sugar? What is the trouble now?

Mr. PATERSON. If the paint manufacturer had as much protection as the sugar refiner, it could be done.

Mr. FOSTER. He has more.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps, by percentage, but not in bulk.

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to say that if you work out the figures, you will find that the sugar refiner has not more than 20 per cent ad valorem, but if you will work out the duties on oil, you will find that the protection is a great deal more. Now, why, in the name of suffering humanity, which needs to have its carriages varnished, its doors painted, and its woodwork preserved—why, I say, cannot the minister arrange the duty on the raw material and keep it where it is on the manufactured article, as in the case of sugar? Just because he does not want to?—is that the underlying principle?

Mr. FIELDING. Under the scale of duties very little sugar was coming in, but a considerable amount of linseed oil was coming in. That is the true test as to whether there is much protection or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why have specific and ad valorem duties on this? This strikes the carriage manufacturers of the country pretty hard for they use large quantities of varnish.

258. Linseed or flaxseed oil, raw or boiled, per one hundred pounds, preferential, 80 cents; intermediate, $1.10; general, $1.20.

Mr. FIELDING. I propose to amend that so as to make it read British preference, $1.25, intermediate, $1.55 and general tariff, $1.65. This is the immediate result of the flaxseed readjustment.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. What is the change?

Mr. PATERSON. It is forty-five cents per one hundred pounds.

Mr. KEMP. About 50 per cent advance.

Mr. FIELDING. We had a careful calculation made as to what increase of duties would be necessary to correspond with the duties on flaxseed, with the results here indicated.

Mr. FOSTER. How many linseed oil factories are there in Canada?

Mr. PATERSON. There are a good many flaxseed mills, but of oil mills there are not so many. Some of them have shut down. There is one in Baden, I think, and one or two in Montreal. There are not many.

Mr. FOSTER. There are not many going—the minister thinks that they are nearly all shut up?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, some of them.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister puts on this duty to set these industries going?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Why then?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman will see that they could not have a duty of 10 cents per bushel on linseed with the old duty on oil, for that would close all the oil mills, and, if the oil mills were closed the farmer growing the flaxseed would be in no better position than at present. If you are going to benefit the farmer, you must not close the oil mills.

Mr. FOSTER. So, you make every man who uses linseed oil go down in his pocket to help a few flax mills. That is a doctrine that used to be greatly reprobated by hon. gentleman opposite.

Mr. PATERSON. Not to help the flax mills, but to help the farmers.

Mr. FOSTER. How many?

Mr. PATERSON. I guess there are a good many.

Mr. LAKE. How much flaxseed was imported last year, and how much oil?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. And while the minister is turning that up, I would like to ask how many pounds of flaxseed are required to make one hundred pounds of oil, so that we may get at the basis of these things. It strikes me that a good deal more than 10 cents per bushel is represented by this tax on oil. I understand that a gallon of linseed oil weighs nine pounds. The increase of half a cent per pound will equal 4½ cents for a gallon of oil. At 50 cents a gallon, which is a fair price for the import oil, this would represent 10 per cent advance, on every gallon of raw and boiled linseed oil used. The increase on the flax required for the oil, I should judge, would not make it necessary to have anything like this increased rate of duty on the oil. My argument may be a little weak, because I do not know how many pounds of flax are required for a gallon of oil.

Mr. PATERSON. Answering first the question of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), the importations last year of flaxseed out of which linseed oil is manufactured were 76,949,206 pounds, valued at $1,647,194. The imports of linseed oil entered for consumption during the last fiscal year were 1,170,012 gallons, valued at $438,937.

Mr. LAKE. What is the duty paid on the oil?

Mr. PATERSON. The duty was 25 per cent on the general and 16⅔ per cent under the preference. By far the greater part of it came from Great Britain. So that the duty would be about one-sixth the value of the imports, or, say about $70,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, what will the duty be under this? A little over fifty per cent more?

Mr. PATERSON. The commissioner says about 25 per cent.

Mr. LAKE. I would point out to the minister that these changes in oils and paints have been rather sprung upon the House and there has been no opportunity for the country to have its say in the matter. These duties are going to have a very far-reaching effect upon the country and it would be much better if the country had known that such proposals were going to be rushed through.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Will the minister tell me now how many pounds of flaxseed are required for a gallon of oil.

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed that a bushel of flax, which weighs 56 pounds, produces 17 pounds of oil.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. And the oil is nine pounds to the gallon, I believe?

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed 9·35 pounds.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It used to be 9 pounds. I was familiar with this item at one time. I wanted to get at what this duty was going to be per gallon. The minister says that 17 pounds of oil are produced from 56 pounds of flaxseed. That is, a little over three times the weight of seed is required to make 100 pounds of the oil. That is to be accurate, it will take 325 pounds of flax-seed to make 100 pounds of oil. In that case, the duty is not advanced more upon the oil than upon the flaxseed. I think that has been the idea of the minister. Is the advance in the price of oil more than is justified by the advance in flax-seed itself?

Mr. FIELDING. If there is any difference, it is that the increase has hardly been as much. It has been figured out very closely, and the difference has not been more than that which is required by the flaxseed duty, if anything it is a little less.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The expectation is that the increased duty on flaxseed is going to enlarge the production of the home grown article.

Mr. FIELDING. It is so represented to us by a number of gentlemen representing a group of counties in Ontario, and similar representations have been made to us as respects the west. Flaxseed is grown in a portion of our western country and in four or five counties in Ontario.

Mr. LAKE. What does the ad valorem duty on the oil amount to?

Mr. FIELDING. The preferential rate will work out about 25 per cent, I am informed.

Amend item 281, so as to read—

281. Fire brick of a class or kind not made in Canada, British preferential tariff rate, free; intermediate tariff rate, 5 per cent; general tariff rate, 5 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. We had made fire brick free from Great Britain, with a small duty from other countries; but on further consideration we came to the conclusion that they might as well be made free from all countries, as there is a considerable portion of this country which cannot get them from Great Britain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What becomes of the portion of the item not covered by that? Was it fire brick of a class or kind not made in Canada before?

Mr. FIELDING. It was originally fire brick, but we have defined it to mean of a class or kind not made in Canada. Anything of a different class would come in under item 282 as a manufacture of clay or cement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much of it comes in?

Mr. FIELDING. Of fire brick and stove lining the imports were $51,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The effect of items 281 and 282 is that you increase the duty on all such descriptions of fire brick as are made in Canada, that is the net result.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. It can scarcely be said that there are any fire brick, properly so-called, made in Canada, I think there are none.

Mr. FIELDING. They are made in Nova Scotia.

300. Crucibles, clay or plumbago, free, free, free.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some one has mentioned to me that this item should include sand crucibles.

Mr. PATERSON. I think we had representations on nearly every thing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My communication reads :

This does not include sand crucibles, which are used in many industries, especially mining, and should be included along with those mentioned.

Mr. FIELDING. We will consent that item 300 be reconsidered, and the word 'sand' be included.

307. Marble and granite, n.o.p., and all manufactures of marble or granite, n.o.p., 30 per cent, 32½ per cent, 35 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. You still tax a man after he is dead.

Mr. PATERSON. No, you do not tax that man.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember Sir Richard used to have a succession of long sentences, or one long sentence, in which he commenced with the babe reclining on its mother's bosom, or earlier, and carried out the history of child until it was laid away, a whitehaired man or woman in the grave. He enumerated every article used from the begining to the end and declared that the Conservative government commenced taxing at the first end of youth and never gave over until the aged person was laid away in the grave. Here we have another stone laid upon the grave with an added duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much increase is there on this tombstone item ?

Mr. FOSTER. Some of us are getting interested in this matter. I think we had better discuss it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any increase in it ?

Mr. PATERSON. The competition is very keen from Aberdeen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much of an increase is there ?

Mr. PATERSON. It was 35 per cent less one-third and it is now made 30 per cent. It is no higher under the general tariff.

Mr. MILLER. This is a very grave question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Nothing comes in under the general tariff ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, marble would come in and granite comes from Aberdeen. It is a large industry in Charlotte county and competition is very keen. The preferential is advanced but the general is not.

Mr. CLEMENTS. From where do we get the greatest competition ?

Mr. PATERSON. In granite we get it from Scotland.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. What is the new duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. 30 per cent from Great Britain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister of Trade and Commerce has consented, I suppose.

Mr. FIELDING. Without prejudice.

309. Roofing slate, 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Amended item. Per square of one hundred feet, 50 cents, 70 cents, 75 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the effect of that? You had a general rate before.

Mr. FIELDING. Its effect is to lower the rate on the good class of slate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the poorer class of slate it is somewhat higher ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the object of that? Is it that you do not want to encourage the poor class of slate ?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There is a slate quarry in Quebec that turns out a considerable quantity of a low class of slate. The bulk of the slate that is brought into Canada is brought in at $4.50 per square. It is proposed to reduce it to 75 cents per square instead of 25 per cent thus reducing it by 37½ cents per square.

Mr. FOSTER. I have several communications in reference to that matter and the objection which has been taken in this letter which I hold in my hand seems to be partly met by the change. It goes on to say :

The duty on roofing slate formerly was 25 per cent ad valorem, not to exceed 75 cents per square, the object being to encourage the use of a high grade slate as no matter what the cost at the quarries the duties would not exceed 75 cents per square. The present government commissioners have made the tariff on all kinds of roofing slate 25 per cent ad valorem. This again will tend to encourage the use of No. 2 quality or low priced slate and discourage the importation of the No. 1 grades.

As I understand this change meets that difficulty.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it ought to have been made. Whether it meets all that these gentlemen require or not, I do not know, but I see that it goes along the line of meeting the objection they have made. I thought it was a very good objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think they are perfectly satisfied.

316a (new item). Incandescent lamp bulbs for use in the manufacture of incandescent lamps, and mantel stocking for gas light, 5 per cent, 7½ per cent, 10 per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the object of this new item ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was classified with manufactures of glass generally. At one time we thought these goods would be made in Canada, in fact it was so represented to us, but on further examination we found that they are not made in Canada. They have to be largely imported by the manufacturers of electric light apparatus. We want to insert the words 'glass tubing'. That is a small item which is almost invisible in the electric light bulb that we are familiar with. It is not made in Canada.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Are these duties made retroactive ? Suppose the hon. minister reduces duties since the budget came down does he refund the amount which has been paid up to the present time ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a clause which will come later which lays down the general rule that whenever goods have been actually imported and we have increased the rates of duty by these recent changes we will not disturb the existing entry, but when we reduce the duty we will give them the benefit. We give the importer at the custom house the benefit on both sides.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. This is a reduction ?

Mr. FIELDING. In this case it is a reduction. If any goods have been brought in in the meantime they will get the benefit of the reduction.

326. Glass demijohns for carboys, bottles, decanters, flasks, files, glass jars and glass balls, lamp chimneys, glass shades or globes ; cut, pressed ware, decorated or not ; blown glass table ware and manufactures of glass, n.o.p., 20 per cent, 30 per cent, 32½ per cent.

Proposed amendment :

Strike out the words 'and manufactures of glass, n.o.p.,' and instead thereof insert the words 'and other cut glass ware.'

Mr. FIELDING. That is a mere change in the wording for greater clearness.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it only a change in the wording ?

Mr. PATERSON. In the classification.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Manufactures of glass would include some articles that would not be included in other cut glass ware ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What becomes of the other ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is a new item, 326a, which follows.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. 326a is as follows :

Articles of glass, not plate or sheet, designed to be cut or mounted, and manufactures of glass, n.o.p., 15 per cent, 20 per cent, 22½ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. That means that partially manufactured glass brought into Canada for the purpose of being further manufactured shall have a lower rate.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister propose to make any changes in items 320, 321 and 322, which refer to plate glass ?

Mr. FIELDING. We are dealing with these in the drawbacks which we will consider later. I think we will to some extent meet the case the hon. gentleman has in mind.

Mr. FOSTER. I have had pretty extended representations with reference to that matter.

Mr. FIELDING. I think we have had the same representations, and while we may not fully meet them, we purpose dealing with them in part at all events, in the matter of drawbacks.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall have my papers with me when we come to discuss these items.

Works of art in bronze, cast from models made in Canada and designed by sculptors domiciled therein, under regulations by the Minister of Customs, free, free, free.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a new item which never was in the tariff before. Formerly they came in under unenumerated, or perhaps as manufactures of the metal of which they happened to be made. The idea is to give some encouragement to our native artists, so that when they make designs in Canada which have to be sent abroad to be cast, the castings may come back free of duty. It is done at the suggestion of some of our artists. Probably there will only be a few cases, but in each case it may be of importance to some Canadian artist.

349. Brass in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than six feet in length, and brass in strips, sheets or plates, not polished, planished or coated, 5 per cent, 7½ per cent, 10 per cent.

356. Nickel, nickel silver and German silver, in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than six feet in length, and also in strips, sheets or plates, 5 per cent, 7½ per cent, 10 per cent.

Mr. PORTER. Has any change been made in these items ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is no change.

Mr. PORTER. I have had considerable correspondence in connection with this matter from different Canadian manufacturers, who have represented to me that the materials mentioned in these two items are not manufactured in Canada. For instance, I might mention the lock industry at Belleville and Peterborough. The metal comes in sheets, and the form of the lock is

stamped out of the sheet. The remainder of the sheet, which cannot be stamped out, has to be returned to be re-rolled ; it comes back to Canada, it keeps going backwards and forwards and every time it enters it has to pay duty. It is imported to carry on a manufactory here, and it is not made in Canada. It seems to me that this article, not being produced in Canada, ought to be admitted free, for the same reason as the minister gave for the free admission of certain parts of the bulbs of incandescent lights, which are not manufactured in Canada but are used in manufacturing here. These brass and nickel sheets ought to be admitted free, or they ought to be dealt with by rebate or drawback.

Mr. PATERSON. We understand that this material is made in Canada.

Mr. PORTER. I have a resolution passed by a large number of the manufacturers : the Belleville Hardware Company, the Canadian Gasoline Launch Company, the Dominion Wire Manufacturing Company, the Robert Mitchell Company, the Ontario Lantern and Lamp Company, and others, representing that the brass and nickel sheet is not produced in Canada, but is used by these various industries. I know that it is used in the lockworks in Belleville and they say they cannot procure it in Canada. They only use a small portion of the imported article and send the refuse back to be re-rolled when they import it again, so that they have to pay duty on that raw material several times before it is completely used up. That being the case the duty is certainly very high. The duty should not be charged more than once.

Mr. PATERSON. That is where they stamp out shapes as in the case of spoons.

Mr. PORTER. Or where they stamp out the face of a lock out of brass or nickel.

Mr. PATERSON. As far as spoons are concerned, we deal with that by way of drawback.

Mr. PORTER. These parties ask that the matter be dealt with in one of three ways :

(a) That the articles covered by these clauses be placed on the free list until such time as they shall be manufactured in Canada in such quantities and of such quality as shall meet the demands of the Canadian market ; or

(b) That the duty on brass and German silver goods named in these clauses when used by the Canadian manufacturer, be rebated 95 per cent ; or

(c) That the duty in the clauses aforesaid be cancelled, and in its place a bounty of an equal amount be granted on such goods, when manufactured in Canada.

They ask that the matter be dealt with in one of these three forms.

Mr. PATERSON. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) proposes to give 65 per cent drawback in the case of nickel and German silver waste sent back to the United States and imported again to be used in spoons and articles of that kind.

Mr. PORTER. The same drawback should apply to lock works.

Mr. FIELDING. Do they not use chiefly brass ?

Mr. PORTER. They use nickel as well.

Mr. FIELDING. We make a distinction between brass and German silver. There is a brass factory in Canada now.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that it is practically out of existence.

Mr. FIELDING. It was suspended for a while, but they represent that they are going to resume business.

Mr. TAYLOR. The large industries which use any quantity of these brass rods say they cannot get a supply in Canada and have to import them.

Mr. PATERSON. There was a large amount of capital invested in that factory when the goods were on the free list, and they are only getting 10 per cent under the general tariff now. The other manufacturers ought to be willing that they should get some share of protection.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are if they would supply the trade.

Mr. PATERSON. They said they could not do it under an absolutely free tariff. They wanted 20 per cent but said they would try and get along with 10 per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR. As soon as they are able to supply the demands of the trade, every manufacturer will be willing that they should get the benefit of the duty, but they will not take an order.

Mr. PATERSON. That is not the representation made to us.

Mr. PORTER. If it is fair that a drawback should be given when the raw material is used in stamping out spoons or forks or things of that kind, it is just as fair that a drawback should be given when the raw material is used in stamping out locks.

Mr. FIELDING. Do they use German silver to a large extent in manufacturing locks ?

Mr. PORTER. I am told they do.

Mr. FIELDING. We do not propose to grant drawbacks on brass, but propose to grant drawbacks in certain cases when German silver is used, but I imagine that would be little used by the concern the hon. member speaks of because brass is the article they chiefly use.

Mr. PORTER. The representation made to me is that brass is chiefly used, but they do use German silver as well in making

locks. For instance, the locks furnished the Hotel Alexandria in Winnipeg were made out of German silver. And the firm in Belleville write to me that while the greater number of their locks are made from brass, they do get orders and make locks from the German silver as well. Any drawback granted the Niagara firm which stamps out spoons and forks ought to be granted the Belleville and Peterborough people who are stamping out locks.

Mr. PATERSON. The conditions may not be alike. I do not know what the locks are to which my hon. friend refers. I take it they are not mortice locks, encased in wood, for they would not be made out of nickel. Would there be anything like the loss in cutting out a square of metal for a lock as there would in the case of a spoon ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What difference would it make ?

Mr. PATERSON. There would be much greater waste in the case of a spoon. In the case of a lock the waste would be very little. In the spoon you have the narrow handle, but in the case of a lock you take a square or an oblong piece and there is very little waste.

Mr. PORTER. It is not simply the face of the lock, the square part, that is stamped out of this sheet. The handle is stamped out as well and the round part, and it is only the round part that is used. All the intermediate spaces are waste and go back to be re-rolled. So that the raw material may be sent back and imported again three times before it is entirely used up, and each time it is imported it pays a duty.

Mr. PATERSON. I hope my hon. friend will not forget to bring this question up when we reach the item.

Mr. FOSTER. Why take the cumbersome system of drawbacks with reference to an article which is not made in Canada at all ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is made.

Mr. FOSTER. The people who carry on a large industry in connection with it, say they have to import it. The Niagara concern employ 160 people most of whom are married and have families. It is a large industry, its raw material is nickel silver in rods, bars and strips. These have hitherto always been admitted free of duty. They are not supplied in this country and are the raw material for other manufactures. If this raw material is not made in Canada why change it from the free to the dutiable list ? This concern says that if the law is enforced it will put them out of business. Surely the government does not propose to do that. They use 220,000 pounds of nickel silver in sheets every year, amounting to a value of about $60,000. It is a large industry and a very nice industry as I know from having visited it. The same objection they made has been made by my hon. friend that the scrap is not used in this country, it has to go back into the United States, then it is rearranged into form and comes back to Canada and pays duty the second time and so on until it is used up. I do not see why drawbacks should be resorted to in a case of this kind where the free admission answers all purposes.

Mr. PORTER. This resolution seems to put the matter very concisely. It is a resolution passed by all these manufacturers, whose names I have already given. Speaking in regard to these two items, they say :

1. We do not object to the principle underlying the imposition of the duties levied on the articles covered by the clauses as above referred to.

2. While thus approving of the principle, we would respectfully ask you to consider the fact that none of the goods named in these clauses are, at present, made in Canada.

These manufacturers who use the articles say they are not made in Canada.

3. That the industries using these goods as raw material are now, and will be, compelled to import them ; at least for months, if not for years to come, and pay the duty imposed thereon.

4. The cost of the finished products of the manufacturers is thereby increased to this extent.

5. That there is not in the new tariff any corresponding increase in the duty upon such finished brass and other goods to offset the duty on the raw material.

6. That for these reasons the tariff, as now enforced, is injurious to our interests as manufacturers, while it fails to benefit any other industry or industries already established in Canada.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In support of what has been said by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter), an automobile manufacturing concern that has spent a large amount in Chatham in equipping a plant that will do credit to any Canadian city, claim that it is not possible to get the class of goods they require in Canada at all. I took it up with the minister before, and they tell me on my last visit to Chatham that it is not possible to get them.

Mr. PATERSON. Unfortunately, in many cases when manufacturers appear before us they represent that the goods they make are equal to any that can be produced, but when some other manufacturer using this finished article as his raw material comes up he says he will be very glad to use the product of the other factory, but that they do not make it and he cannot use it. That is not very encouraging ; and if you believe all that was said, you would think that we produced hardly anything in Canada that is of any use. You have sometimes to take these things with a little discount, because, no doubt, if they could get

this raw material cheaper, it would be an advantage to them, and I suppose all these people would be benefited if the nickel works were stamped out. It may be a question whether it should be in existence. For my part, I do not think it wise to bring an industry into existence that cannot live with a moderate rate of duty. But when you have an industry started in the face of the free competition, and there is a large amount of money invested in it, and then they come and say that they think they could run it in the face of foreign competition, but that the pressure is very great and that if given 20 per cent they could go on; then we may say: That is a big jump; we will give you 10 per cent. Then we see that the man who uses their raw material has 30 per cent protection, and he surely will be able to stand 10 per cent on the raw material, because he has still a 20 per cent protection over what he pays on his raw material, and then he has the full 30 per cent on the labour that goes into the production of the article. It seems reasonable when an industry is in existence that the other manufacturers ought not to begrudge that amount. The reason for the drawback is that there is a hardship upon them if they have to send it back and forth, and that is the reason that this 65 per cent of drawback is proposed. If it were not for the waste there would not be the proposition for the drawback.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. In support of the argument of my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter) in regard to admitting nickel blanks for locks, let me say that nickel is used to a considerable extent in locks and when the minister turns it to door locks only that does not cover the point. There are perhaps fifty other kinds of locks—desk locks, piano locks, dog collar locks, and all those locks for small furniture. That is where nickel comes in. Then I presume that the nickel door knobs are part of the locks, and that is a growing industry. These factors are all to be taken into consideration on this item—all the kinds of locks manufactured from these blanks; and I believe the document read by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter) includes that class of goods, and that he is quite right in sticking to the contention that if brass is to be allowed in for these manufactures and nickel for some other lines, it should be admitted in the same way.

Mr. PORTER. If I understood the minister, the issue is reduced to this. If the raw material is produced in Canada, then I understood him to insist on a duty. If the raw material is not produced in Canada, then he agrees the duty should not be there.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a rather dangerous doctrine. Who is demanding the inquiry?

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. PORTER. These manufacturers. It then comes to a question of veracity, or a matter of evidence, as to whether this raw material is or is not produced in Canada. On the previous discussion the minister undertook to ascertain for a fact whether that raw material is produced in Canada in anything like sufficient quantities to satisfy the trade, if it is it ought to be encouraged. Then I am prepared to withdraw my objection to a large extent, if the facts are as represented in this correspondence to me, that the raw material is not produced in Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. Do they say that they are not produced in sufficient quantities?

Mr. PORTER. One says that they are not produced in Canada, and the resolution says 'until it is produced in Canada in sufficient quantities to meet the trade.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The representation made to me on the same subject was that:

This toll has evidently been placed upon these goods to encourage a small copper mill at New Toronto. This mill, however, has been closed down for nearly a year, and even were it able to start it again on account of the duty, it would be impossible for it to supply the Canadian trade with the various kinds of German silver and brass that they require.

Mr. PATERSON. I think that is true.

Mr. GERMAN. I happen to have had this matter up before the minister for some time and I did suppose that it was in a position which would be satisfactory at any rate to the manufacturers of cutlery who are using German silver because I was under the impression that the drawback was to be 95 per cent, but I now hear the minister say it is only 65 per cent. Well, that is unfair. All the manufacturers of cutlery are using German silver as their raw material. German silver is not manufactured in Canada, and, in my opinion, and in the opinion of men whose views should have weight, it will not be manufactured in Canada. The reason is there is not a sufficient quantity consumed in Canada to make it worth while for any manufacturing establishment in Canada to produce it. It is a very difficult article to manufacture. There are only three factories in the United States producing it, and of these only one is making it to the satisfaction of the consumer. It is a hardship for the manufacturers who are buying nickel silver as a raw material to pay duty on it so long as the article is not manufactured in Canada. If they had a drawback of 95 per cent that would relieve them somewhat. But why go to the expense of collecting a duty only to give it back again? It seems to me that nickel silver should be absolutely free. At any rate this particular duty should be held in abeyance until this Toronto factory is in a position to manufacture German silver to supply the market.

Mr. TAYLOR. And brass.

Mr. GERMAN. No, I am not interested in brass but in silver—and not Cobalt silver. The Niagara Falls industries use the largest amount of silver in Canada, I apprehend. The Ontario Silver Company has imported for the last few years, practically all the nickel-silver imported into Canada. They pay a duty on all they import though half has to go back to the United States as scrap, there to be re-rolled and brought into Canada, when a duty has to be paid on it again. In all fairness, this article should be on the free list. But, as I said, I supposed that there was a drawback of 95 per cent. Unless this concession is made, I must oppose as strongly as I can, the imposition of this particular duty.

Mr. FIELDING. The idea that because an article is not produced in Canada, therefore it must be put upon the free list, is a doctrine which I would not like the House to commit itself to too rashly.

Mr. PORTER. That is the doctrine that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) announced a little while ago.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I think the statement of the Minister of Customs has been considerably broadened. As 65 per cent of this duty is to be returned, the net result is that the duty paid is 3½ per cent. When representations were made on the subject of the duty of 10 per cent we were told that those interested should not mind the 10 per cent, but, owing to the waste, the duty had practically to be paid over and over again. Well, if you multiply 3½ per cent even three times, you have a total duty of only a little over 10 per cent. As against this, these manufacturers have a protective duty of 30 per cent, a pretty liberal margin. If they get 65 per cent drawback they are paying a duty of only about 3½ per cent, and, with a general duty of 30 per cent, I do not think the position of the industry is so bad as some hon. members seen to think.

Mr. PORTER. I would point out that these are very important industries. The Niagara concern of which my hon. friend from Welland spoke employs about 160 men and pays out about $65,000 a year in wages. The Belleville concern employs over 200 men in the lockworks. And the Peterborough employs still more. These are important industries lately established and getting nicely on their feet. The responsibility is on the government to say whether they shall be driven to the wall or crippled by this duty.

Mr. PATERSON. If there is a waste in the manufacture of locks corresponding to that in these other articles, that is a fair subject for consideration. I would not pronounce against it. That item will be reached in a little while——

Mr. PORTER. That is the representation made to me—that there is this waste.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) will be here when the item is read and the matter can then be dealt with.

Mr. FOSTER. Why does the minister act so inconsistently ? Here is an industry which has been shut for a year and has not been employing any people. On the other hand here are industries employing large numbers of people—settled industries. Now, the government say they will not give these men the drawback of 95 per cent. Yet, in the case of others whose raw material is made in vast quantities in the country as for instance the implement manufacturers, you take the implement men to your bosom and give them raw material free. That raw material they bring in from the United States, and they are charged nothing upon it, but this other industry you deprive of a large proportion of the advantage that they ought to have.

Mr. PATERSON. But the protection upon agricultural implements is not so great as that which these other people enjoy.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister proceeds upon no principle. If he wants to favour some body he gives them a drawback of the whole duty, and if he wishes to hold up some other industry, he does so.

Mr. PORTER. Like the malleable iron industry.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The whole malleable iron industry in Oshawa is in danger of being wiped out by the hon. gentleman's tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. The drawback to the manufacturers of agricultural implements was made to correspond with the reduction of 2½ per cent on their item making their protection a good deal less than 20 per cent. These other people have a clear 20 per cent after paying 10 per cent for their raw material. And, to cover the point of waste which has been brought up, we give them a drawback 65 per cent on the duty paid. If you ask for consistency, it seems to me that this is rather consistent.

Mr. FOSTER. But the minister's inconsistency is further shown in his treatment of my hon. friends who are trying to get fair play for a large and settled industry. He says regard must be paid to the possible employment of a few people in a factory in Toronto, but he is ready to imperil this large and settled industry in order that he may secure the employment for these few. Will he figure out how much employment is taken from the people of this country by the importation of the steel which our people are not allowed to manufacture for the implement makers, Money is sent out to pay the wages of foreign workmen to make this material, because the minister

wants to secure something in a political sense to these makers of implements. The matter came up in this way: What in the world can we do to help the farmers? We must do something for them. We will take 2½ per cent off, and after we have done that we will go blowing about it among the farmers. But no farmer will get his implement a single cent cheaper because of your taking off that 2½ per cent. You take out of the productive industries of this country some 40,000 or 50,000 tons of steel and you imperil large industries. You rob the people of employment on a large scale in one case and you plead for a little expansion of employment in the other case, to the peril of industries that are already large employers.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not believe there will be any less demand for steel than will require every man that is at the present time engaged in the production of steel and iron. I think the industries are working to their full capacity, and that no change we have made will cause the discharge of a single man in the iron industries.

Mr. PORTER. I cannot see the consistency in the statement of the Minister of Customs. Take the manufacture of a certain class of agricultural implements, there is a drawback allowed on certain classes of material going into that manufacture of 99 per cent. Now the same reason exists for that as allowing 65 per cent drawback in the other case. Why is it 65 per cent in one case and 99 per cent in the other?

Mr. PATERSON. Because the agricultural implement maker has a protection of 17½ per cent and the protection of the nickel silver manufacturer is 30 per cent.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Then in that case the raw material coming in free is 20 per cent. The agricultural implement manufacturer has 20 per cent, practically. In this case, the raw material coming in at 10 per cent and the manufacturer having 30 per cent, it is asserted that the manufacturer has 20 per cent. But I submit that he has not 20 per cent. The manufacturer brings in $100 worth of raw material and pays 10 per cent on it. He uses one-half of it, and on that half he has 20 per cent. But he has to send back the other half which is waste, and he gets drawback of 65 per cent. So he has now paid 3½ on that which is sent back. Then these coils are re-rolled, brought in again and he pays 10 per cent, so when he brings them in the second time he has paid 13½ per cent. He does not have 20 per cent, he only has 16½ per cent. Then half of that is sent back again and re-rolled, and he gets a drawback of 65 per cent. So by the time he gets it back again he has to pay nearly 20 per cent on the raw material.

Mr. FOSTER.

355. Britannia metal in pigs, blocks or bars, nickel, nickel silver and German silver, in ingots, blocks or bars, n.o.p., free, free, free.

Insert the word 'or' before 'blocks.' Strike out 'or bars' before 'n.o.p.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do any of these articles come in the shape of bars?

Mr. FIELDING. The effect will be that bars will become dutiable at 10 per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the effect of striking out the words 'or bars'?

Mr. FIELDING. As I say, it makes the bars dutiable at 10 per cent, it strikes them from the free list.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the object of that?

Mr. PATERSON. Hon. gentlemen opposite want that to be continued as it was before.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You are transferring German and nickel silver, and nickel in bars, from 355 to 356, and that transfer makes it dutiable at 10 per cent, 7½ per cent and 5 per cent, instead of admitting it free, I want to know why you are doing that?

Mr. PATERSON. Because they are being produced in Canada, as I understand. That is a disputed point, but I think we can ascertain to-morrow, it might be worth while to find out. There is a question as to the extent to which it is manufactured in Canada. I have no doubt my hon. friend believes the statement that it is not made in Canada. This letter says that it is not made in sufficient quantities and others give us to understand that it is not made at all. If that article is not made in Canada then it would be better not to deal with it by way of drawback but to make it free altogether, but having made it dutiable under the impression that it is being produced in Canada and that they have a right to have 10 per cent when others who buy their material have 30 per cent we thought it was fair. If it is not made or is not likely to be made it would be another thing. If it is not produced in sufficient quantity for all the needs of Canada many of our industries would be placed in the same position.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot push it to an extreme.

Mr. GERMAN. In view of what the hon. minister has said, I have the best of authority for saying that nickel silver is not made in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is exactly what I understood. The minister says he has given me certain information a dozen times. I never heard it given once. The distinction is between nickel silver in bars and nickel silver in blocks. I do not understand that any distinction such as

the minister suggests has been raised. I understand, as the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has said, that it is not produced at all. I was asking as to the distinction between silver in blocks and in bars and why you make that distinction.

Mr. FIELDING. The bar is the manufactured article. That is really what we have been talking about for some time although we have not properly reached it. The block is what may be called the raw material, the bar is an advanced process and there is a dispute as to whether it is made in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the two sections have not the effect that has been stated just now:

Nickel, nickel silver and German silver in ingots, bars, blocks or bars——

That was the wording in the first instance. Now you strike out the words 'or bars' and you say it comes under item 356, but it does not come under item 356, if it is in bars not less than 6 feet in length. So you have nickel bars less than 6 feet in length which come under some other item and I would like to know under what item.

Mr. FIELDING. The smaller bar would become the manufactured article at a higher rate—under 357.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it be necessarily a manufacture of nickel where it is under 6 feet and not a manufacture where it is over 6 feet?

Mr. FIELDING. The words there make the distinction.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it would be run up to 30 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the smaller bars are treated as manufactured articles.

Mr. TAYLOR. Better let the item stand and get it right.

Mr. FIELDING. The only point in dispute is as to whether these things are made in Canada and if, before it goes through, we get different information we will be able to have it revised.

Mr. PATERSON. Item 355 will be the raw material of this factory that we are told is in existence and turning out this work. The people conducting that factory are allowed to get their material in free, and the material they get in free they turn into bars 6 feet in length, strips, sheets and plates. They get free material and 10 per cent for turning it into another form. This finished product of these 10 per cent men becomes the raw material of the manufacturers of locks, cutlery, and other articles on which they get 30 per cent. If the intermediate process is not carried on here at all it will leave the manufacturers of britannia metal, locks and other articles just as they were under the old tariff; it will leave them free.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I may say that there is absolutely no German silver manufactured in this country.

Mr. PATERSON. Nor nickel?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Nor nickel. To roll out the 30,000 pounds that this country uses would require a plant costing at least $300,000 and the market is not large enough to justify any manufacturer going into that business. It is different with brass. There is a small factory in Toronto and I do not know but what it is a fair proposition to give those manufacturers, even though they are in a small way—and nearly all are manufacturers starting from small beginings—some consideration in manufacturing rolled brass, coiled brass, brass rods, &c. I think it is a great injustice to put a duty on German silver in any shape or form because it is the raw material of a number of very important industries in this country. Take the manufacturer of spoons, forks and knives; it requires 210 pounds of German sheet nickel to turn out 100 pounds of stamped spoons and forks, so that there is a loss of 110 pounds in turning out 100 pounds of the manufactured article. I think it is only fair to the manufacturers of these articles that German silver in sheets and bars should come in free.

Mr. FIELDING. The dispute is as to whether or not these things are made in Canada. We will look into it and if you do not expect to run through the whole tariff to-night we will let the item stand. If, as the hon. gentleman says, it takes 210 pounds of this material to turn out 100 pounds of the manufactured articles of which he spoke you would not have to multiply the duty by three. Under the British preferential tariff the duty would be about 8 per cent and you have a duty on the finished article under the general tariff of 30 per cent.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is German silver and when it is returned to them they pay the duty on it again. That brings the duty up to 20 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. Not at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Items 355 and 356 stand.

374. Iron or steel scrap, wrought, being waste or refuse, including punchings, cuttings or clippings of iron or steel plates or sheets having been in actual use; crop ends of tin plate bars, or of blooms, or of rails, the same not having been in actual use, per ton, 70 cents, 90 cents, $1.

Amended item. Strike out the figures and words 'seventy cents' and insert the figures

and word 'fifty cents' in the British preferential tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a reduction of duty on scrap iron.

376. Iron or steel billets, weighing not less than sixty pounds per lineal yard; ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, slabs, puddled bars; and loops or other forms, n.o.p., less finished than iron or steel bars but more advanced than pig iron, except castings, per ton, $1.50, $2.25, $2.50.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a reduction in the duty on steel billets.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a general division of the duties between the various industries using metals. We thought the consumers of steel billets had to pay rather higher than was fair and we reduced the duties on the billets. It was represented to us that it is sometimes difficult to buy billets in Canada and it appeared to us the duty was somewhat higher than it should be.

379. Rolled iron or steel beams, channels, angles and other rolled shapes of iron or steel, not punched, drilled or further manufactured than rolled, weighing not less than thirty-five pounds per lineal yard, not being square, flat, oval or round shapes, and not being railway bars or rails, per ton, British preferential tariff rate, $2; intermediate tariff rate, $2.75; general tariff rate, $3.

Mr. FIELDING. These specific duties are about the equivalent of the former ad valorem duties.

Mr. BERGERON. Why did you change to a specific duty?

Mr. FIELDING. Most of the iron and steel duties are specific and we thought we might make this also.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that the only reason?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not recollect any other reason to-night.

379a. Flat eye bar blanks, not punched nor drilled, and universal mill or rolled edge plates of steel over twelve inches wide for use exclusively in the manufacture of bridges or of steel structural work, or in car construction, per ton, British preferential tariff rate, $2; intermediate tariff rate, $2.75; general tariff rate, $3.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a further concession to the manufacturers in these several lines. There is a large industry established near Montreal for the manufacture of cars, and it was represented that the tariff would make it difficult for them to pay the duties and carry on their operations. We have made the same duty in connection with the manufacture of cars as in the case of bridges and we have included general structural steel. It was open to debate whether general structural steel should be rated the same as if it were steel for bridges, and now we treat steel for bridges, for cars, and for structural purposes alike.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the new car company you refer to?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a company promoted by some American people, in which there is also Canadian capital invested.

Mr. KEMP. The Canada Car Company.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there any duty collected on Pullman cars coming into this country?

Mr. FIELDING. If they run on international roads they are not dutiable, but a Pullman car built abroad and imported for service in Canada would have to pay duty.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the Pullman Car Company ever paid any duty?

Mr. FIELDING. I suppose they claim their cars are running on international lines and as such they would not be dutiable.

Mr. BERGERON. Suppose a car is running between Montreal and Toronto?

Mr. FIELDING. It should pay duty.

Mr. J. D. REID. Take a Pullman car that runs between Montreal and Toronto, from its first day until it is used up?

Mr. FIELDING. It should pay duty.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know it should, but has any duty ever been collected on these cars? There are a great many railroads in Canada which import these cars and they never pay any duty.

Mr. FIELDING. The Commissioner of Customs informs me that there have been cases in which duties have been collected, but I cannot give particulars now.

386. Rolled iron or steel and cast steel, in bars, bands, hoop, scroll, strip, sheet or plate, of any size, thickness or width, galvanized or coated with any material or not, and steel blanks for the manufacture of milling cutters, when of greater value than three and one-half cents per pound, British preferential tariff rate, free; intermediate tariff rate, 5 per cent; general tariff rate, 5 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. This item was five per cent before, with one-third off to Britain. We have made it free to Britain as we thought it might turn the trade to Britain, the duty against the United States being 7½ per cent. It is represented that it is impossible to get this material from Great Britain and it is thought desirable to make it five per cent in the general tariff instead of 7½ as proposed.

387a. Steel in bars or sheets to be used exclusively in the manufactrue of shovels, when imported by manufacturers of shovels, 10 per cent, 12½ per cent, 15 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. We are converting this into specific duty—$2 ; $2.75; $3 per ton. Some of this steel is very high class and it was found that an ad valorem duty would operate rather severely. This meets to some extent the criticisms of people interested in that line of industry.

393a. Round polished steel shafting in bars not exceeding two and one-half inches in diameter, 17½ per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a reduction of about five per cent in the general tariff on this class of goods used in the manufacture of agricultural implements.

395. Wrought or seamless iron or steel tubes for boilers, n.o.p., under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs ; flues and corrugated tubes for marine boilers, free, 5 per cent, 5 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. Strike out the figures and insert free instead thereof.

397. Tubes of rolled iron or steel, not joined or welded, not more than one-half inch in diameter, n.o.p., 5 per cent, 7½ per cent, 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. Strike out all the rates of duty and insert the word free. That is a class of tubes not made in Canada, chiefly used in the manufacture of bedsteads.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business tomorrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. The tariff.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.01 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 6, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 108) to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—Mr. Aylesworth.

QUESTIONS.

INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOLS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What was the cost of building each of the boarding schools for Indians, opened at Fort Alexander, Fort Francis and Sandy Bay ?
2. How many pupils are attending each, and are these schools under the control of the government ?
3. What studies are taught in these schools?
4. What qualifications have the teachers in each of the said schools ?
5. What is the total quantity of Indian lands contained in reserves in each province in the Dominion ?
6. Do denominational Indian schools receive any government inspection ? If so, how many of such schools are inspected, what are the names of the inspectors, and what are their salaries ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. These three boarding schools were built by the Reverend Pères Oblates, St. Boniface, Manitoba, and before being taken over by the department were inspected by an architect from Winnipeg, who valued the cost of the Fort Alexander school at $16,000; the Fort Frances school at $18,000 ; and the one at Sandy Bay at $16,500 ; making the total cost of the schools $50,500.

2. The returns for the quarter ended 31st December last show that there were 45 pupils in attendance at the Fort Alexander school ; 46 at the Fort Frances ; and 43 at the Sandy Bay. The government has general control.

3. English, reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, history, general knowledge, ethics, recitation, vocal music, calisthenics and religious instruction.

4. These schools are conducted by the Oblate Fathers on a per capita grant paid by the government. They appoint the teachers, who are members of religious orders.

5. The quantity of land contained in Indian reserves in each province is as follows :

Province.	Acres.
Nova Scotia	21,557
Prince Edward Island	1,524
New Brunswick	37,342
Quebec	204,354
Ontario	1,050,882
Manitoba	326,013
Saskatchewan	1,171,567
Alberta	1,422,291
British Columbia	527,427
Northwest Territories	45,026
Yukon Territory	960
Total	4,808,943

6. Yes. All denominational schools are inspected. In Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces the Provincial Separate and Public School inspectors inspect all the Indian schools in their districts. These inspectors are paid a fixed fee for each inspection, the amount of which was settled by the Educational Department of each province, with actual travelling expenses.

West of Ontario the regular departmental inspectors perform this duty. In Manitoba there are two inspectors, Mr. S. R. Marlatt, salary $2,200, and the Rev. J. Semmens, salary $2,000 ; in Saskatchewan, Mr. W. J. Chisholm, salary $2,000; and Mr. W. M. Graham, salary, $1,800 ; in Alberta, Mr. J. A.

Markle, salary, $1,800 ; in British Columbia, Rev. A. E. Green, salary, $1,000.

COST OF HANDLING CHEESE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What was the total amount paid by this government for hauling cheese from the cheese factory to the cheese curing rooms, in 1906?
2. What was the total number of cheese boxes purchased by this government, and the total amount paid for same in 1906 ?
3. What is the total cost of running the cheese curing rooms, and the total receipts from same ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. 1906..	$ 2,663 96
2. 1906,—11,842 boxes.. ..	1,811 08
3. Total operating expenses from date of establishment to March 1, 1907	80,148 13
Total revenue, same period	34,901 26

The figures in 1 and 2 are given for 1906, as these cheese curing rooms were not in operation in 1896.

GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN BANKS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What was the total amount of money in banks, to the credit of this government, at the end of each month during the year 1906, giving the name of each bank ?
2. Is interest paid on deposits made to the credit of this government ? If so, what was the amount collected from that source in 1906, the name of the bank and the amount paid ?

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

1. The information asked for is too extensive to be given in the form of a reply to a question. If a motion is made for a return, the return will be prepared.
2. No interest is allowed by the banks to the government on ordinary accounts. On the other hand, the banks receive no payment by way of commission for the services which they render as agents of the government in receiving and paying moneys throughout the Dominion. The only exception to this is in the case of the Yukon, where a small commission is paid to the bank for handling the government business at that point.

Mr. J. D. McGREGOR.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. For how many years was J. D. McGregor, license inspector in the Yukon, and between which dates ?
2. How many permits for the importation of liquor into the Yukon territory were granted by James D. McGregor while he was license inspector for the Yukon territory ?

Mr. OLIVER.

3. To whom were these granted, and for what amount of liquor in each case ?
4. What was paid Mr. McGregor each year in salary and expenses ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Mr. J. D. McGregor was employed as license inspector in the Yukon from May 1, 1899, to January 31, 1901.
2. None, as far as the Department at Ottawa is aware.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Mr. McGregor was paid by the Yukon council the following sums:

Fiscal year.	Salary.	Expenses.
1898-1899..	$ 400 00	$ 814 90
1899-1900..	600 00	644 00
1900-1901..	2,600 00	2,802 55

GOVERNMENT LANDS, WHITEHORSE, YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Were any government lands granted in the town of Whitehorse, Yukon territory ?
2. If so, what are the names of the persons to whom these grants issued, and what, if any, transfers have since been made ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.
2. Following are the names of the persons to whom patents have been issued for lands within the town of Whitehorse, Yukon Territory:

	Lot.	Block.
The British Yukon Land Company..	4	4
The British Yukon Land Company..	5	4
Hugh A. Biglow..	7	4
Hugh A. Biglow..	8	4
Robert Lowe..	14	4
F. W. Cane..	15	4
A. G. Preston..	17	4
F. Langholz and Nels C. Neilson..	6	10
F. Langholz and Nels C. Neilson..	7	10
Wm. Turnbull and Agnes Turnbull..	10	12
The British Yukon Land Company..	6	15
Rev. John J. Wright .. .. ..E, ½	10	15
Robert Lowe.. .. ..W. ½	10	15
The British Yukon Land Company	3	18
The British Yukon Land Company..	5	18
The British Yukon Land Company..	6	18
The British Yukon Land Company..	7	18
The British Yukon Land Company..	8	18
The British Yukon Land Company...	10	18

	Lot.	Block.
Seymour Rowlinson..	5	23
A. E. Henderson..	8	23
Alexander R. Gordon..	1	47
Minnie Lamoureux..	6	47
Betty J. Wylde..	7	47
Richard Harvey..	9	47
Charley W. Ward	10	47

Transfers of lands patented are not registered in the Department of the Interior, but are recorded with the local registrar.

CONFERENCE OF PROVINCIAL PREMIERS—PROVINCIAL TAXES.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

What agreement, if any, was made at the conference with the provincial premiers, (a) as to the provincial taxes upon commercial travellers ; (b) as to the provincial tax upon companies chartered by the Dominion government ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will find the answer to this question in the report, which has already been brought down, giving the proceedings of the interprovincial Conference. I may tell him, however, that the premiers there present agreed, with regard to the provincial taxes upon commercial travellers, to have that form of tax repealed. With regard to the discrimination against companies having Dominion charters by provincial authorities, the matter was discussed, but no conclusion arrived at.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. NORTHRUP asked:

1. What sums have been paid to Sir Charles Ross, or the Ross Rifle Company, in addition to the contract price of $25 per rifle for, (a) sights ; (b) gauges ; (c) rent ; (d) heating ; (e) water tax ; (f) lighting ; (g) inspection ; (h) salaries or wages ; (i) for any other reason ?

2. What sums have been paid to any person, company, or corporation, other than the above, for the above items, respectively ?

3. What is the total expenditure to date in consequence of the contracts *re* Ross rifle ?

4. How many Ross rifles have been accepted by the government to date, (a) mark 1 ; (b) mark 2 ?

5. How many have been rejected, (a) before; (b) after acceptance ?

6. What was done with those rejected in each case ?

7. Has the government paid for any that were rejected ? If so, how many ?

8. Was the progress estimate paid on any of the rejected rifles ? If so, how much, has it been refunded, and when ?

9. How many rifles, mark 1 and mark 2, respectively, are being used by the militia, including the permanent force, and the Northwest mounted police ?

10. Who discovered the nine defects in the Ross rifle, pointed out to the House by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, on February 26 last ?

11. Are the Ross rifles, mark 1, corresponding and equal in every respect to a standard sample rifle, approved by the minister under clauses two and seven of the contract with Sir Charles Ross, dated March 27, A.D., 1902 ?

12. If so, has the committee which approved the Ross rifle been asked to explain the above defects ? If not, has the inspector of small arms been asked to explain why the rifles were accepted ?

13. Were above defects in the rifle approved by the committee appointed by the minister to examine and report upon the Ross rifle originally ?

14. How many contracts has the government made with Sir Charles Ross or the Ross Rifle Company ?

15. What does the government consider to be the duration of the original contract of March 17, 1902 ?

16. What amount of insurance payable to the government is there on the rifles on which progress estimates have been paid, and what is the amount of advances ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I have to state that all the information called for in this question is covered by returns moved for and ordered by this House, as follows: On December 10, 1906; on January 14, 1907, and January 28, 1907. The returns to these orders will be ready during the present week and will be laid on the table of the House early next week. They will be complete and will cover all the information in the department up to date of their compilation.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LIFE INSURANCE.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What has been the total cost of the Royal commission on insurance to date?

2. What amount thereof has been paid to Mr. Shepley and to Mr. Tilley, respectively ?

3. Has any sum been expended therefrom in supplying funds to enable Mr. Clifford Sifton, or any one suggested by him, to procure information or evidence for possible use before the commissioners ?

4. Has Mr. A. B. Aylesworth or the Minister of Justice had any communication, verbal or written, from Mr. Clifford Sifton, suggesting possible information or sources of evidence that might be examined with a view to use before the commission ?

5. Has Mr. A. B. Aylesworth or the Minister of Justice had any conference or communication, verbal or written, with any person other than Messrs. Shepley and Tilley, bearing in any way upon the suggestion or collection of evidence for possible use before the commission ?

6. Did the Minister of Justice or his department receive any written communication from Mr. Shepley from April 26, 1906, to May 3, 1906, following up or further explanatory of the telegrams sent by him (Mr. Shepley) to the minister, of dates April 26, 27, May 1 and 3, 1906 ?

7. Will the Minister of Justice reduce to writing and place on the records any suggestions or advice tendered by him to Mr. Shepley and Mr. Tilley, in the verbal communications referred to in the minister's answer to Mr. Foster's question, as given in the 'Hansard' of January 31, 1907, as follows: 'I have had communication with Mr. Shepley, and I have had communication with Mr. Tilley. I have not had communication in writing. I happen to be personally acquainted, intimately acquainted, with each of these gentlemen, and my communications with them since I have assumed the position of Minister of Justice have been by word of mouth'?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. and 2. I am told by the Department of Finance that payments have been made on account, but the exact amount has not yet been made up.

3. No.

4. Some information was received by me from different sources in regard to facts which it was said investigation by the commission might establish. Such information was in each case communicated to me confidentially, and I have no right to disclose the source of such information in any case.

5. The persons giving such information were not Mr. Shepley or Mr. Tilley.

6. No such communication from Mr. Shepley is on file in the Department of Justice, and I have never seen any such communication, or heard that any such communication was ever made.

7. No suggestions, instructions or advice with regard to the conduct of the inquiry before the commission were at any time made to Mr. Shepley or to Mr. Tilley, by the present Minister of Justice in any official capacity, nor were any such instructions or advice at any time tendered to either of these gentlemen, nor were any such suggestions made, beyond the communicating to them of such information in regard to facts pertinent to the inquiry as is above referred to.

OLD MILITARY BARRACKS, ST. JOHNS, QUEBEC.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked:

1. Have the old military barracks at St. Johns, Quebec, been, or are they about to be sold?

2. If so, to whom, and at what price?

3. Who has had the ownership or control of these barracks for the past forty years?

4. How much land and what buildings are there in the property?

5. For what purposes are the barracks being purchased?

6. Why are they not retained as a national point of interest?

7. Is it too late to stop the sale of the said properties?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). There is no intention on the part of the government to sell or in any other way dispose of the military barracks at St. Johns, Quebec.

WATER RESERVE LANDS—LETHBRIDGE DISTRICT.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. At the sale of water reserve lands in the Lethbridge district in the summer of 1906, was it the policy of the department and one of the conditions of sale that no more than 160 acres would be sold to any one person?

2. Since that time has the west half of 3—10—24 north of the river, been sold to any person? If so, to whom?

3. Does not said west half of 3—10—24 contain 320 acres?

4. Were there any other applicants for said land, or any part thereof?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. One of the conditions of the sale at auction of cancelled stock watering reserves in June, 1906, was that not more than 160 acres would be sold to any one person.

2. This land was offered for sale by public auction, but no bids were received, and in regard to such lands public notice was given that they would be offered at the upset price to the persons owning adjoining lands who applied therefor.

The west half of 3-10-24 west 4th, north of the river, has been offered to Mr. J. C. Graves, who owns adjoining land, at the upset price of $3 per acre.

3. No. It contains 268 acres. The portion north of the river, offered to Mr. Graves, contains 253 acres.

4. There was another applicant, but he did not own adjoining land.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Of what pattern was the Ross rifle or rifles reported on by the commissioner sitting during the months of June and August, 1901, and how many rifles were examined by this commission?

2. Were the rifles examined by this commission, manufactured by the Ross Rifle Company in Canada, or were they of American or foreign manufacture?

3. Has this commission or any other commission met and reported on any Ross rifle since the above-mentioned dates?

4. If so, what was the nature of the reports, and were they unanimous and concurred in by all members of the commission?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). A return moved for and granted by this House, and which will be brought down in a day or two, will cover all the information on these subjects in the department.

THE CENSUS—FORMS RELATING TO MANUFACTURING.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many 'forms' relating to manufacturing were sent out for each of the years 1905 and 1906, under the provisions of the Census and Statistics Act, chapter 5, 4 and 5 Edward VII.?

2. How many were sent to each province ?

3. How many were completed and returned from each province ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. No forms were sent out in 1905. In 1906, 30,373 forms were sent out calling for information of the year 1905.

2.

British Columbia	1,008
Northwest Territories	372
Manitoba	845
Ontario	15,455
Quebec	8,367
New Brunswick	1,389
Nova Scotia	2,341
Prince Edward Island	596
	30,373

3.

British Columbia	895
Northwest Territories	339
Manitoba	743
Ontario	13,411
Quebec	6,068
New Brunswick	1,148
Nova Scotia	1,904
Prince Edward Island	525
	25,033

MR. LOUIS LEOPOLD.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked :

1. Is the government aware of the report that has been current in the press to the effect that Louis Leopold (Lazarus), who formerly conducted a labour bureau in London, England, is now the agent of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and that he has opened an office in London, to assist the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in inducing skilled labourers to emigrate to Canada ? If so, can the government verify the truth of the report ?

2. Has the government taken any steps to prevent the manufacturers' agents inducing skilled labourers, by false representations, to emigrate to Canada ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour) :

1. The following paragraph from 'Canada' of February 16, 1907, is the only information the government has upon the subject :

Mr. Louis Leopold, after an extended trip throughout the Dominion, has just returned to London as the salaried representative of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in Great Britain. In this capacity, Mr. Leopold has undertaken to supply various members of the association, which embraces almost every industry, with skilled labour, of which there is a pressing need. This he proposes to recruit from the ranks of artisans in the British Isles.

2. In 1905 this parliament enacted the following measure respecting false representation to induce or deter immigration :

Every person who does, in Canada, anything for the purpose of causing or procuring the publication or circulation, by advertisement or otherwise, in a country outside of Canada, of false representations as to the opportunities for employment in Canada, or as to the state of the labour market in Canada, intended or adapted to encourage or induce, or to defer or prevent, the immigration into Canada of persons resident in that country, or who does anything in Canada for the purpose of causing or procuring the communication to any resident of such country of any such false representations, shall, if any such false representations are thereafter so published, circulated or communicated, be guilty of an offence, and liable, on summary conviction before two justices of the peace, to a penalty of not more than one thousand dollars and not less than fifty dollars for each offence.

In September of last year the government sent Mr. Mackenzie King, deputy Minister of Labour on a special mission to England to represent to the British authorities the importance of having similar legislation enacted by the British parliament with a view to prevent false representations being made in Great Britain and Ireland to induce persons to emigrate to Canada. As a result of the government's action the following provision was enacted as one of the clauses of the Merchants' Shipping Act, passed by the British parliament, assented to on December 21, 1906 :

If any person, by any false representation, fraud or false pretense, induces or attempts to induce any person to emigrate or to engage a steerage passage in any ship, he shall for each offence be liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds, or to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding three months.

WAGES OF PAINTERS IN HALIFAX.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. Is the government aware that Mr. F. Reardon, the contractor for the painting of the walls of the new custom house in Halifax, is paying only $8 per week to some of his painters employed by him, although the current wages in Halifax amounts to $10.70 per week of forty-eight hours ?

2. Has the Department of Labour any information on the subject ?

3. Does Mr. Reardon's contract contain the fair-wage provision ?

4. What action does the government propose to take in the premises ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. No, the Department of Public Works is not aware of the fact stated.

2. The Department of Labour has received from the secretary of the Painters'

Union of Halifax, a communication stating that the union has been informed that Mr. Reardon had been awarded a contract to paint the walls of the customs house, and that members of the local union who had applied for work on the building were informed by the contractor that the wages he paid were $8 per week, while the current wages at the present were $10.70 per week of 48 hours. This communication was referred to one of the fair wages officers of the Department of Labour for investigation and report.

3. No contract was made for this work. The work was allotted by correspondence and no mention of wages was contained in the correspondence.

4. The government is prepared to insist that the wages generally accepted as current for competent painters in Halifax shall be paid.

POSTMASTER AT OPHIR.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. Who is the postmaster at Ophir in Algoma, when was he appointed, and what is his present remuneration?

2. Has his salary been recently reduced? If so, to what extent, and for what reason?

3. Have not representations been made to the department that a tri-weekly mail service between Rydal Bank and Ophir is desirable in the public interest? If so, how have such recommendations been dealt with?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. James Clarborough is postmaster of Ophir. He was appointed on October 1, 1904. His present remuneration is $25 per annum for salary and $3 per annum for forward allowance.

2. The postmaster's salary was reduced from $40 a year to $25 a year on January 1, 1906, the reduction being due to a corresponding falling off in the revenue of the office.

3. No representations were made to the department for a tri-weekly mail between the points mentioned, but an application was received for a semi-weekly service. The circumstances of the case, however, did not warrant the department in acceding to the proposition.

WAYS AND MEANS—A. B. STEELE ET AL., A. W. PRITCHARD AND J. OBED SMITH.

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

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, in the 'Free Press and Times,' a paper published in the city of Burlington, in the State of Vermont, in the issue of January 21 last, I find the following item:

The 'Free Press' referred recently to a suit tried in Winnipeg between Asa B. Steele, A. B. Buell and Max Powell, as plaintiffs, and A. W. Pritchard and J. Obed. Smith, both of Winnipeg, as defendants. The action was for alleged deceit in the sale of a large tract of land in Saskatchewan purchased by the plaintiffs who relied upon the representations of the defendants, who made the sale, that the block of land was all of the original purchase and that none of the land originally purchased by the Ontario and Saskatchewan Land Company, the owners of the land in question, had been withheld when in fact a large tract of the best land had been taken out.

The trial lasted ten days and Judge Mathers has just handed down the opinion. He holds that defendants, Buell and Powell, were induced to make the purchase by the false statements of defendants, that they relied upon those statements and suffered loss; that the land was worth at the time of the purchase last June all that the plaintiffs paid for it and that the enhanced value since that time cannot be taken in reduction of damages, but was simply what plaintiffs were entitled to as a result of the deal, that the plaintiffs were entitled to the value of the tract if it had been as the defendants represented and intact, and measures the damage at $14,601.80. The court finds that plaintiffs' deal did not rely upon the representations and he is non-suited. The apportionment of damages between the plaintiffs will not be finally made until counsel have time to look up testimony and argue that question.

The land purchase was syndicated in Burlington and the plaintiffs formed a part of the syndicate. The land taken out was not the choice selections throughout the tract so as to leave 'culls' but was in the north part nearer the railroad. The soil was no better than what was left. Defendant J. Obed Smith is government immigration inspector at Winnipeg, and the plaintiffs relied upon his statements the more on account of his position.

I have in my hand as well a copy of the pleadings in this case which was brought before the high court in Winnipeg. Without reading the pleadings in full, they being somewhat voluminous, I may say that the statement of claim starts out in the usual way by describing who the plaintiffs are and who the defendants are. The second paragraph is as follows:

The defendant A. W. Pritchard is a real estate agent residing in the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba. The defendant J. Obed Smith resides in the city of Winnipeg.

The statement of claim then goes on to say that the defendants, representing that they were the agents of the Ontario and Saskatchewan Land Corporation, or that they held an option from said company, undertook to sell to the plaintiffs all the land that had been acquired by that Ontario and Saskatchewan Land Corporation Company. In the course of the negotiations the plaintiff Powell asked the defendant Smith particularly if the defendants were selling all the lands that had been acquired

by the Ontario and Saskatchewan Land Corporation, and the answer was that they were selling to them all these lands. As a matter of fact, the plaintiffs claim that some 7,000 acres had been kept out; land not particularly better—as the newspaper report said—than the other, but better situated, being at the north near the railway. The plaintiffs, therefore, brought their action, claiming damages for the 7,000 acres of which they had been wrongfully deprived, as they said, through the misrepresentations of the defendants. The defendants denied all the allegations of the plaintiffs' statement of claim with the exception of the first two, and the second one, as I read to the House, was the one in which the defendant Smith is described as immigration commissioner residing in the city of Winnipeg. We, therefore, have the plaintiffs claiming that they have been defrauded by J. Obed Smith, who was the Dominion immigration agent at Winnipeg, and we have the defendant Smith admitting that he is that official.

The case went to trial, and I have in my hand the judgment of the learned Judge Mathers, after a trial which lasted according to the newspaper report ten days. Evidently from the amount of evidence taken, the trial must have lasted a very considerable time. The judgment is somewhat lengthy, but I may read two or three extracts from it. The judge held as to the plaintiffs Powell and Buell:

There is a preponderance of evidence in favour of them and I find that the defendants did represent to them that that block of land was the entire original selection and all that the selling company ever owned in the six townships named, and that these two plaintiffs were induced by such representations to become co-purchasers with Steele of this block of about 47,000 acres of land at $6.50 per acre. I find that the representation was not true as the Ontario and Saskatchewan Company had previously sold out of its original holding 7,800 acres and the block in question represented the balance only of the company's original holding in these townships. From the examination of the defendant for discovery put in evidence it is impossible to find otherwise and that they had no belief in the truth of the representations when made.

Mr. McCRANEY. At what date was the judgment rendered by Judge Mathers?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman the exact date, but evidently it would be within a few days of January 21 of this year, because the item appears in the Burlington 'Times' of the 21st of January, and it says that the judgment had just been handed out. In the course of the examination in the court, of the defendant Obed Smith, some extraordinary admissions were made by himself. I can quite understand that if, standing in this House I were to claim that an official of the present government should be condemned in consequence of any evidence given by any witness in court which had been contradicted by the official in question, the government might well stand by their own official and say he was as well entitled to belief as those who contradicted him. But when we find the immigration commissioner himself in the box; when we find him under oath making certain admissions, I think even the Minister of the Interior might be justified in finding, if these admissions tell against the official, that the official has no ground of complaint if the department should act on the admissions made by himself. On pages 4 and 19 of the cross-examination of Smith, which I have before me, the point was made very clear, when the question was asked, whether or not he and his co-defendant were keeping anything back. Here is his own answer to the question:

I am stating what he (that is Buell) said: Now you fellows are not keeping back any of the best sections for yourselves, are you?

That was, of course, indignantly denied Then on page 19:

Q. I see Mr. Powell says in his examination that you told Buell that he was to get all the holdings of the company; is that the expression you used?—A. No, I do not think that was exactly correct.

Q. You would not agree with these words?—A. No.

Q. Substantially correct?—A. Yes, that was the intention.

So we have Mr. Obed Smith himself, under oath, admitting that he did represent to the plaintiffs that they were getting all the holdings of the Ontario and Saskatchewan Land Corporation, when in fact and in truth they were getting some 7,400 acres less than had been the holdings of that company.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). Were the representations of Mr. J. Obed Smith made verbally or in writing?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I would judge from the evidence that it was a conversation between the plaintiffs Powell and Buell and Pritchard and Smith; as far as appears from this evidence it was a verbal representation.

Mr. McCRANEY. What was the amount of the claim made?

Mr. NORTHRUP. The following are the particulars of the plaintiffs' claim—they ask damages at $3 per acre in respect of 7,840 acres of land occasioned by the deceit of the defendants, $23,520. The plaintiffs, therefore, claim $23,520. I may say for the information of my hon. friend, that I have reason to believe that the plaintiffs differ entirely from the basis on which the learned judge assessed the damages. The learned judge found that the plaintiffs were entitled

to be reimbursed whatever they had lost through the deceit of the defendant, but in computing the manner in which the damage was to be assessed and the amount of the damages, the plaintiffs contend that the learned judge erred very grievously and, therefore, there has been an appeal. The appeal is not by the defendants from the judgment, but by the plaintiffs, claiming a larger amount of damages than has been given them by that judgment.

On pages 15, 23 and 24 of this cross-examination of Mr. Obed Smith, the further admission was made by Mr. Smith that he was utilizing his position as a government official in order to make money—to use his own classic expression—on the side. Let me read his own evidence that I may not be accused of misrepresenting him or wronging him. I quote from page 15:

Q. You as an officer of the Dominion government received reports of homesteads from time to time?—A. Yes.

Q. Daily reports?—A. Weekly reports.

Q. So that you were in a position to give information as to what land had been homesteaded?—A. Reasonably accurate information.

On page 23 I read:

Q. That is to say, Mr. Riddington——

And Mr. Riddington turns out in a subsequent part of the evidence to be a government official.

Q. That is to say, Mr. Riddington sent you this exhibit No. 45 with letter exhibit No. 2 of the 18th of June and the plat inclosed in that letter?—A. Yes.

Q. Were they all attached together?—A. They were.

Q. You detached the letter from the plat in the meantime?—A. No, I have the report. The report that Mr. Buell took away was not the report of Mr. Riddington, but it was a copy of it. I gave him a copy of the plat and the original report.

At page 24, as if to place the matter beyond peradventure, I read:

Q. Who is this Mr. Riddington who sent you this report?—A. One of the homestead inspectors up there.

Q. An employee of the Dominion government?—A. Yes.

Q. Paid by salary?—A. Yes paid by salary.

Q. And you have made use of government officials to make reports for you in order that you might make money on the side?—A. Yes, that is true.

I think I have established that a Dominion government official has been charged in the courts with deceiving people who came to this country, and who, relying on the statements made by a Dominion government official—and the more to be relied on for that reason—that he deceived them, and that he has been mulcted in heavy damages in the courts of the land. I think I have shown that this defendant, Obed Smith admitted under oath that he had made untrue representations whereby these people were deceived and defrauded. He also admitted that he was in a position to use, and did use, the weekly reports sent in by officials in order to make a little money for himself on the side. I would have thought it would not have been necessary to do more than call the attention of the House to such a state of facts to insure prompt action by the government; but I am sorry to say that our experience in the past is such as to lead us to a very different conclusion to that which ordinary men, unaware of the proceedings of the Department of the Interior in days gone by, would reach. Had this been the first case of the kind, I would have thought it beyond peradventure that a man who had thus abused his position would have been promptly dismissed, and probably punished by prosecution at the hands of the department; but for such a trifling offence as poor Smith is guilty of, merely lying to people and thereby defrauding them, and using his official position to make money on the side; I must say that I do not think the department, unless prepared to admit its sins of the past and to turn over a new leaf, is in a position to punish him very severely. We have had the experience of the mis-doings of other officials in the Department of the Interior. We had in this House in a previous session the case of Nixon, a land agent at Macleod, whose case was reported upon by one of the officials of the government. It was proven that his books had been mutilated, that moneys he had received had not been handed over to the government, and that various other wrongs had been done by him, and the only excuse that could be offered was that this was all done by his son, a youth fifteen years of age. Although it was proved by affidavit on more than one occasion that money had been paid to Nixon himself, he was not prosecuted, but was allowed to resign, and shortly afterwards he was put on the immigration staff at a salary of $40 or $50 a month, which, in a couple of weeks, was raised to $75 a month; and, as far as this House knows, Nixon is still enjoying the fruits of his services by drawing this increased pay. Then we had the case of Wagner, the facts of which are intimately known to the Minister of the Interior, possibly more intimately than to any other man in the world except Wagner himself. There was no dispute about the facts of the Wagner case. He was a thief, convicted as such in prosecution after prosecution, and sent to jail; yet when the inquiry was made in this House whether he had received any promotion, the Minister of the Interior could only say: There is no information on the files of the De-

partment of the Interior to show that this man had ever been in jail. The Department of Justice knew it; it was on record there. The Minister of the Interior, as an individual knew it; but the House was gravely informed that there was no record of it on the files of the Department of the Interior. It may be said that these things are of the days gone by, that they are charges of two or three years ago. Well, we have had some since. We had an election in this country in 1904, and now that the smoke of the conflict has blown over and every member is secure in his seat until the next election, I suppose no gentleman will deny that there are three or four members of this House from the province of Manitoba who would not be sitting here had it not been for the thin red line which was introduced into Manitoba politics. Here again I deal with matters which were before the courts and on which evidence was given. Nobody in the province of Manitoba, certainly nobody in this House from that province, will deny that in constituency after constituency the majority recorded for hon. gentlemen opposite was indescribably less than the number of Conservative supporters who were disfranchised by virtue of the thin red line. This was all done by one Leach; and how was he punished? The government, on the 1st of January, 1905, expressed its dissatisfaction, its indignation, I might almost say its determination to be revenged on Leach, by appointing him an immigration agent, at a salary of $2,000 or $2,500 a year, a position which, so far as I know, he still occupies.

These cases of which I have spoken are known to all the members of this House, and therefore one can refer to them with confidence. I hold in my hand a letter which I have received in the last few days from a gentleman in the Northwest in whom I have the greatest confidence, and he tells me that Lawrence Duggan has received an appointment from the Dominion government in the land titles office, at either Calgary or Moosejaw. He also says that Christopher C. Calverley has been appointed Indian agent at Norway House, the former having been returning officer at Selkirk, and the latter deputy returning officer at Beausejour. And these gentlemen were evidently implicated in the thin red line scandals for which Leach has been so well rewarded. I do not say that these appointments have been made; but I am prepared to accept the statement of the correspondent, for two reasons—first, because he is a man of standing, whose word can be relied on in any event; and, secondly, because in view of our past experience of the Department of the Interior, if Nixon, Wagner and Leach, after having been found guilty, have been rewarded by promotion in the service at increased salaries, why should not these men be rewarded in the same way? Even if the appointments have not been made, the names have been before the public, and the public believe they have been made; and I call the attention of the right hon. leader of the government to the fact that when an impression gets in the public mind that men are to be promoted for their bad deeds, 'by merit raised to that bad eminence,' it is supposed to be well-founded; and the destruction of public confidence is bad, not only for the department and the government, but for everybody who loves his country. There is another reason why I have brought this matter before the House. We often hear the question asked, why do not the Conservative opposition expose some of the scandals which are talked of throughout the country? The members of the opposition have been taunted again and again before the electors with the question: Why don't you ventilate these charges before the House? Why are you mute there, and only speak of them after the House is dissolved and there is no one to answer you? The case of Smith is one to illustrate the disadvantage under which the opposition labour. Looking at the Auditor General's Report, which is the only basis we have to work upon in the Public Accounts Committee, the only record I find with reference to Smith is the following (L—29):

Smith, J. O., Winnipeg: commissioner, 12 m. to June 30, $3,000; caps, officers, 1, $3.75, 1, $3.50; overcoat, $25; uniforms, 2 $56; total, $3,093.25.

That is all the biography any Conservative member of this House has of Mr. Smith. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite how could it be expected that that would be sufficient to assist us in ferreting out such a transaction as this. How could we, from merely reading that little scrap of biography suspect that Mr. Smith had been implicated in a land deal? It may be the first he has indulged in and I hope it will be the last he will have any opportunity of indulging in; but hon. gentlemen opposite know that it is common rumour in the Northwest that all these officials are engaged in just such transactions. Mr. Smith might have been engaged in such transactions for years and the opposition would never have had an opportunity of ventilating the matter. Had it not been that Mr. Smith happened to come across an American who had both money and courage to fight what he considered a wrong and dragged this matter into the courts, we would never have heard about it. There may, for aught I know, be other cases of a similar character. This one item is a scandal of which the government should be ashamed, and the very fact that it has come to light gives reason to suspect that there

may be other cases just as bad but which the opposition are unable to discover. I bring this matter to the attention of the government in the hope that some change may come over the direction of the Department of the Interior so that it may be understood that there are other ways of securing promotion in that department than by violating the law. There is no necessity why those who violate the law should be promoted, but that appears to have been the rule in the past; and if examples were made, whenever breaches such as this occur, they might lose to the government active supporters in election times, but the people would be better off and the administration of the various departments would be better respected. I lay this matter before the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and we ask him what he proposes to do about it.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY (Saskatchewan). The material upon which my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Northrup) bases his argument is the evidence and judgment in the case recently tried in Manitoba of Steele vs. Pritchard. My hon. friend has told us that the judgment of Mr. Justice Mathers was delivered about the 21st January last. Up to the present time however no formal judgment has been signed. My hon. friend has told us that the plaintiffs intend appealing from that judgment because it does not give them sufficiently large damages. Well, I have here a copy of a telegram from Mr. T. H. Johnston, a lawyer of Winnipeg, addressed to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and dated the 26th February, 1907:

> As counsel for Mr. Smith, I state to you that my associate counsel and I have advised that the verdict in Steele vs. Smith et al. is against the law and not supported by evidence and that an appeal would obtain its reversal.

I would further point out that in the province of Manitoba no appeal can be had until the formal judgment is taken. The Act of the Manitoba legislature passed last session, establishing the courts of appeal, provides that the rules of procedure in appeal shall be the same as those which obtain in the court of King's Bench. These rules, which are to be found in the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, state that the time for filing an appeal against a judgment shall be within fourteen days from the date of the entry of the judgment. The reason therefore that no appeal has been entered as yet by the defendant is because the plaintiffs have not seen fit to take out that formal judgment. I submit therefore that as the matter is still before the courts, it is not one which should be discussed in this House.

Mr. BOYCE. Does my hon. friend contend that the time for the appeal runs from the date of the entry of the judgment or the rendering of the judgment?

Mr. NORTHRUP.

Mr. McCRANEY. I understand that in Manitoba the time for entering the appeal runs from the time of the formal judgment, thus differing from Ontario in that respect.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman will find that he is wrong.

Mr. McCRANEY. I have the statute here and can show it to my hon. friend. Before discussing the subject matter of this suit we should not only have the evidence given at the trial but also the finding of the highest court of appeal to which either party wishes to go. These are essential to this House before it can form any judgment, and I think that this House should hesitate before discussing this subject and making a pronouncement which might prejudicially affect either party before the courts. I understand that up to yesterday no formal judgment had been rendered.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). The hon. gentleman has hardly met the point at issue. We have not only the decision of the judge but the admissions of the defendant himself. We have the admissions of Mr. Smith himself. If we bring to the knowledge of the Minister of the Interior, the fact that the defendant upon his oath—reluctantly no doubt admitted that he was speculating upon information which he had obtained officially, we have sufficient on which to ask the minister to dismiss this official. Now the statute under which we have been acting and which the minister proposes to re-enact, provides for a case of this kind, and I am sorry to say that such cases have not been unknown in the department before. Sections 84 and 85 of the proposed Act are practically a re-enactment of the present statute. The first deals with the Dominion officials and land officials of any kind who speculate in Dominion lands. Section 85 provides that:

> No employee of or under the Department of the Interior shall disclose to any person, except with the authority of the minister, any discovery made by him or any other employee of the said department or any information of which he is possessed in relation to Dominion lands.

This officer, as I understand, by his own sworn statement, disclosed information which he got as an employee under the government and which was specially reported to him by Mr. Riddington, homestead agent, and the penalty provided by the Act is:

> Any employee appointed hereunder shall be liable to summary dismissal on the order of the minister, but such dismissal shall not affect the right which any person may have to bring against such dismissed employee any civil or criminal action.

That is the definite proposition, the definite statement of the law if the facts bring Mr. Obed Smith within this provision and

I shall ask no more than that the statement of the defendant himself, the party whom we are attacking, shall be taken at par as a statement to govern us in this case. Then, further, the Civil Service Act provides an oath for parties occupying positions such as that of Mr. Smith and the concluding part of that oath in the case of one in the outside service provides :

And that I will not, without due authority in that behalf, disclose or make known any matter or thing which comes to my knowledge by reason of my employment as (defining the position).

I do not suppose that that gentleman got authority from any one to make the disclosures he made and I shall refer briefly to what he says as to his action. We find this in the evidence.

Q. You, as an officer of the Dominion government, received reports of homesteads from time to time ?
A. Yes.
Q. Daily reports ?—A. Weekly reports.
Q. So that you are in a position to give information as to what lands have been homesteaded ?—A. Reasonably accurate information.
Q. The one whom one would most naturally look to for such information ?—A. Reasonably accurate, as I have said.
Q. And it was a matter of discussion, and the information received with pleasure by Mr. Powell and Mr. Buell on the morning of the 29th that a great many lands had been homesteaded in the vicinity of the lands in question ?—A. Yes.

That is the lands this gentleman was dealing with. Then turning to pages 23 and 24 we get a further insight into his position and to what took place.

By Mr. Bradshaw :
Q. Will you look at exhibit No. 45. Do you recognize that document ?—A. I do.
Q. Who prepared that ?—A. Well, I can't say, but it was sent to me with Mr. Riddington's letter and plats.
Q. That is to say Mr. Riddington sent you this exhibit No. 45 with his letter, exhibit 2, of the 18th of June, and the plats inclosed in that letter —A. Yes.
Q. Were they all attached together ?—A. They were.
Q. When did you last see this prior to this trial ?—A. On the morning of the 29th of June. Mr. Powell asked me if he might take them, and I took them apart and handed him the instruments.
Q. Took what apart ?—A. The papers that were pinned together. This plat and these reports were pinned together.
Q. You detached the letter from the plats and the reports ?—A. No, I took the report—the report which Mr. Powell took away was not the report of Mr. Riddington, but it was a copy of it. I gave him a copy of the plats and the original report.

This was the original report from Mr. Riddington the homestead agent to Mr. Smith, the immigration commissioner.

Q. Did you also give him exhibit No. 11 at that time ?
Mr. Wilson—That has all been gone into in chief. That is the one I think I gave you before.
Q. Were the reports attached to the township plats when you gave them to him ?—A. I can't remember that.
Q. Did you keep any copies of exhibit No. 45 ?—A. No, I kept no copies. In fact, I had practically forgotten about it until I wrote to Mr. Riddington for a copy a few days ago. I received it and I have had no copies since this was given to Mr. Powell.
Q. You didn't take any copies before giving it to Mr. Powell ?—A. No.
Q. And is this the original report you received from Mr. Riddington ?—A. Yes. They were in somewhat of a hurry, and off they went with the report in their hands.

Now we will find the position that Mr. Smith definitely says he took in the matter.

By Mr. Wilson :
Q. Who is Mr. Riddington who sent you this report ?—A. One of the homestead inspectors up there.
Q. An employee of the Dominion government?—A. Yes.
Q. Paid by salary ?—A. Yes, paid by salary.
Q. And you have made use of government officials to make reports for you in order that you might make money on the side ?—A. Yes, that is true.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the whole matter in a nutshell, that this gentleman, employed by the government, in defiance of the statute, and in defiance of the oath and presumably in defiance of the Minister of the Interior if we can presume that, used his position and the influence that he thus obtained, for the purpose of making money as he says, upon the side, making as a matter of fact in this transaction, although that is not material, a matter of nearly $30,000, because as the evidence shows he received 60 cents an acre upon some 48,000 acres which he sold.

I said that nothing else was very material. It is not a question of the findings but of a certain fact. My hon. friend who has just spoken says that an appeal is about to be taken and that notwithstanding what has happened there may be a reversal on appeal, but what I point out is that there can be no reversal of what this man deliberately swears to in the investigation of this case. There can be no change of the deliberate admission that he has made upon record in the evidence in the case.

But it is important all the same to read what is said in the judgment in regard to the facts. The judge first points out that as to the plaintiff Steele, he was aware of the circumstances and therefore he was not deceived and not entitled to damages. The judgment proceeds :

As to the other plaintiffs the case stands differently. There is a preponderance of evidence in favour of them and I find that the defendants did represent to them that that

block of land was the entire original selection and all that the selecting company ever owned in the six townships named, and that these two plaintiffs were induced by such representation to become co-purchasers with Steele of this block of about 47,000 acres of land at $6.60 per acre. I find that the representation was not true as the Ontario and Saskatchewan Company had previously sold out of its original holding 7,800 acres and the block in question represented the balance only of the company's original holding in these townships. I find also that the defendants at the time the representations were made had no information on the subject at all and could not therefore believe it to be true.

That is not information as to the matters that they were alleging in reference to the Dominion lands and their sale or the information obtained from Riddington, but no information as to whether any lands had been sold out of the purchase or not.

From the examination of the defendants for discovery put in evidence it is impossible to find otherwise than that they had no belief in the truth of the representations when made.

The judge then proceeds to find the amount of damages to which the plaintiffs are entitled, finding that by reason of the fact that the plaintiffs have disposed of a portion of the lands without damage they are entitled to less damages than they otherwise would.

The sole and only question is whether on the admitted facts as given by the defendant Obed Smith in his evidence, this is a person whom the government in the face of the statute should retain in their employment, and secondly, whether having regard to the statute and the oath that the gentleman has to take, the government is prepared to swallow the whole matter and maintain this gentleman in their employment.

Mr. D. W. BOLE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, I should not have taken part in this debate had it not been that certain extraneous matter was introduced by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). But for that I would have rested upon the point made by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. McCraney) that it is hardly proper for this House to discuss a question which is now practically in the hands of the courts; we should first have before us the findings of the court and the evidence in the case. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) made some reference to the 'thin red line,' and intimated that the gentlemen who represented Manitoba on this side, are here in consequence of the 'thin red line.' I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that, so far as I am personally concerned, it does not apply, and it does not apply for the simple and sufficient reason that in my case the 'thin red line' was not necessary. And the reason it was not necessary is that mine is one of three constituencies which are co-terminous with the Dominion constituencies. I challenge the hon gentleman to show to the House how it would be possible for a Dominion election to be held in Manitoba without the use of the 'thin red line.' Why, the thing is simply impossible, for the reason that the Dominion and provincial constituencies are not co-terminous, but lap over one another, and the only voters' lists that we had on the occasion of the last election were provincial voters' lists. It was necessary to introduce the 'thin red line' in order to remove from the list those who had no right to vote and include those who had.

Now, with respect to the subject introduced by the hon. member for East Hastings, namely, the case of these gentlemen from the United States against J. Obed Smith and Pritchard, I may state that Mr. Smith in his capacity as immigration commissioner in that western country is solicited a dozen times a day the whole year round by people who are looking for investments or who desire to settle in the country. I am not surprised that Mr. Smith has interested himself in securing information for people who desire to settle in the country. Now, it has been contended by hon. gentlemen on the other side who have spoken on this subject that Mr. Riddington, who was a land inspector, furnished information to Mr. Smith out of which he could make money. Now, Mr. Riddington, as inspector of Dominion lands, is not subject to Mr. Smith's orders. But Mr. Smith, I suppose, in his capacity as immigration commissioner, has facilities for securing information that is collected by Mr. Riddington for the benefit of immigrants and the general public. It is Mr. Smith's duty as an officer of the government to give such information with respect to land as has been obtained by such officers as Mr. Riddington. I did not know until very recently that the hon. gentleman intended to bring this matter up, and therefore I shall not consider at length, the propriety of a government official engaging in outside business. But I believe it is acknowledged on all sides that an official of the government, if there is an opportunity for a little speculation, is quite at liberty to engage in it, so long as it does not interfere with his ordinary duties. I would point out to hon. gentleman that the land that Mr. Smith has evidently been interested in is not Dominion land or land concerning which he had any information as an officer of the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What lands were they, then?

Mr. BOLE. I understand that these were lands, part of a lot of 151,000 acres sold by the Canadian Northern Railway Company to the Ontario and Saskatchewan Land Company. Of this total 100,000 acres were sold, as I understand, at the price the company paid for it. Some of the stockholders of the company were stampeded and sold

at about the price they bought for, leaving 51,000 acres unsold. I understand that the Land Company had a provision in their charter by which the members of the company could purchase some of the land on payment of stock in the company, and I understand that that was taken advantage of to some extent. That is to say, 4,000 or 5,000 acres were bought by members of the organization leaving 47,000 or 48,000 acres still to be sold.

Now, with regard to the matter under discussion, itself, I would like to read the evidence I have. I am sorry I have not the official evidence which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) seems to have, but I read from the report in the Manitoba Free Press of October 27, 1906:

J. Obed Smith, one of the defendants, was also called and gave a categorical denial to the statements made by the plaintiffs as to the representations made at the time of the sale. The quantity of land which he and Mr. Pritchard agreed to hand over to the plaintiff Steele, was '48,000 acres, more or less.' It was with Steele that the whole bargain was consummated and he emphatically denied making any sale to the other plaintiffs, Powell and Buell.

I understand that Steele has been nonsuited in the case and certain damages have been granted to the plaintiffs Powell and Buell—one-seventh of the amount claimed, the amount claimed being $23,-250. I understand that it is Mr. Pritchard's intention to appeal against that judgment, and that it is the intention of the plaintiffs to appeal against that judgment as it affects them. Therefore, I think it is quite improper to discuss the merits of the case before this House until judgment is rendered and the terms of the judgment and the evidence are before us. But if hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to discuss the merits of the case, let me read the evidence of one Bredin, who made an inspection of the land:

The evidence of E. A. Bredin, land inspector for the Osler, Hammond and Nanton corporation, was taken on behalf of the defence. He testified to the effect that he had been connected with the original survey of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which made the selection of lands for that company's grant. He had been connected with surveys and land inspections in Manitoba and the Northwest since 1876, and was over the lands now occupying the attention of the court sixteen years ago. He had also made an examination of it, within the past few weeks, and while he would not say that he had personally investigated every quarter-section of the whole of the six townships under discussion, he had examined a very large portion of it.

He swore that the lands secured by the plaintiff were 'a good buy' at the price paid, $6.60 per acre. He made comparisons of the value of the lands which actually went to the plaintiffs and the portions which they asserted they should have got in addition to the 47,000 acres, and claimed that the lands which the plaintiffs got were equally valuable with those which they alleged had been culled out.

In view of that testimony, if it is properly reported, I think it abundantly clear that the discussion of the matter should not go on until we have before us the judgment of the court and the evidence in the case.

I may state that Mr. Obed Smith we in the west regard as one of the most efficient officers of the government. He is a very active immigration agent. I would not be surprised if he were once in a while mixed up in land transactions for the reason that I know that he is solicited a dozen times a day, especially in the busy season, for information as to land and it is very natural for him to turn to Mr. Riddington's report or to any other report of the land inspectors to enable him to furnish that information. I think that any gentleman from the United States who bought land at $6.60 an acre in this district should not appeal to the court with respect to their bargain because they have made, as Mr. Bredin has stated, a very good buy and I do not see for the life of me on business grounds why they should have brought any action.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, it must be, to all hon. members of this House, a very regrettable fact that the ordinary business of the House which the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) desires to be expedited in view of his wish to attend the colonial conference next month, should be of necessity delayed by the continued attention which the House has to give to matters brought before it of grave misconduct in the departments of the government or on the part of officials of the government such as this and such as have been brought to the attention of the government and of this House this session and last session. It is to uselessly and idly prolong a discussion of this nature for hon. members opposite to get up one after the other in the interests of their friends who may be charged as a gentleman is charged here and endeavour to cloud the issue and to gloss the subject by themselves making excuses which do not amount to anything more than just an invitation to the hon. member who brought the matter to the attention of the House to withhold his fire and not to shoot. I listened with some attention to the speeches of the hon. gentlemen who spoke on the government side of the House, and I appeal to you and to the House to say whether either of these gentlemen touched the kernel of the accusation of my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) against the Department of the Interior in this regard. Neither of these hon. gentlemen touched the crux of this point at all and very much to my surprise, and I am sure very much to the surprise of this country, when a charge so serious as this is brought to the attention of this

House and in the presence of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), the Minister of the Interior sits dumb and opens not his mouth in defence of a public servant who is drawing from the coffers of this country $3,000 per annum to stand between the country and the speculator. The Minister of the Interior has been known to have excuses in this House. It is not often that the hon. gentleman sits dumb. It is not that he is not ready with specious if not eloquent and cogent arguments in answer to accusations and charges brought from this side of the House, but the hon. gentleman to-day puts up hon. gentleman behind him to offer excuses which do not touch the subject matter at all, to raise legal quibbles as to the pendency of appeals from the judgment and to present all sorts of excuses in order to cloud the issue which is before us. What is the issue? The hon. Minister of the Interior knows that as well as we all know it. The issue is as to whether J. Obed Smith, immigration commissioner, upon his sworn oath in a court of law, has not shown himself to be disentitled to hold the position under this government which he holds at the present time by his admitted misconduct as an officer of the government. There is no question of any pending litigation. There is no important question as to whether the judgment which has been rendered by a learned judge on the bench in the province of Manitoba is a final judgment or not. The question is whether, by word of mouth, writing, or upon oath, that officer has admitted that he has made use of an officer in his department and has made use of the services of other gentlemen employed in the Department of the Interior to further his private ends and to enable him to make money on the side. Is there any dispute, Mr. Speaker, about that fact? It is sworn to and sworn to by the gentleman who is himself charged. Surely that is evidence enough and no appeal by that gentleman and none of the laws' delays will enable the Minister of the Interior to put any different construction upon that admission. This gentleman was speculating with his position. Can the Minister of the Interior put it in any different light, or does he, by his silence, intimate to this House that there is no misconduct on the part of that official? Is it an improper act in the opinion of the minister for J. Obed Smith or any other official of the government, especially an immigration official, to use his position and the positions of the homestead inspectors under him, not for the purpose of furthering the interests of this country, not for the purpose of promoting immigration or of assisting immigrants as they come to the Northwest to make themselves comfortable, the conditions pleasant and the prospects happy for them by lending them, as it is his duty to do, all the assistance that he possibly can, free gratis and for nothing, to make comfortable homes for themselves in the Northwest country, to promote their prosperity, but for the purpose of promoting his own private interests? This man comes forward and in a court of law swears that he was using his office and the office of those subordinate to him to put money in his pocket in addition to his salary. That is the case that has been presented to this House by my hon. friend from East Hastings and that is the case that so far there has not been one word in rebuttal of either by any member of the government or by any follower of the government, perhaps the Minister of the Interior would say that, well, after all, the proceedings show—and I fancy the strenuous effort of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole), produced with iron bars and perspiration, was to try and get the House to believe it also—there were some comfortable features for Mr. Smith, and that it was not government land that he was dealing in, but I would like to ask the hon. Minister how far he would carry that doctrine into these excuses. Could it be carried, for instance, into the Department of Finance? Would the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) countenance an officer of his department dealing in government bonds or securities as a broker? Would the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) contemplate—I do not know whether he would or not or whether he has or not—but should he, in the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, tolerate an officer in his department, or an employee under his department, who has to fulfil the duty to the public, being interested in a canal, railway, or public work which comes under the jurisdiction of the department and in respect to which he has to make reports or to exercise some official jurisdiction. Or, how would my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) behave supposing it were brought to his attention that some officers in the employ of his department were found to be interested in contracts for the furnishing of supplies or arms for the maintenance of the volunteers in Canada? Would that be proper? Is there a line of demarcation, may I ask the minister, between acts so gravely improper as those which I cited, and which of course, are hypothetical and the one in question where Mr. J. Obed Smith uses his office to promote his private gain? Is that the work for which J. Obed Smith was appointed by this government? Was he appointed to prey upon the public, or, was he appointed to assist the public? Was he appointed to get as much as he could personally out of the office, or, was he employed to carry out to the best of his ability the immigration policy of this country? The people of Canada pay Mr. Obed Smith $3,000 a year for attending to the country's business, and for no other purpose. We have it on as high an authority as the present Minister of Justice, when he was

Postmaster General, that a postmaster who receives $1,000 a year would be required to devote his whole time and attention to the duties of his office. Why is that rule not applied to Mr. J. Obed Smith who gets $3,000 a year? I was much interested in some of the remarks of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) who told us in a very appealing tone, how great a pity it was that unsettled lawsuits should be the subject of discussion in this House and that the opposition should be silent until this litigation had been threshed out to its conclusion, and that not until then, should we speak, according to his view, in well modulated whispers as to the misconduct of a government official. The hon. member (Mr. Bole) has forgotten some things; his memory is as clouded as he attempted to cloud this issue. Does he remember the taunts and the charges, and the abuse that came from his side of the House, against my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) against my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), against my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey), in connection with matters which were then before the courts, but which had not been tried at all, and as to which there was no judgment of the court, but only a pleading. Whether the copy of the pleading that these gentlemen cited was a true copy or not we do not know but at all events the mere pleading seemed to justify an hon. member on that side of the House in making the gravest possible charges against hon. gentlemen on this side. In that case there was no judgment of a court, no evidence of witnesses, no sworn admissions as there were in this case; but merely a statement of the plaintiffs claim, and that justified members on the opposition side iterating and reiterating grave charges, and hurling taunts across the floor at gentlemen against whom there was not one tittle of evidence. Let me suggest to the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole), that we on this side of the House do not follow the example set by some hon. gentlemen opposite. We have sworn testimony to support the whole of the charge that is now brought against the Department of the Interior in connection with the retention in office of Mr. J. Obed Smith, after his misconduct has been proven. Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Bole) that if litigation over this matter had never arisen there would have been ample in the evidence, which has not been discredited, of the admissions made by Smith on oath, that he had been making money out of the public by the use of his office, and by the use of private reports made for him by other officials of the Dominion government. My hon. friend (Mr. Bole) tells us we should read the evidence, but I submit it is not necessary to go further than to take this one sworn admission of Mr. J. Obed Smith, and to ask the government upon that: Whether that is the kind of officials it appoints and maintains in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, in such an important position as Mr. Smith holds. But we have brought numerous instances of this kind of thing to the attention of parliament. We have moved resolutions, moderate in their tone, in condemnation of the methods employed by the government and its officials. We have, amongst others, moved resolutions condemning the Galway Cattle Ranch deal, the Robins Irrigation deal, and the Saskatchewan Valley Land deal, and calling for some action on the part of this government to show that it was a responsible government which has the welfare of the people of Canada at heart. But these resolutions have been voted down by the majority. We have brought to the attention of the House abuses of another class, such as the case of the postmaster at Thessalon. Here was an official who had been proven by the report of the post office inspector to have embezzled the public funds, for his pulp wood deals, his house deals, and his land deals. It was shown that he had taken money out of the post office till to purchase his pulp wood, and his house, and his land. The inspector recommended that he be dismissed, and he was dismissed, but having served the party interests of this government in a by-election and in the Dominion general elections, this same man wrote a letter endeavouring to place the blame upon one near and dear to him, and the very Postmaster General who dismissed him reappointed him, and to-day that man enjoys the office of postmaster at Thessalon: And so the game goes merrily on.

Mr. BERGERON. Did he get an increase of salary?

Mr. BOYCE. I do not know as to that, but I can tell my hon. friend that he gets a salary exceeding $1,000 a year, in addition to which he carries on a business which he stated in a letter to the department was bringing him $200 a day, and which he also stated was taking up so much of his time that some one else could rob the till while he was attending to his private business. And yet the present Minister of Justice, when Postmaster General, told this House that any postmaster in receipt of $1,000 a year or over must attend wholly to the duties of his office. But this gentleman at Thessalon gets over $1,000 a year, and yet he is allowed to engage in private business which he states in his own letter to the Post Office Department, exceeds the sum of $200 per day. This gentleman at Thessalon is very comfortably taken care of. After being dismissed summarily by the Postmaster General, after being found guilty of a serious charge, he is reappointed to office, and his qualification for reappointment was his activity in the general elec-

tions of 1904, and that alone. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) also suggested that the thin red line scandal in Manitoba could not have been avoided. I would remind my hon. friend that there was a time, when the Liberals were in opposition, when they discussed the Dominion Franchise Act, and I would ask him to consider very carefully, whether, had that Franchise Act been in force, there would have been any occasion for, or any danger of, the thin-red line scandal. I leave that to him for his consideration. As the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) reminds me, the repeal of that Act was promised by the leaders of this government when in opposition, and that was possibly the only election pledge which was carried out; and in the carrying of it out, we now have the pitiful excuse of my hon friend for the thin red line scandal. Now, how long is this sort of thing going to continue? I ask the Minister of the Interior whether he is so desirous of maintaining the public service of Canada in an efficient and honest state that scandals of this kind shall be met in a summary mannner and dealt with justly and firmly? Were this the only one it would be bad enough, but my hon. friend has got so thick skinned with so many of these scandals brought before the House, that he has come to relish them, and where he used to get up and make an argument in reply, he now sits silent.

Mr. BERGERON. There are too many of them.

Mr. BOYCE. Perhaps there are, and perhaps the more there are and the graver they are the thicker skinned and more callous the government of the day will get, because when this sort of thing is allowed to creep in it is likely to permeate the whole system of government. It is not as if charges like these were made with reference to one department only. They have been made before, and with regard to different departments; and if the government do not take notice of them there is a tribunal which will, and which will require clean and honest administration of the public service, whether in the Department of the Interior or in any other department, and that is the tribunal of the people of Canada. The people of Canada are becoming awake to the fact that the fountains of the administration of justice are impure, that the government are winking at iniquities like this. Hon. gentlemen opposite may gloss them over and vote them down to serve party ends, but the settlement day will come, when the people will declare their desire to have a clean government cleanly administered in every department. I appeal to the Prime Minister, a gentleman for whom I have the highest personal respect, who in 1893, on a public platform in this city declared himself in favour of a clean administration of every department of the government, making the strongest possible tirade against scandals that appeared in the public press and certain matters then before the House of Commons. The right hon. gentleman also went through the country, and in towns where I had the pleasure of hearing him, promised the people of Canada that if his party were returned to power, a clean administration would follow, and these scandals would be a thing of the past, their desire being to serve the interests of the people in the cleanest and cheapest way. I appeal to the right hon. gentleman to take cognizance of these charges and to see to it that some action is taken to lessen the number of them in future. He has the power to do it if he has the desire, and I earnestly trust that he will make it his business to see that the services of any man found in the position of Mr. J. Obed Smith, using the office of a servant of the people for his own profit, be immediately dispensed with. If the right hon. gentleman will not do that, I fear that when the people of this country have an opportunity to pass their opinion upon his masterly inactivity in that connection, they may in their wisdom and their might, see fit to dispense with his services. I beg, along these lines, to move, seconded by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup):

That all the words after the word 'That' be omitted, and the following substituted therefor:

'The government ought not to continue in office public servants who, in violation of their duty, make use of their official positions to promote their private interests.'

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the House for continuing the debate. I would not have done so had it not been that our friends opposite have placed their opinions in the form of a motion. As this debate or alleged debate was going on, I thought of the views expressed a few days ago by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when he regretted so deeply the deterioration of debate in this House of Commons. I think he must have felt doubly grieved to-day as he listened not only to the subject but to the manner and method of the present debate as far as it has gone. There was one remark made by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) which I think gives the keynote of the discussion. He said it is bad for people to get the impression that matters are not going right in the public service, for if they get the impression, it does not matter much whether matters are right or wrong. That, I think, expresses very fairly the attitude of my hon. friend and those who have spoken in this debate, and who will no doubt vote in favour of this motion. With them it is not a matter of whether there is right or wrong; it is only a matter of continued clamour, continued asservation and extravagant statements, if the public can be induced to believe that there is or may

be something wrong. My hon. friend appealed to the right hon. leader of the government to do something to prevent the statement of these scandals against the Department of the Interior and other departments of the government. Unless and until the right hon. the premier shall be empowered to gag the capacious mouths of some of our friends on the opposite side, it will be impossible for these scandals to be stopped.

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot all have as nice a mouth as my hon. friend. We have to do with what nature gave us.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not so much the kind of mouth as the purpose for which we use it, and when hon. gentlemen use their mouth to no other purpose than to give vent to unfounded scandals, certainly the most beautiful mouth will not justify its existence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Tell us about Obed Smith.

Mr. OLIVER. As regards the scandals alleged against the Department of the Interior, that department has no cause of complaint if they are all of the character of the one brought forward to-day. The Department of the Interior has responsibilities extending from the international boundary to the Arctic sea and from ocean to ocean, which involve the employment of a very large number of officials. And if the charge brought forward to-day is a sample of the best or the worst our hon. friends opposite can do, then the administration of that department stands very fairly justified before the people. The people are reasonable and do not expect absolute perfection on this earth, even in the administration of an approximately perfect government, and if they secure good results from the public administration, the government is doing all that can be expected of it, and it will take something more than this exploiting of petty scandals to destroy public confidence. Might I give an instance which will show the character of the alleged facts placed before the House to-day. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) read a letter which he said came from a most reliable person. He did not happen to mention the name of this very reliable person, but the subject matter of the letter was an accusation against the Department of the Interior for having appointed a man named Duggan to a position in the Land Titles office at Calgary or Regina or somewhere else. What particular crime this man committed I forget, but probably he had voted Grit at the preceding election and this was his reward. Well, it would surprise my hon. friend to know that this government has no authority to appoint Mr. Duggan or anybody else to a position in the Land Titles office at Calgary or elsewhere in the west. As a specimen of the credible statements made by the reliable friends of hon. gentlemen opposite this will stand. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was good enough to read the law with regard to the responsibilities of public officials and applied the law as he read it, to the case of Mr. Smith. But he did not read the law as it is to-day, but as we hope it will be.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. minister say that it differs in any way from the law as it is?

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend will not interrupt I shall be much obliged.

Mr. LENNOX. Does he mean to say that what is proposed to be incorporated in the new Act is not what is in the present Act?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will be content to accept the statements as I make them.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know about that.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not suggesting that I have any hope of convincing the hon. gentleman. The law, as it is at present, is as follows:

> No person employed in or under the Department of the Interior shall purchase any Dominion land except under the authority of the Governor in Council or shall locate military or other bounty land warrants, or land scrip, or act as agent of any other person in such behalf; and no person so employed shall disclose to any person, except his superior officer, any discovery made by him or by any other officer of the Department of the Interior, or any other information in his possession in relation to Dominion lands, until such discovery or information has been reported to the minister, and his permission for such disclosure has been obtained.

My hon. friend assumes that under this section Mr. Smith should be dismissed from his position. Does he know that Mr. Smith, in the discharge of his duties as immigration commissioner—one of his duties being to give information to people going into the western country with the view of directing them to such parts of the country as shall be best suited to them—has to take information from the homestead inspectors and land agents and other officers of the government in that connection and divulge it to people who may be looking for land. Therefore, Mr. Smith is not under any liability to dismissal, according to the reading of this section in the duties he performs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He is entitled to that, the minister thinks, for the purposes of his private speculations.

Mr. OLIVER. Again I would ask my hon. friend to permit me to make my own statement and he will be at liberty to make his.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree that the minister should not be interrupted.

Mr. OLIVER. I say that this man has certain duties to perform and those duties do not render him liable to the condemnation which hon. gentlemen opposite want this House to pronounce against him. I do not know that it is necessary that I should traverse the case which has been brought before the House, but since my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) read from a newspaper, published somewhere in the United States, an article on this matter, let me read from a newspaper published in Toronto, the Toronto 'World,' a special despatch from Winnipeg dated October 21:

'SKINNED' IN A LAND DEAL—YANKEES BRING LAWSUIT.

Vermont Millionaires Charge Government Agent with Misrepresentation.

Winnipeg, Oct. 21.—(Special.)—A case comes before the high court to-morrow which promises to have most sensational developments, as it involves J. Obed Smith, government immigration commissioner, in a big land deal.

A. B. Steele, West Derby; Max L. Powell and A. B. Buell, Burlington, millionaire Vermont lumbermen, have brought suit against Smith and a real estate agent named Pritchard, for $23,000. They claim that Mr. Smith misrepresented to them a tract of 54,000 acres of land which they secured through him and Pritchard.

The Americans state that the cream of the land had been culled over and that the tract they got was far from what was represented. They have engaged the best counsel in the city, and are preparing to fight the case to a finish. They say that if they lose the suit here they will draw the attention of the American consul at Ottawa to the case and at least endeavour to have Smith removed.

The House can judge in whose interest this discussion has been brought up to-day. As to the rights of Mr. Smith to traffic in land, I do not know what my hon. friends have been placing before the public if it is not that this gentleman because he is in the employment of this government must not engage in land transactions. In other words, a man who is in the employ of the government must not engage in any other business. I submit that if this is a good rule it is a rule that has never been acted on by any government in any country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is applied to postmasters who receive over $1,000.

Mr. OLIVER. No, I do not think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is so stated over and over again.

Mr OLIVER. I think not; I think my hon. friend will have to revise his information on that point. I am stating the broad, general principle that we have no right to control over the private acts of a private person, and when we come to undertake to interfere with the rights of a private citizen in transacting private business we take a very serious responsibility. If it is asserted that Mr. Smith has no right to buy or sell land that is not government land—and it is not alleged that this is government land, it is private land—I am going to ask my hon. friend opposite in what position are hon. members of parliament sitting on that side of the House in regard to land transactions which have been discussed in this House? If Mr. Smith has no rights as a private citizen, neither have other people, and surely the obligations of a member of parliament are just as important and just as delicate as the obligations of an employee of the government and of parliament. Mr. Smith is one of the most important public officials in that western country. It is under Mr. Smith, and very largely by reason of his efforts and directions, that the population of those three western provinces has doubled within the past six years, has increased from 400,000 to 800,000. Mr. Smith stands at the gateway of that country and the increase of population there very largely passes under his control or under his review. That he has discharged his duties well, that increase is all the evidence that this country needs.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the North Atlantic Trading Company were entitled to that credit?

Mr. BERGERON. What about Preston?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Preston and the North Atlantic Trading Company have played their respective parts.

Mr. SPROULE. And passed off the stage.

Mr. OLIVER. Just as Mr. Smith has played his part. Each of these officials of the government has played his part as the general policy of the government has played its part, and the result has been a stupendous success. I submit that when hon. gentlemen ask the government of this country to condemn an official with such a record as that of Mr. Smith, in the discharge of his public duties, because of an alleged quotation from evidence said to have been given, I say that they are asking something that it not reasonable, that is outrageous and carries with it its own condemnation. If Mr. Smith has done wrong the case has been before the courts, and a judgment has been given which Mr. Smith is not prepared to accept and the people who have taken out the judgment do not dare to put Mr. Smith in a position to appeal his case. They have been careful not to do it until their friends here in this House had an opportunity to drag Mr. Smith's name with all the discredit they can give it before this House and the country. This is a kind of politics, a kind of political warfare, that I

do not imagine will receive any but that credit which properly belongs to it before an intelligent and progressive country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). The facts which are relevant to this case have been dwelt on at considerable length and I do not propose to repeat them. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), who has just taken his seat, carefully avoided any reply to my question. He stated that Mr. Smith is a man of great energy, that a great deal of immigration which the governmen have been attributing to Mr. Preston and the North Atlantic Trading Company is really due to Mr. Smith. That is entirely beside the case.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. gentleman ought to quote fairly. I said that each had played his part, and that statement caused a great deal of risibility among our hon. friends opposite. I did not say that Mr. Smith was entitled to all the credit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman did not state exactly to what 'part' he referred. The question is not as to Mr. Smith's qualifications as an immigration agent. We are not attacking him on the ground that he has not been active in a certain way; I do not know whether that is the case or not. There is no evidence on the subject before the House except the statement of the minister. We are quarrelling with Mr. Smith's conduct for two reasons. In the first place because, being an officer of this government brought into the most delicate relations with settlers in that country who are seeking lands, he has seen fit to go into land speculation himself, and in the second place we are quarrelling with him because from his own sworn admission, against which I presume he does not intend to appeal, he has been using government officials to make reports for him in order that he might make money on the side. The minister stated that this gentleman has the right to use the reports of government officials for the purpose of affording information to intending settlers. I asked him whether he undertook, standing here, as a trustee for the people of Canada, to announce to the officials of the government throughout this country and especially to his own officials in the west that one of them is at liberty to make use of his position, to make use of other government officials and of official information for the purpose of carrying his private business; and the hon. gentleman exercised a great deal of discretion by informing me that he was going to make his speech and he did make his speech, which, however, is not very relevant to the subject. In the course of his speech he did not venture one word of reply to that question.

Mr. OLIVER. I will reply now if the hon. gentleman wishes. All I have to say is that each case will have to rest on its merits.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, on what kind of merits does this case rest? The minister has not made us acquainted with any merits on which this case rests.

Mr. OLIVER. The matter has been discussed before the courts and I am awaiting the judgment of the court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The judgment of the court has nothing at all to do with it; it would not make the slightest difference from a public standpoint which way the judgment went. I would be prepared to take exactly the same position, as far as this case is concerned, if Judge Mathers and the Court of Appeal had pronounced unanimously in favour of Mr. Smith on the question of misrepresentation. That is not the point. The only matter of concern, from a public standpoint is whether or not this man, enjoying a salary of $3,000 per annum, and supposed to devote his whole time to the public service and brought into these delicate relations with intending settlers, is to be permitted, in the first place, to engage in land speculations which must interfere with his public duties, and in the second place, to use government officials and official information in order—using his own words—that he may 'make money on the side.' That is the question, and not any question which is to be argued before the courts of the province of Manitoba. The minister says that each case must rest on its merits. That is a mere evasion, just as the minister's remark to me a moment ago was a pure evasion of the question which he dare not answer. By the vote which he will give in a little while, he will declare, and summon his followers to declare, that these men are entitled, notwithstanding that they are officials of this government, to make use of their public position, in violation of their duty, to promote their private gain. That is what this man has stated in this case, and he has stated it in no equivocal terms:

> You have made use of government officials to make reports for you in order that you might make money on the side?
>
> Yes, that is true.

That is not the statement of a hostile witness, it is the statement of the man himself whose conduct we are discussing. As I said before, I presume that he is not appealing to the Supreme Court of Manitoba against his own sworn statement in the courts of that province before a judge of the land and in the presence of his counsel. There is no appeal, so far as this case is concerned, in respect of that which alone concerns the public interest. The only question we have to consider to-day, as my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) said, is whether this government official in the west, brought into these delicate relations with

men who are proposing to acquire homesteads in that country, and with men who are going there not merely for the purpose of homesteading but for the purpose of purchasing land, shall not only carry on his work as commissioner of immigration, but shall also carry on land deals and speculations for the benefit of himself alone, and shall do that, not by means of information secured by himself or through servants employed by himself, but by utilizing for that purpose government officials who have handed in their reports to him and by means of official information so acquired by him. If that is the principle upon which the government propose to carry on the public service of this country, well and good—it is only right and just that we should understand that that principle is boldly and unblushingly allowed by the Minister of the Interior, and that he and his followers propose to place themselves on record to-day in confirmation of such a position, absolutely against any recognized principle of constitutional government and absolutely against principles which have been proclaimed in this House by ministers of the Crown. The other cases, I suppose, were considered 'upon their merits.' For example, the postmaster at Cannington happened to be a Conservative appointment. He had a salary of $1,000 a year, and was interested in some business which he did not openly carry on. He was dismissed by this government, as I recollect the record—and I think I recollect it very well—solely because he was interested in that business; and the principle was laid down that a postmaster receiving a salary for his whole time should be dismissed if it were ascertained that he was interested in any other business even though he had not allowed that business to interfere with his public duties. Said the Postmaster General of that day, on March 19, 1906:

> It is, and always has been the policy and practice of the department to require postmasters to give personal attention to the duties of their offices, and when a post office is sufficiently important to call for the full time and attention of the postmaster, and the salary adequate for his maintenance, it is considered undersirable that he should engage in any other business.

That was the only ground for the dismissal of that postmaster. Yet this officer in Winnipeg has a salary of $3,000 a year, and I think it will be conceded that the duties of his office are sufficiently great and sufficiently important to require his whole time and attention, and yet he is permitted, according to the principle laid down on the other side, to engage in business which must take his time from his official duties; in short, he and every other officer of the Department of the Interior, according to the doctrine laid down, are to be permitted to carry on business for their private gain, to take the necessary time from their official duties and also to utilize other employees of the government and official information for the purposes of their private business. That is a new doctrine and a new principle. It may have been carried out in practice by this administration up to the present time—and I believe it has in some cases—but it has never been so boldly and unblushingly avowed as in this House to-day by hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). This debate has taken a turn which was not anticipated by me, at all events, on listening to the remarks of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who brought the subject to the attention of the House. As I understood his remarks that hon. gentleman called the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the conduct of one of his subordinates which he thought at variance with the proper discharge of the duties entrusted to him. Had the debate been confined to that there would not have been much fault to find, and we could answer the hon. gentleman to his satisfaction. But the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) went further and moved this resolution, as an amendment to the motion before the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means:

> The government ought not to continue in office public servants who, in violation of their duty, make use of their official positions, to promote their private interests.

As an abstract proposition there is no objection to this. Everybody will agree to the doctrine that the government ought not to continue in office public servants whose conduct is as here described. If it were to come before us as an abstract proposition, I would have no hesitation to saying 'yea' to the declaration of the hon. member for West Algoma. But we cannot forget that this amendment comes after a debate, which has been going on for some time, in which one of the officers of the government, Mr. J. Obed Smith, commissioner for immigration in Winnipeg, has been under discussion, and, to some extent, under censure. If we were to accept this motion at the present time, it would be an admission on the part of the government that we agree to the strictures passed upon Mr. Smith; and, for my part, I am very far from being disposed to agree to anything of the kind. I say in all candour—and I think I shall be able to show—that nothing has been made out against Mr. Smith in his official capacity. Mr. Smith has been in office for a great many years, and so far as my information goes, he is one of the best officers we have in the department. I never heard, up to two days ago, that any charge was ever made against him. I was quite surprised to learn in the course of a conversation I had with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) after a note I had received from my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr.

Northrup) stating that he intended bringing this motion forward—that any charge had been made against Mr. Smith.

Let us review the accusations made against him to-day. I am ready to accept the version given by the hon. member for East Hastings, with very few exceptions. Mr. Smith was brought into a lawsuit by certain parties to whom he had sold land, and a judgment was rendered against him in the court which tried the case. As far as I understand there has been an expression of opinion by a judge but as far as I understand also there has been no formal judgment and the case is not finally disposed of. From the speech of my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Adamson) I understand that Mr. Smith's lawyers have advised him to take the case to the court of appeal and certainly I am not surprised at that. I would be surprised if the statements which have been made in this case were not brought to a superior tribunal there to have another hearing. As far as the circumstances reveal the facts to us we find that Mr. Smith had a land transaction with somebody and that one of the conditions of the sale—at all events that was the contention of the plaintiffs—was that there should be a whole, entire block of land which had been bought by Mr. Smith and his associates and that it turned out that the whole block of land which he had bought was not sold to the purchasers, whereas they had the intention of purchasing the whole block. Upon this condition of the contract which it appears was an element of the case, the action was brought and it developed that in regard to this condition, at all events, there was no written contract. It was simply a verbal agreement, affirmed on the one side and denied on the other. In a matter of this kind it is not surprising that the mind of one judge might be one way while possibly the mind of another judge might be the other way. Every one knows how dangerous it is to rely upon verbal agreements and if that was a condition essential to the contract my surprise is that the purchasers, who must have been keen business men, were satisfied with a verbal agreement rather than with a written condition in the contract. I do not know that there is anything to justify the conclusion that Mr. Smith has violated the contract which he entered into. So far as I can see I think that nobody can gainsay the conclusion at which I have arrived. But, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asks: 'Are you going to allow one of your officers to enter into land speculations? Is he not paid to discharge his duties and is it consistent with his duty that he should be allowed to traffic in land? There can be no two ways of looking at that. I do not admit that Mr. Smith or any officer of this government can engage in any other occupation than the one which he is paid for. He is paid to give all his time to his office whether it be that of the Commissioner of Immigration or any other office. When we give a salary to a man we expect to have all his time, but would it be reasonably pretended, and as I understand it that is the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that a man in the service of the government is not to have the same liberty as any one else to make an investment if he wishes to do so in land, or stock or anything else? Is that the position of hon. gentlemen opposite? If it is, it is a position which is not tenable. It is not common sense. Every man in the community as far as that goes is allowed, outside of his occupation, to engage in a legitimate transaction, but it is a very different thing for a man occasionally to enter into a transaction of some kind in which he has no management from going into that business as an occupation. If it were proved to us that Mr. Smith is a trafficker, a merchant, or a trader in land then I would say certainly you must be allowed to go into that, but if it be an isolated transaction, if it be a thing that occurs once in awhile, I do not know that a man in the civil service ought to be placed on any other footing than any other member of the community.

I can not see the relevancy of this case to the case which was mentioned by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition a moment ago in regard to the position of a postmaster. A postmaster who receives the sum of $1,000 a year as salary is expected to give all his time to his office. If he does not receive $1,000 a year in salary he may engage in other business, but if he receives more than $1,000 then he is expected to give all his time to his office. His remuneration is supposed to be sufficient to justify us in exacting from him that he shall give all his time to his duties and that he shall have no other occupation. But, supposing a postmaster receives $1,000 or $2,000 or $500, nobody pretends that it is not open to him, as it is open to me, or to any other member of the community, to engage in an isolated transaction, I do not know that Mr. Smith has done anything else. It does not appear that Mr. Smith is a trader in land. It does not appear that he does not attend to the duties of his office, but what appears is simply that this gentleman, with some other parties, upon one occasion bought and sold some land. After all, when we have an isolated transaction of that kind, I do not know that any one could reasonably tell us that he has violated the duties of his office and that he has made himself liable to censure or dismissal. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) stated that, answering under oath, Mr. Smith admitted that he had received information from his subordinate and that he had pro-

fited by it. If Mr. Smith had made such an admission it would be a matter which we would have to look into, but on a reference to the answer which was given by Mr. Smith, I do not so interpret it, nor do I think that the answer which he gave is liable to such an interpretation. As I understand it he might have received information out of which he might have profited and I dare say that every man who is a land agent may certainly profit by such information if he chooses to do so. But, I do not admit that he made the admission that he actually profitted by information obtained from a subordinate officer. I think my hon. friend from East Hastings will agree with me when I say—and in this I appeal to his sense of fairness—that it is not right or fair to any man who gives evidence of that kind to cull out a sentence from his evidence and quote it against him. There may be other statements which qualify it, which give another colour to this sentence and therefore to take a sentence simply out of a deposition which covers twenty or thirty pages of paper and hold it up and say this is what you said and judge this man by it is not fair to the party impugned. We have a right to see the whole of his evidence, to see if there are any qualifications, to judge of it in its entirety, because, to take only one sentence, might give an impression which reverses the meaning intended to be conveyed. I must say in all candour to my hon. friend from East Hastings who usually exhibits fairness in taking part in the debates in this House, that I do not think he displays his usual fairness when he comes before this House and asks it to condemn a man simply from a sentence culled from his evidence. In view of the circumstances as they appear to us, I can have no hesitation whatever in coming to the conclusion that the motion moved by the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) should be voted down.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I propose to simply follow closely the argument made by the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and to discuss his positions leaving the extraneous matters alone. In the first place, as he is entitled to do, he raises a presumption in favour of Mr. Obed. Smith by saying that Mr. Smith is an old officer, a good officer and that there have been no faults found with him. That is a proper proceeding. What a man has made of his office work, of his character and the like of that goes to prove him all right until the special point is brought up in which he has committed a fault. Presumptively, therefore, the right hon. gentleman made a case in favour of Mr. Smith in his very first sentence. But, when it comes down a little later what is really the first thing that appears ? The first thing that appears is that Mr. Smith, the Dominion commissioner, a man whose office is very exigent, whose duties are manifold and multiplex, whose energy and intensity of service are such in the position that he holds that it would tax even such a good and able man as Mr. Smith if he gave all his time and energy to the work of his office. I think that is a fair inference to follow from what the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and the right hon. Prime Minister both said.

Suddenly, we find in a lawsuit which is brought, that this official, Mr. Obed Smith, with so many duties of such importance devolving upon him, figures as a public land agent. Can there be any exception taken to that statement ? My right hon. friend ingeniously, but fairly, states that no matter whether a man is an official of this government or not, and no matter whether his duties be light or heavy, or his pay great or small, you cannot debar him from making a private investment. Certainly you cannot. Mr. Obed Smith, or any Dominion official, had a perfect right to buy a home for himself, or to buy a lot of land in the city of Winnipeg, or to make an investment anywhere he pleased. That is his own private business. But, will my hon. friend maintain that in this transaction, Mr. Obed Smith is making a private investment ; that he is simply a man exercising his right to invest his money as he pleases ? Certainly not. Mr. Obed Smith appears in a large transaction, he is the agent in the disposal of over 50,000 acres of land ; he appears in the position of a public agent, acting for gentlemen who are well known as investors and speculators in Northwest lands. These gentlemen find in Mr. Smith an agent whom they are able to enlist in their service in this large transaction. That, is far removed from the kind of private investment that my right hon. friend pleaded for, and which it is the right of any official of the government to exercise if he thinks fit. But, would my right hon. friend say, in relation to a transaction like this, that it is a fair inference that this was the only land transaction in which Mr. Obed Smith was engaged. Prima facie, it would not be a reasonable thing that a private individual discharging his official duties and his official duties alone, and making a little private investment once in a while, should be picked out by large land dealers to carry on a transaction involving 50,000 acres. That at once places Mr. Obed Smith out of the category of the occasional private investors, and it elevates him as a man of mark for men who wish to speculate in lands in the Northwest, to go to in order to negotiate deals, with the idea of mutual profits. My right hon. friend spent a lot of time in tearing out all the padding in the lawsuit which took place. But I think my right hon. friend was answered before he made

his speech. It is absolutely immaterial to this case, as to whether there was a lawsuit, as to whether there was a judgment, or, as to whether there was not. That is not the question which is being debated ; that is not the question which has to be decided here. The question is simply this : Does it appear from the records, that Mr. Obed Smith, while he was the Dominion commissioner of immigration, and drawing $3,000 a year salary, was in such a land transaction as has been described, and that he was making himself the agent and negotiator in the deal, with of course the expectation of getting profit,—and any man who undertakes to negotiate a sale of land is entitled to make his profits thereby. But let us see what appears by the record. The right hon. gentleman said that if it were an isolated case it might be condoned, but he would condemn it if it were not an isolated case. Well, Mr. Obed Smith, cross-examined by Mr. Wilson, deposed :

Q. Who was Mr. Riddington who sent you this report ?—A. One of the homestead inspectors up there.

Q. An employee of the Dominion government ?—A. Yes.

Q. Paid by salary ?—A. Yes, paid by salary.

Q. And you have made use of government officials to make reports for you in order that you might make money on the side ?—A. Yes, that is true.

Now, that appears upon the record. Take away all the rest,—as to the evidence, as to the judgment, as to it being a case which is now appealed—there is the admission on oath by Mr. Smith himself, that he made use of government officials, over whom he had authority. You may say that this official is not in the same department as Mr. Smith, but nobody believes but that Mr. Obed Smith, in his position, does have an authority—whether it be moral or official—and that he used that authority in this case to get information, and to give away original reports which he got from paid officers of the government in order to assist him in making a land deal out of which he was to profit. The Prime Minister went just as far as he could go when he said, that an official of this kind cannot engage in any but his official business for which he is paid, and limiting such an official definitely to a private investment which he may make from time to time, but utterly cutting out the business of a trader in any particular, and in this respect that of a trader in land. The case of the postmaster at Cannington has been brought into this discussion. It is a case in point. The postmaster at Cannington had a salary of $1,000 a year. He was engaged in assisting some relative of his in the grocery business. He was dismissed, and the reason given for his dismissal was, that being paid a salary of $1,000, it was his duty to attend to the postmastership and not to engage in any extraneous business. If that be the rule to apply to one government official who has a salary of $1,000, is it not a rule which ought absolutely to apply to another government official who has a salary of $3,000 and whose duties are much more responsible and much more multifarious, than the duties of the Cannington postmaster. But the Cannington postmaster had to get out of his office because he assisted his brother in the grocery business and was supposed to have some interest in it—although it has been proven fully this session that he had no beneficiary interest in it, and that his connection with it was by reason of a loan made by him, or something of that kind. Prima facie, Mr. Obed Smith appears as a trader in lands ; he appears as a trader in lands on his own admission; he appears as having availed himself of the reports of Dominion officials in order to further his trading in lands. I do not think it can be taken as an isolated case of private investment at all. It is the case of a public negotiator of land sales. The right hon. gentleman ended by saying that he could not condemn Mr. Smith on the statements that had been made, and on the evidence such as it was, before the House. But, having a prima facie case before him in which this Dominion official appears as a negotiator in the sale of 50,000 acres of land, the Prime Minister refrained entirely from giving this House any intimation that he, or the Minister of the Interior, would take occasion to look into this matter, and would by investigations find out, whether or not Mr. Smith was in the habit of negotiating in land deals of this kind, or whether or not this was an isolated case.

I think the least that the minister could have done was to have given that statement to the House, that inasmuch as evidence came out which implicated Mr. Smith in a wholesale transaction in lands, which put him prima facie in the position of being a trader in lands, of doing the thing more than once, of doing it often, may be habitually, the matter should be looked into most carefully and investigation put on foot to find out just what position Mr. Smith had been taking during the last five or six years with reference to the negotiation and selling of land in the Northwest. I think that is the least the Prime Minister could have done to set this matter on a proper footing. Going out as it does, the statement made by the Minister of the Interior, which was full and explicit, and had no ifs or ands about it, which was not limited at all as was the statement of the Prime Minister, that it is the perfect right of an official of this government, if he wishes, privately and outside of his duties, and in connection with the carrying on of his office, to engage in these transactions on the side, gives carte blanche to all the government employees in the Dominion of Canada to go into private speculation and to use their official positions in connection

therewith. Translate this into all the branches of the Department of the Interior, let the hordes of men engaged in carrying on the Indians affairs of this country, the men engaged in the Yukon, the men engaged in the homestead business, the men engaged in the inspection of lands and the reporting on lands—let all the men throughout the whole Interior Department know that they have carte blanche from the minister, whilst being paid their salaries and getting intimate information as officers of the government in connection with their special duties, to use such information in order to make private investments and to carry on private transactions as go-betweens with others, and the administration of that department in the future will be much more difficult than it is at the present time. Let this matter be left just where it is by the Minister of the Interior and the Prime Minister, and you have done more to demoralize the public service of this country, to make it inefficient and unreliable, than any action that has taken place in this parliament so far with reference to the officials of the country.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the merits of the question now before the House, but to draw your attention and the attention of the House to what I consider to be a grave departure from the practice that obtains in the British parliament in reference to the conduct of public officers. I have heard the deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs attacked when he had a seat on the floor of this House advising his minister, and had no opportunity of defending himself; I have heard Mr. Preston attacked in this House; and now I hear Mr. J. Obed Smith attacked in this House. In the British parliament no such attack could be made. Under the rules of the British House of Commons, when an hon. member desires to attack a civil servant, he must move for a committee of inquiry, where the civil servant will have an opportunity of appearing and defending himself. Now, it does not appear to me to be British fair play to attack an officer of this government on the floor of the House where he has not the slightest opportunity of defending himself. I do not wish to raise the point of order at the present time, but I think the time has arrived when this House should take the position that the civil service of the country should not be attacked in the House of Commons. I wish to quote one or two precedents in regard to the practice in the British House of Commons. Mr. Todd has laid it down on page 215, volume II, as follows:

It is competent to any member of the legislature to call the attention of parliament to abuses or irregularities in the conduct of business in any department of state; but the intention to submit a cause of complaint to the notice of either House ought first to be communicated to the department concerned, so as to afford an opportunity for the redress of a particular grievance. If no remedy be thus obtainable, it would be proper to appeal to the House to appoint a committee of inquiry.

(Todd, volume 2, page 215).

That practice is confirmed by other authorities who lay down the rule that it is not competent in the House of Commons to discuss the conduct of civil servants, they being responsible only to the political heads of the department who are on the floor of the House to answer for themselves. A case in point occurred in the year 1873, when a charge was made against a Mr. Scudamore, of the Post Office Department of Great Britain. A committee of inquiry was appointed, which reported a finding against Mr. Scudamore, and a resolution was introduced into the House denouncing the Post Office Department. Mr. Gladstone, in reply to the hon. member who introduced the resolution, spoke as follows '(Hansard' of 1873, p. 1229):

The hon. gentleman has criticised—and very naturally from his point of view—the conduct of the Postmaster General, but he does not confine his motion to the conduct of the Postmaster General. He extends it to the entire department, and both in the interpretation of the terms of the motion and in the speech of the hon. gentleman I read a strong censure on Mr. Scudamore. To censure the post office is not the phrase a man would adopt if he meant to pass a censure on the Postmaster General exclusively; and the attack on the post office dictinctly includes an attack upon Mr. Scudamore. Now, Mr. Scudamore is a very proper subject for animadversion, if he has done wrong. in the report of the committee, but he is not a fit subject for the censure of this House. It is the political officers of this House who stand between the permanent officers and its censure.

The committee before whom Mr. Scudamore was in a position to defend himself, had a right to censure him, but the House of Commons has not such right because he had no opportunity of appearing before it in his own defence.

Mr. Scudamore has committed a great error but that great error is, in my judgment, balanced by still greater services and upon the merits of this case I refuse to censure Mr. Scudamore. What I stand upon, with those who are not so well aware as myself of the great services of Mr. Scudamore, is that we should do wrong to adopt a motion which does not confine the sweep of its censure to political officers but includes within it these important permanent servants of the post office.

I think that the rule is absolutely laid down in this connection that parliament has no right to criticise a public servant of this country. There is a way of reaching these public servants when they do wrong, but it is hardly fair that a member

of this House should get up and attack civil servants who have no opportunity of defending themselves.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is not an attack on civil servants we are making, but an attack upon responsible ministers of the Crown for allowing their officials to do wrong, and in this we are quite within our rights. We are laying a charge against the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) for having allowed his officials to depart from their well understood duty, and parliament is the proper place in which to lay that charge. Was not the same course followed in 1893 in that long inquiry against the Department of the Interior which was promoted by hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then in opposition? Did they not attack government officials then? They cited man after man in the department. Mr. Arnoldi, because he took a couple of brass dogs as a gift, was driven out of the civil service. These hon. gentlemen opposite were loud in their denunciations of the department because Mr. Arnoldi accepted that gift from a company from which he obtained supplies for the department.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I was not in the House in 1893, but I was old enough then to read the discussions. All this took place in the Public Accounts Committee where Mr. Arnoldi had an opportunity of defending himself.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all, the charge was made in this House, and Mr. Arnoldi could not come here. True he was brought before the Public Accounts Committee where he was questioned and cross-questioned by the hon. gentleman's friends and where he admitted like a man what he had done. Was there anything disgraceful in that, yet these hon. gentlemen endeavoured to hold the Minister of the Interior of that day responsible and to pass a vote of censure on the government because that had been done. Yet we have this hon. gentleman telling us to-day that the course we have taken is an improper one because it is an attack on officials. Sir, it is an attack on the responsible head of the department, and the motion is a vote of ensure on him for having allowed improper conduct to take place. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has asked where are all these scandals. Why, we have cited one after another this session—land scandals, grazing lease scandals, timber scandals—all in the Department of the Interior. And in each case we attacked the department and held it responsible for the conduct of its officials.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Ross) after coming down and getting his instructions from the Minister of the Interior, who no doubt consulted with the First Minister—

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I had no instructions from the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was in the House in 1893, when the hon. gentleman tells us he was old enough to read the discussions that then took place, and I am surprised that the right hon. First Minister should allow one of his supporters to take the position that we have not the right to charge the officials of any department with wrong doing. Why, in 1893 the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of Customs and others of their colleagues, who were then in opposition, from day to day made charges against civil servants. And what did the First Minister of that day do? Did he put up a supporter to say that this was the kind of thing which the British House of Commons would not allow? Not at all; he took an entirely different course. But this government is in a different position. The officials who are doing their dirty work throughout the length and breadth of this land are their masters and the government dare not dismiss them. They have the government by the throat. But how was it with the late government of which Sir John Thompson was First Minister? Sir John Thompson then said: Bring on your charges and we shall dismiss every civil servant against whom any wrong-doing is proven. Why the most frivolous charges were brought by hon. gentlemen opposite against these civil servants. They even charged wrong doing because some of these officials took writing home at night and did it during extra hours and got extra pay. That was a charge made against them and some of them were dismissed on that ground. But these gentlemen have so added to the staffs of the various departments that there is a congestion of officials, and where a few dollars extra pay were earned by the civil servants of these days doing a little extra work at their homes after hours, we have thousands of dollars spent on permanent employees who could very well be dispensed with. The First Minister of that day did not take the position which the right hon. gentleman has taken. He did not put up one of his supporters and give him instructions.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I received no instructions from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). The First Minister did not put me up. I got up on my own volition, and I must ask the chief whip of the Conservative party (Mr. Taylor) to withdraw that statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman says he did not receive any instructions, but we on this side knew for some time that he was going to be the one who would be

called on to reply. He had been consulting with the Minister of the Interior. Whether he received instructions or not—and of course I accept his word—he took his inspiration from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). But I am just drawing a comparison between the attitude taken by this government, who know that their officials are doing wrong, but who are afraid to chastise them, and the attitude taken by the late lamented Sir John Thompson when, as First Minister, he challenged the opposition to bring on their charges and he would investigate every one, and if any official were found guilty of wrong doing he would dismiss him from the service. That is not the position that the Prime Minister to-day is taking. It is pointed out to him day after day that his officials are doing wrong and in place of dismissing them he promotes them at increased salaries.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Does my hon. friend consider the resolution introduced by the member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) a charge against Mr. Smith ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not considering the resolution, I was answering the speech of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross).

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings' and Albert). The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) has cited some precedents in the British House of Commons. He claims that a different procedure should have been had with respect to this matter, and that the resolution as presented to the House by the hon. member for West Algoma is a charge against a certain civil servant, Mr. J. Obed Smith. Now, Sir, there is no mention of Mr. Smith or any other civil servant in the resolution. His name has been mentioned as an incident in connection with the discussion. The hon. gentleman from Yale-Cariboo finds fault with the hon. member for West Algoma because he did not move for a committee of investigation with respect to this matter and as I say he cites certain precedents in the British House of Commons ; but my hon. friend need not have gone very far in his research, he might have looked at 'Hansard' of last session and on page 5571 he would see that a committee of this House was moved for with respect to a civil servant and that the motion was voted down by a large majority ; the vote stood 41 for the investigation and 88 against. The motion, after reciting the charges against this particular civil servant, wound up :

> That in the opinion of this House the said Philip Wagner should be forthwith dismissed, or if he denies the truth of the said charges and allegations, an immediate investigation should be held into the matter aforesaid.

Now, if this man made denial of the charges against him—and they were made on the record of convictions of the court against him—if he denied these allegations then we asked for a committee of investigation. Did we get it ? It was voted down by 41 to 88. The hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) was not in his seat but he was paired as voting against the motion. But his leader, the leader of the government, voted against the motion refusing the committee of investigation asked for. There was one of the most glaring cases where it was shown that a man, an official in the immigration branch of the Interior Department who had to do intimately and closely with the immigrants coming into the country, people who could not speak English, an interpreter and therefore a man upon whom these new immigrants must lean with the utmost confidence, had so far betrayed the confidence of these men that twice he had been convicted of taking money from them under false pretenses, and yet an inquiry into his conduct was absolutely refused. We can quite understand how the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) would think there had not been that change of heart on the part of the government which would be necessary to make them assume a different attitude this year from their attitude last year with respect to this investigation and therefore he proposed the motion in the manner in which he did.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). The right hon. gentleman who leads the House appealed to me to be fair in any statements I made against Mr. Smith or in connection with this case. I certainly wish to be fair. The Prime Minister took the ground that it is not a fair thing to take an isolated sentence from a document, from the evidence in the case, and to judge the witness from that one sentence. Partially I agree and partially I disagree with this statement. I can quite understand that under certain circumstances it would be most unfair to take an isolated sentence which is perhaps explained away and destroyed in effect by the context. In other circumstances it might be fair to take an isolated sentence which might be a straight question and answer. There are several answers given by Mr. Smith in the certified copy of the evidence, not in a fugitive scrap of evidence as the Minister of the Interior would imply—where statements are made by Mr. Smith that, on a fair reading, I think tell against Mr. Smith. At the same time there was a context which certainly modified what was said and I did not read any of these statements to the House. But the principal statement I read and which I think justified the position I took is not modified by any context or by any thing else in the evidence. It is a clear and distinct statement and was I think read to the House before. I take the liberty of reading it now and if the right hon. gentleman can show a line in it which in any way modifies the direct answer given by Mr. Smith or which

should lead a member to change his opinion, I am quite prepared to accept the correction and to change the opinion I formed after reading the questions and answers :

By Mr. Wilson : Who is Mr. Riddington who sent you this report ?—A. One of the homestead inspectors up there.

Q. An employee of the Dominion government ?—A. Yes.

Q. Paid by salary ?—A. Yes, paid by salary.

Q. And you have made use of government officials to make reports for you in order that you might make money on the side ?—A. Yes, that is true.

Q. And in making these copies of reports in the exhibit, did you also make——

And then he was stopped by the lawyer on the other side. So that I submit that these are clear cut questions and answers and that unless Mr. Smith can come forward and say he entirely misunderstood the questions and did not intend to give the answers he did, the case is proved against him. As regards the charge made that we should not attack Mr. Smith here, in the first place we are not attacking him, there is no charge against Mr. Smith.

Mr. SPROULE. We are attacking the Department of the Interior.

Mr. NORTHRUP. We are attacking the department for not looking after its duty and the motion before the House is a fair attack on the department if they did not do their duty. Mr. Smith is simply an incident in the case to show that the minister did not do his duty and even when instances of malfeasance in office are brought to his attention he refused to banish the official and continued the official in office. The evidence is cited in proof of this case and I venture to say that what has been said about the cases in England falls wholly to the ground. The member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) spoke as if for the first time in parliament an attack of this kind was made on civil servants. Let me refer to an attack made years ago by a gentleman whose authority I think the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) will admit, at a time when the Conservative government occupied the treasury benches. This is what was said at that time, speaking of appointments to the bench :

I do not say that all the appointments which have been made by the present government have been bad but I say unhesitatingly that the present government, not the government of 20 years ago, but the government which came into office after Mr. Mackenzie's downfall, have appointed men who had no other qualification for the position than the fact that they had been mere party hacks.

That is an attack made on the judges of the bench in 1893. And that same speaker further down goes on :

The Senate is now composed very much as was the legislative council of the province of Quebec at one time, when, out of twenty-four members, there was only one Liberal. This is why the work of the bench has been degraded, as it has been. It is asserted and hon. gentlemen know the names as well as I do, that judges of the province of Quebec have paid for their appointments. It is asserted, and I believe the truth will be forthcoming some day, that judges contributed to the election fund of the Conservative party at the last election. This is a statement current in the streets of Montreal and Quebec, and I believe, moreover, the fact will be proved before many months have passed over. . . . These are the reasons why my hon. friend has spoken as he has to-night. Certainly the bench should be respected, but if the bench has to be respected, let the appointments be made, not for considerations of politics, but simply for legal qualifications.

These are the words of an attack on the bench made in 1893, by a gentleman who then bore the name of Mr. Laurier. Now, I do not wish to add anything to what has been said, save this: The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) seemed to complain that no amendment was made when I first brought this subject to the attention of the House. I may tell the right hon. gentleman that, at that time, it was not decided that any motion should be made. It was desired to know what defence the Minister of the Interior had to this charge, and, if the minister would give such a defence that we should know where the government stood, that would be the end of it. But after several hon. gentlemen had spoken, the motion was made. And then the Minister of the Interior rose and told us exactly what we had expected—that he had not intended to speak, and would not have spoken had not this motion been made. When I gave the hon. gentleman notice, I had no intention or expectation of my presentation of the case being followed by a motion—it was my intention simply to bring the matter to the attention of the House. But when it turned out that the minister declined to treat even with the courtesy of an answer charges which to us seemed serious charges, then, and not till then, it was decided that a motion should be made.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Boyce.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lefurgey,
Ames,	Lennox,
Armstrong,	Macdonell,
Avery,	MacLaren,
Barker,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Barr,	McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Bennett,	Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Bergeron,	Monk,
Blain,	Morin,
Borden (Carleton),	Northrup,
Boyce,	Paquet,
Brabazon,	Perley,
Bristol,	Porter,
Chisholm (Huron),	
Christie,	

Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Gunn,
Haggart,
Herron,
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Reid (Grenville),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—54.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beland,
Belcourt,
Black,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carney,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin (Nicolet),
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
German,
Gervais,
Greenway,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Harty,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Laurence,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Miller,
Oliver,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Robitaille,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Zimmerman.—94.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial,	Opposition.
Brown,	Broder,
Loggie,	Stockton,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Roche (Marquette),
Marcil (Bonaventure),	Forget,
Cyr,	Leonard,
Tobin,	Lancaster,
Pardee,	Pringle,
Grant,	Hughes (Victoria),
Dyment,	Seagram,
Martin (Wellington),	Osler,
Wright (Renfrew),	Henderson,
Knowles,	Cochrane,
Telford,	Clare,
Gordon,	Marshall,
Galliher,	Clements,
Devlin (Wright),	Lewis,
Crawford,	Staples,
Sifton,	Schaffner,
Adamson.	Maclean (York, S.).

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

403a (new item) Steel wire valued at not less than two and three quarter cents per pound when imported by manufacturers of rope for use exclusively in the manufacture of rope; and also wire rope for use exclusively for rigging of ships and vessels—under regulations by the Minister of Customs.

Free in all the tariffs

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the explanation of that new item ?

Mr. PATERSON. It was formerly admitted free of duty under item 625 as crucible steel wire, but as it is doubtful whether it is really crucible steel wire it has been deemed advisable to make a new item to cover it.

399. Wrought or seamless iron or steel tubing, plain or galvanized, threaded and coupled or not, four inches or less in diameter, n.o.p., 20 per cent, 30 per cent, 35 per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did this stand?

Mr. FIELDING. It is one of a group of items which were held over. The rates are not changed but there is a difference in the size. Formerly the item read 'seamless iron and steel tubing over two inches' and we propose to enlarge it to four, the manufacture of these goods having been developed in Canada and things are being made now which were not made at the time of the former revision of the tariff.

404. Galvanized iron or steel wire, Nos. 9, 12 and 13 gauge, free, 5 per cent, 5 per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the explanation of that ?

Mr. FIELDING. We had made it free from Great Britain and dutiable from other places. This is one of the several items in regard to which it is represented that there are difficulties of importing it from Great Britain especially in the western part of the country and we are making it free from all sources.

410. Coil chain, coil chain links, and chain shackles, of iron or steel, five-sixteenths of an inch in diameter, and over, 5 per cent, 5 per cent, 5 per cent.

Strike out the rates in the intermediate tariff and in the general tariff and insert the

following rates: intermediate, 7½ per cent; general, 10 per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is an increase. What is the explanation?

Mr. FIELDING. In this case the rate was 5 per cent all through and in order to make a difference we propose to make it read 7½ and 10.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the country from which we import these articles?

Mr. FIELDING. They may be imported from both Great Britain and United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to ask if item 399 has been passed?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the change in that?

Mr. FIELDING. The change is an increase in the size. Formerly the limit was two inches and now we make it four.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the duty?

Mr. FIELDING. The rate of duty has not been changed—35 per cent under the general tariff. We shall have some provision in the schedule for drawbacks for certain purposes. We shall give some portion of the duty back.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Would you say at this time what the drawback would be? I think it was printed—it may have been an error—that there would be 99 per cent of a drawback.

Mr. PATERSON. It will be 50 per cent, I think.

Mr. FIELDING. There will be 99 per cent of a drawback for some purposes but 50 per cent for part of this. When used in casing water, oil and natural gas wells it is proposed to give a drawback of 99 per cent, but when used for the transmission of natural gas under high pressure from gas wells to points of distribution there will be 50 per cent of a drawback.

411. Malleable sprocket or link-belting chain, 15 per cent, 17½ per cent, 20 per cent.

Strike out all the rates of duty and insert the word 'free' in all the tariffs.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. PATERSON. It is not made here and it is used largely in the manufacture of agricultural implements.

Mr. FIELDING. And it is also used in the lumber industry to a very considerable extent.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I understand that there is a plant in which there has been invested $10,000 for the manufacture of the article mentioned in item 411.

Mr. PATERSON. We heard the other day that they were preparing to go into it in Oshawa, and as the hon. gentleman states representations were made that there was something like $10,000 invested, to make some of the smaller kinds, I suppose. But, to make anything like the quantity that the country requires it would have to be gone into on a very much larger scale than that.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do you propose doing with it now?

Mr. PATERSON. We are putting it on the free list.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where we have an industry like the Oshawa Mallable Iron company ready to do business we should give it some encouragement. You protect a little industry in Toronto like a brass works that are not manufacturing on anything like the scale that the Oshawa Mallable Company are but you refuse to give protection to this industry. I think you should let this item stand and consult with them. You should not wipe out an industry that is already started and which is employing over 1,000 men.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not understand that they are making this article. The representations are that they are putting in this plant, but that they have not gone to any length with it yet. The main business of the Oshawa Malleable Iron Works, is making malleable castings.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the same thing.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a very extensive institution at Oshawa; there has been a great deal of capital invested in it, and the enterprise has been in progress of development for a great many years. If there is further development proposed, and a considerable investment of capital for the purpose of manufacturing articles of this kind, it seems to me it is very unwise to change the tariff for the purpose of preventing that development of the industry. There seems to be an extraordinary consideration given to the manufacturers of agricultural implements; we have articles allowed to come in free for their benefit, and we have proposals for drawbacks and so on. Why is not this particular industry entitled to equal consideration?

Mr. PATERSON. The works at Oshawa are not engaged in making these particular items.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from South Ontario says they are so engaged, and that they have put in a plant costing $10,000 on the faith of the tariff as it was up to the time of this amendment. Why is it that so many of these amendments are designed for the benefit of the agricultural implement in-

dustry which seems to be in a fairly prosperous condition, and why is so little consideration given to some other industries?

Mr. PATERSON. According to the representations made to us by the Oshawa concern, the agricultural implement industry is a very vital fact in their prosperity. The Oshawa company represented to us that they employ about 1,000 hands, and that one-half that number are engaged the whole year round in making malleable castings for the agricultural machinery men. My own impression is that if that trade is preserved to this company, it will not attach so much importance to this particular item, because it means of necessity extra expenditure to the agricultural implement makers in this item which the malleable iron people do not claim to be in anything like a position to supply. That is my impression.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not minimizing the agricultural implement industry; I am pointing out that it is a very well established industry and in a very prosperous condition. No doubt it is a customer for a very large part of the product of the Oshawa works. But the statement is made that these Oshawa works will shortly be in a position to supply articles of this kind.

Mr. PATERSON. The representation made to us was, that they might be in a position to supply this demand, but we were not impressed with the information we had on the subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What information has the hon. gentleman on the subject?

Mr. PATERSON. The representation made to us was that they were just beginning, that they were preparing to go into the business in a small way; probably they would enlarge by-and-by.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Christie) says they are manufacturing at Oshawa. This sprocket chain is not manufactured in the chain, but each separate link is cast in mouldings, and the links are then put together. Eight or ten feet of that chain is used on each agricultural machine, while my hon. friend (Mr. Christie) says they are able to supply it from Oshawa. I understand from the malleable iron men, that the agricultural men are getting all their malleable castings as well as the sprocket chain put on the free list, so that the industry at Oshawa will be wiped out of existence under this tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. The representation made to us was that our malleable works in Canada were all running to their fullest capacity, and therefore we thought that the putting of this article on the free list, in order to compensate the agricultural implement men for the reduction of duty, was a proper thing to do. The malleable men came here, and notably the Oshawa company said that was a serious matter, and that while it was true that they had all the work they could do, yet one half of their 1,000 employees were engaged in making these malleables all the year round. When that matter came before us we had to see if we could not accomplish our purpose in some other way, because while the malleable men have demand for all they can make, yet so much of the work of the Oshawa concern is in this one line, that it became a very serious matter for that one concern, even though they might have turned their attention to other things. As a result of our consideration, the hon. gentleman will find there will be a proposition made by-and-by.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I can state that the Oshawa Malleable Iron Works have been enlarging their concern to a great extent, and I am given to understand they have put in a plant costing $10,000 for manufacturing this very sprocket chain.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I was present when the deputation waited upon the ministers in connection with this matter and my recollection is that the Oshawa people stated that they were already in a position to manufacture this very chain and that a $10,000 plant has been established for that purpose. They pointed out that it would injure their business to a large extent if the industry were not put on a protective basis.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. In the case of a new industry starting, this government professes to protect it, and when they put this article on the free list in the present case, I think they are doing a most unfair thing to this industry. I would like to know what reason there is for the change. It was not free before; the duty on it was 20 per cent. I have not heard any satisfactory reason why that should be taken off, especially as there is an institution in this country which has put $10,000 into machinery for the very purpose of making it. I think that in all fairness to those people who have invested their money in this industry, the government should hold that item over until they get more information, if they cannot leave it as it is now.

Mr. PATERSON. I have given the explanation. I do not think there would be a desire to burden the agricultural implement maker with a duty on all they have to buy, because a company which is employing a thousand hands has invested $10,000 in this industry. Although I do not wish to belittle that, it is small in comparison with other industries which have $100,000 or $200,000 invested.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The point I do not understand is this. Up to the present time the manufacturers of agricultural implements have got along pretty well with a tariff of some 20 per cent on these very articles, and I have not heard any complaint during the last ten years on that score. Then, just on the eve of the establishment of this particular industry, or after it has been to a certain extent established, you suddenly change the tariff and permit these goods to come in free. What is the particular crisis in the development of the agricultural implement industry at this moment that makes it necessary to change the tariff? That is what I do not understand, and I do not think the minister has made that plain up to the present time.

Mr. PATERSON. It has been explained several times by the Finance Minister and others. The farmers, especially in the Northwest, are very much interested in agricultural implements; and, with a view to benefit them we reduce the duty on self-binders, reapers and mowers from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent; and in order to compensate the manufacturers for that change, we propose to give them a drawback of the duties they pay on certain raw materials which enter into the cost of the machines. We proposed to give them a drawback on their malleable iron, but we had a representation from the Oshawa Company to the effect that they have 500 men employed the year round in producing that very thing. That representation could not be passed over. This sprocket chain we were not aware was made in the country, and my information is that there was an investment of only $10,000 for the purpose of starting the manufacture. Though I do not want to under-value that investment, I did not consider that such an investment made by a firm employing 500 or 1,000 men at other work could be made a ground of objection to this reduction in the tariff for the benefit of the farmers.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is the minister going to meet the request of the delegation which waited upon him in regard to malleables and restore them to their former position?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. They will be put in the position they were in before.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). There are other factories besides the Oshawa factory which are very much interested in this very question. I do not understand whether the minister intends to wipe out the duty altogether on malleable.

Mr. PATERSON. No, the malleable manufacturers will be where they were before, but they will have 2½ per cent more duty on certain articles which they produce.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman has made a bargain with the agricultural implement makers——

Mr. PATERSON. No bargain.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT—that if they would allow a reduction of 2½ per cent he would give them free malleable iron and other considerations, I think they are getting altogether the better of the deal. The privileges he is giving them under the changes proposed are far in excess of the 2½ per cent rebate they are giving, which will not benefit the farmers one iota, because I am in a position to state that under the new contracts which the implement makers have made since the introduction of the tariff, they are putting the sellers of the implements on the same basis as they did last year, which shows that the farmers will have no benefit from the change in the tariff. So that the hon. gentleman is putting into the pockets of the implement makers and those who are making the raw material for them all the benefit of the change. I do not know just what hold these people have on the government, but they evidently have a hold that is very material.

Mr. PATERSON. If they had much of a pull I do not suppose we would have left the duty where it is on all other malleables. There will be the same duties as there were before, except on the malleable castings which are part of the machine and which are admitted at 17½ per cent instead of 20 per cent. On other malleables, which were 25 per cent before, the duty will now be 27½ per cent, so that the malleable industry will be in a better position than it was in the past.

Mr. BLAIN. But it is quite correct that the concession which the government propose to make in this particular item is to the agricultural implement manufacturers.

Mr. FIELDING. It also affects the lumber interest which is a very large industry.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand there is some change of heart on the part of the government, including the Minister of Customs, on this item. As it is before the committee, the preferential tariff is 15 per cent the intermediate 17½ and the general 20 per cent. They propose now to erase these altogether and make it free. Therefore there is a change of heart.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. And the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) has pointed out that this is a concession made to the agricultural machine manufacturers.

Mr. PATERSON. And lumbermen.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do they use sprocket chains for?

Mr. PATERSON. In their mills, and lots of other manufacturers use them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) to say that they are manufactured in Canada.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. A sprocket chain is simply a lot of links run together. It is a question simply of setting the links in place. I would not like to say that all the sizes of links are made in Canada but there is nothing to prevent any ordinary institution turning out these links. It is simply a question of room.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think that should be fairly satisfactory to the deputation which waited on the government. The matter was thoroughly laid before the minister and he endeavoured to meet the views of the committee. If the item stands, we can hear whether it is made in other factories but I understood the deputation to say it was only made in one factory.

Some resolutions reported.

At six o'clock House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 7, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

TRADE WITH AUSTRALASIA.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked :

1. Does the government consider that the export business of Canada with Australia and New Zealand is in a satisfactory condition ?
2. What line or lines of steamers ply between ports in eastern Canada and Australia and New Zealand, and what aid or subvention do they receive from the government of Canada ?
3. Has application for assistance been made to the Department of Trade and Commerce by the Imperial Export Company, Limited, or any other firm or corporation who propose to operate a direct line of steamers between ports in eastern Canada and the above-mentioned countries ?
4. What action, if any, has the government taken to establish such line of steamers, or to aid in such export trade ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The exports from Canada to Australia during the last fiscal year amounted to $2,082,219 ; to New Zealand to $734,054 ; the imports from Australia to $226,197 ; from New Zealand $302,075.
2. None.
3. Yes.
4. None.

BANKING IN YUKON.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount of commission, and at what rate, has been paid to the Canadian Bank of Commerce yearly for Yukon business ?
2. What interest, if any, is paid by the Bank of Commerce on balances lying at their bank in the Yukon ?
3. What interest, if any, do they charge on overdrafts ?
4. What commission, if any, is allowed other banks in Canada for the transaction of government business involved in the receipt and payment of public moneys ?

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

1. In the Appropriation Act No. 5, 1900, page 10, for the fiscal year 1899-1900, the following sums were voted by parliament to the Canadian Bank of Commerce for Yukon business.

Canadian Bank of Commerce for services in handling and shipping gold dust from Dawson:—	
4 per cent (including insurance at 1½ per cent, freight at 1¼ cent, convoy and all other charges connected therewith ⅝ of one per cent) on $533,695.44, to June 1, 1899.. ..	$21,347 80
2 per cent commission on drafts issued free of charge to miners at Dawson, to June 1, 1899..	4,285 96
1½ per cent on revenue collections, $664,274.83, to September 30, 1898..	9,964 10
1½ per cent on cash payments, $252,555.51, at Dawson, to September 30, 1898..	3,788 33
2 per cent on drafts of the Northwest Mounted Police..	3,931 95
2 per cent on drafts of the Department of Militia and Defence..	979 78
3 per cent (less 2¼ per cent for disbursements and insurance) on $468,382, from June 1 to October 31, 1899..	3,512 87
1½ per cent commission on drafts issued free of charge to miners, from June 1 to October 31, 1899..	10,971 82
1¼ per cent commission on revenue collections of $2,140,003.83, from October 1, 1898, to April 30, 1900..	26,750 00
1¼ per cent on cash payments of $425,531.84, from October 1, 1898, to April 30, 1900..	5,319 14
	$90,851 75

This amount was paid as follows :

July 26, 1900..	$15,257 78
" 27, 1900..	24,860 67
" 31, 1900..	36,714 10
August 3, 1900..	4,911 73
" 14, 1900..	5,319 14
" 9, 1900..	3,788 33
	$90,851 75

For the fiscal year 1901-02 the sum of $53,169.36 was paid on the 26th June, 1902. This amount represented ¾ of 1 per cent on the business from 1st of May, 1900, to 30th of April, 1901, and ⅝ of 1 per cent on the business from the 1st of May, 1901 to 24th of April, 1902.

In 1903-04 the sum of $19,000 was paid on the 9th of December, 1903, representing ½ of 1 per cent on the transactions in the Yukon for the fiscal year ended 30th of April, 1903.

In the fiscal year 1904-05, on the 26th of September, 1904, $12,600 was paid, being ⅜ of 1 per cent on the business for the fiscal year ended 30th of April, 1904.

2. None. The account is kept with the Canadian Bank of Commerce at Ottawa.

3. None. There have been no overdrafts.

4. None. The situation in the Yukon was exceptional. There was no bank in the Yukon when the government began to have extensive business in that region. The Canadian Bank of Commerce established a branch at Dawson upon assurance that reasonable compensation would be paid for the transaction of government business, the rate of such compensation to be such as the Minister of Finance might from time to time determine. The rates of commission are given above. A further reduction to ¼ of 1 per cent has been made in the rate that has been allowed for the business between the 1st of May, 1905, and the 31st of March, 1907. Whenever it is felt that the conditions governing the financial business of the government in the Yukon approximate those prevailing in the rest of Canada, the commission will be abolished.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Has the Department of Militia and Defence any reports touching or concerning the Ross rifle from any of the following officers : officer commanding Royal School of Infantry, Quebec ; officer commanding Royal School of Infantry, Toronto ; officer commanding Royal School Infantry, Halifax, N.S.; officer commanding Royal School of Infantry, London, Ontario ; officer commanding Royal School of Infantry, Fredericton, N.B.; officer commanding Garrison Artillery, Halifax, N.S.; officer commanding Royal School of Cavalry, St. Johns, Quebec ; officer commanding Royal School of Cavalry, Toronto ; chief staff officer, Eastern Ontario command ; officer commanding 6th regiment Canadian Artillery ; officer commanding 67th regiment, Carleton Light Infantry ; Major Goudet, G.C.F.; or any other officer serving in a subordinate position in any of the corps mentioned ?

2. If so, what is the nature of the reports, and when were they received ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) has placed in my hands the following answer : So far as there are any reports in the Department of Militia and Defence mentioned in the question they will be included in the Ross rifle returns, (already called for by the House), to be laid on the table in a day or two.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Jacques Bureau, member for the electoral district of Three Rivers ; introduced by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and hon. L. P. Brodeur.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

That from this date to the end of the session, government orders have precedence on Mondays, immediately after questions to be put by members.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). There are some motions that I think ought to be considered on Monday next and I think the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should make that motion read 'from and after Monday next to the end of the session.' I have one Bill coming in. It only gets on the order paper to-day and there are a number of important motions by members to be considered. For instance, there is one by the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) who desires to secure for the people of the west a three cent passenger rate, and who wishes to discuss that question in this house. I would like to see an opportunity afforded of discussing it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is not well informed in regard to the motion of my hon. friend from Strathcona. He will have an opportunity of moving his motion on the Railway Bill. He has given notice to that effect and therefore he is not affected at all by the passing of the motion that I have just put before the House to take Mondays. We are now in the third month of the session and I think the time has come when we should take Monday if we want to have prorogation at an early day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is quite true that we are in the third month of the session ; in fact we are in the fourth month of the session as three and a half months have elapsed already. Of course, three weeks come out of that during which we were not sitting. But, on the other hand there are some motions upon public Bills and orders, one of which I would like to have discussed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Which one ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No. 18.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend insists upon having a further debate upon his question—No. 18—I do not know that I would object very seriously.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not imagine that very much further debate would be

requisite. As far as I am concerned I do not desire to say anything upon it and it has been fully discussed on both sides of the House. All that would be necessary would be to give an opportunity if any one desires to say anything. I do not imagine there will be very much discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will arrange with my hon. friend about that.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Could my right hon. friend bring up his Railway Bill before that ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am only speaking for myself ; I do not know about other questions under public bills and orders and motions. Perhaps some arrangement might be made by which we could take motions upon which there is no discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For the granting of papers ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection, and on next Monday we can do that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that would leave the whole of the rest of Monday for government business and possibly we could arrange to expedite such motions until the end of the session.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to item 13 under notices of motion. I would like to have that discussed. It is not a matter upon which there need be any division of the House. Certainly I would like to have an opportunity of discussing the matter and I would like also an opportunity of considering a motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 16), item 3, of public Bills and orders 'An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act.' I would like an opportunity of discussing both of these matters.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Notices of motion have been called once or twice already.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps there are same matters amongst the notices of motion that members would like an oportunity of discussing on going into Committee of Supply, and on Monday we could take the opportunity of dropping these so that they would not stand in the way. Perhaps there would be no objection to that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that we will object to that very seriously. We can run over the paper on Monday.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again in Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. R L. BORDEN.

411. Malleable sprocket or link belting chain, 15 per cent, 17½ per cent, 20 per cent.

Strike out all the rates of duty and insert the word 'free' in all the tariffs.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I believe it has been understood that my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) desires to make his motion in amendment to the resolutions, and as several hon. gentlemen have expressed a desire that he should do so at the time agreed upon he has asked that he be permitted to make his motion to-day, to which we have no objection.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, when the budget was brought down in the early days of the session I gave notice that on a subsequent day I would move that the British preference be confined to goods imported into Canada through Canadian seaports. This, Mr. Chairman, I submit is but carrying out the lines of policy which have actuated the parliaments of our country ever since we became a confederation, namely, that the traffic of this country should be from east to west and from west to east ; in other words, that the traffic in Canadian produce should be through Canadian channels. It was under the inspiration of that policy that we contributed millions to help to build the Canadian Pacific Railway ; it was under its inspiration that the Intercolonial Railway was built, and that large sums of money were expended upon the canals of Canada. All these great projects were carried to completion for the purpose of keeping Canadian trade in Canadian channels. And, need I mention that the last great project of this government, the building of the National Transcontinental Railway, was launched with the same object in view? All parties in Canadian politics have endorsed that policy, and had it not been the policy of this country, we would to-day see most, if not all, our trade diverted from Canadian channels and going through American ports. In 1897 the right hon. the Prime Minister, in the course of a patriotic speech, stated he would not rest content until all Canadian commerce should pass through distinctly Canadian channels, and in the intervening years he has nobly devoted himself to the accomplishment of that end. I believe this policy is endorsed by the great majority of the Canadian people, and the motion of which I have given notice is directed towards the same end.

One of the objects of the British preference, perhaps I might say its chief object, was to draw together more closely the motherland and her daughter colony. The British preference was described as an arrangement within the family, and yet during the past year twenty million dollars' worth of goods imported into Canada

under the British preference—not including the goods which have entered free of duty—have been brought through foreign ports. My desire is that this trade, which to-day finds its way through American channels, should be diverted to the development and prosperity of Canadian ports and railways and British shipping.

Prior to 1901, individual boards of trade in different parts of Canada had adopted resolutions endorsing this proposition. In August of that year, at a general meeting of all the boards of trade of the maritime provinces, held at Chatham, N.B., the following resolution was passed :

Resolved, that in the opinion of this board, the preferential tariff, applying to imports from Great Britain, should only apply to goods imported directly through Canadian ports.

In that same year, 1901, the legislature of New Brunswick unanimously passed a resolution on the same lines, and forwarded that resolution to Ottawa. The discussion of this proposition was, however, confined largely to the maritime provinces, but in 1902, at a convention of all the Canadian boards of trade, held in Toronto, the following motion was proposed :

British preference be confined to goods brought through Canadian ports.

It was moved in amendment :

In order to encourage the importation of British goods via Canadian ports this conference desires that the preferential rebate on goods imported from Great Britain arriving by United States ports shall be limited to 25 per cent.

After very full discussion, the amendment was declared carried. I shall quote from the utterances of some prominent Canadians at that convention. Mr. George E. Drummond, who afterwards became president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, in supporting the original motion, said :

There is no question that if you can fill these Canadian Atlantic steamers, both ways, it will mean cheaper freight rates for the men of the west, and our railways will meet us in a generous way, I am perfectly confident, if the volume of trade will permit of it. For that reason I propose to support this motion. My friend from Windsor has spoken of what the Americans may do. I tell him that when the Americans meet in such a conference as this, they do not care much what Canadians are going to do. They believe in themselves. We in this country have never had sufficient confidence in ourselves.

Mr. D. R. Wilkie, of Toronto, in the course of a lengthy speech, said :

We have granted this privilege of a preferential tariff in favour of British goods, and it was said at the time it was passed that we would suffer for it : that the Americans would retaliate. What have they done ?

After referring to the statements that had been made when the British preference was first granted, he said :

As to the argument of Mr. Saunders, that he was forced to export his goods by way of Boston or New York, what does that mean ? It means that by our allowing this preference on British goods coming through Boston and New York, instead of limiting it to goods that come only through Montreal, Halifax, Quebec and St. John, he was forced to send his goods to Boston and New York. Force them to bring our goods through Canadian ports and you will have cheaper freight rates for Canadian products from your own ports.

Subsequent to the Toronto convention, there were a number of resolutions passed by boards of trade in Canada, and on the 20th of June, 1904, I had the honour of moving in this House the following resolution :

That in the opinion of this House the preferential tariff should only apply to importations through Canadian seaports.

Among the hon. gentlemen who took part in the discussion on that resolution was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who said :

But for my own part I am heartily in favour of it, and if he decides to divide the House upon it, I shall have pleasure in giving my vote in support of the motion. For the purposes of the present budget and the present condition of affairs we cannot deal with it. But I hope there will be such an educational movement on the question, that, at no distant day, we may adopt it as part of our practical legislation. If that can be done at no distant day no one will rejoice more than I shall.

After referring to the reasons which I had given in support of the motion, he said :

So, while I do not say that this motion will receive the assent of the House, to take effect at once, it is a move in the right direction. Even if it is not received with unanimous approval, as I would desire to see it received, I trust that the time will soon come when we may accept it as part of a thoroughly national policy.

The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) spoke upon the question, and on being asked by the then member for Victoria, Cape Breton, his opinion as to the advantages which would accrue to Canada from the adoption of the policy enunciated, the member for Grey said in reply :

I took it for granted that no member of parliament was so wanting in common sense that he would for one moment doubt the advantage of it.

The right hon. the Prime Minister, during the course of the debate, said :

Upon the general principle of this resolution there cannot be any difference of opinion.

After referring to the remarks of Mr. Wright, member for Renfrew, in reference to the lack of facilities for shipping in our ports, Sir Wilfrid said :

In my judgment at all events, the way to have better facilities and accommodation in our own harbours, is to turn as far as possible all our trade to these harbours.

The right hon. gentleman, however, stated that if such a policy were adopted without notice it might cause disturbance in the country. The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) said :

I would be inclined to go a little further than my hon. friend from Cumberland. I do not see any reason why we should restrict this enactment to goods entered under the British preferential tariff.

The only members of the House at that time who spoke against the motion were the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Heyd) and the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright), who referred to the congestion which had occurred with respect to east bound freight and who feared that this might have some ill effect upon the transportation of the farmer's produce in that regard ; but we were not discussing east bound freight. The resolution which I had the honour to propose passed this House with only one or two dissenting voices.

Since that time, and particularly during the past few months, resolutions have been adopted by different boards of trade in Canada, a number of which have been sent to me. At the last meeting of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, held in Winnipeg, the following resolution was adopted :

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association, in conference assembled, desirous of building up Canadian ports, unanimously favours the application of the preferential tariff only to goods coming into Canada direct from the country of their origin.

If there are any members of this House who are members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and who were at that meeting, I desire to refresh their memory with this resolution, which it is stated was passed unanimously.

Last year the total imports from Great Britain into this country amounted to $69,194,588. Of this amount 66·21 per cent came in under the preference, 1·21 per cent was subject to the surtax, 8·64 per cent was subject to the general tariff, and 23·94 per cent came in free. The imports from Great Britain into this country through American ports last year amounted to something over $13,000,000; the imports of sugar from British possessions amounted to about $4,500,000, and the goods imported from other parts of the empire entitled to the British preference bring the total importation into this country through American ports up to about $20,000,000. I want to point out that these importations are not confined to the winter months, when the ports of Montreal and Quebec are closed, but of these importations from Great Britain about $5,000,000 worth were brought through American ports during the summer months. So that the argument that the ports of St. John and Halifax are too far away certainly does not apply to these goods brought in during the summer months.

Mr. KEMP. Are these figures set out in the Trade and Navigation returns ?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Will the hon. gentleman give the total volume of goods entitled to the preference which are imported through Canadian ports?

Mr. LOGAN. About two-thirds of the importations from Great Britain come in through Canadian ports.

Mr. BERGERON. About $40,000,000 worth.

Mr. LOGAN. Now, I desire to state as briefly as I can what I consider would be some of the advantages of the adoption of this policy, and afterwards I propose for a few moments to refer to some disadvantages which some people claim would result. In the first place, the adoption of this policy would mean the intensifying of a thoroughly Canadian national policy and a declaration of our independence of the United States of America. So long as we have to admit that we are dependent upon United States ports, so long we have to admit that we are dependent upon the United States of America. In the second place, it would mean the encouragement of steamship lines plying between Canada and Great Britain and the different countries entitled to the preference, giving to the steamship lines between Great Britain and Canada westbound cargoes, which are seriously needed to-day, thus giving encouragement to the shipping industry. Shipping should be one of the greatest industries of this country. To build up the ship-building industry of any country is to build up the nation itself. The third advantage of this policy would be the building up of Canadian maritime ports on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. I hope that we in the east and in the west are not selfish. I do not want it to be thought, for myself personally or for my constituency, that this policy is going to be of any direct or special benefit to us. It will be the same benefit to us that it will be to the rest of Canada. It has been claimed that this policy is in the interest of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I contend that it is in the interest of all Canada that we should establish in this country a thoroughly Canadian national policy. We in the pro-

vince of Nova Scotia cannot be charged, I think, with being parochial in our politics, in view of the fact that we have borne our share of the cost of building the great Canadian Pacific Railway, although not a foot of it is in the province of Nova Scotia. Nor have we complained that this country has adopted the policy of building another great transcontinental line at a cost to the public treasury of probably $100,000,000, although not a foot of that railway is to be built in the province of Nova Scotia. In fact, we have endorsed that policy unanimously, as the last general election in Nova Scotia showed. But what we ask is that there shall be a Canadian policy, not only for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but for all parts of the Dominion of Canada, cementing this country more closely together than it is at the present time. The fourth advantage of this policy would be the lessening of eastbound ocean and rail freight rates by providing westbound cargoes. A representative of one of the largest steamship companies operating to Canadian ports writes to me as follows:

From my experience of 25 years I may say that steamers on the westbound trip from Great Britain or Europe are rarely full of cargo, the vessels depending almost entirely on the freight from Canada to Great Britain and the continent for their earnings. That sufficient tonnage could not be obtained to carry the traffic is, from my experience, incorrect. The fact of the matter is that all the large lines coming to Canada, if the traffic was obtainable could place a larger number of steamers on the several routes. The lack of business, especially on the westbound voyage makes it unprofitable. In the winter months, when the boats run to both Halifax and St. John if full cargoes were obtainable to Canada we could give lower freight rates on goods carried from Canada than when earning practically nothing westbound, which is pretty much the case at present.

Referring to sugar he says:

A large amount of the traffic that comes to Canada finds its way via New York and Boston. Nearly all the sugar for the Montreal refineries comes via New York, whereas if the preference was only given to sugar coming direct to Canadian ports it would benefit Halifax and St. John, give employment to an extra number of steamers, give a large extra revenue to our railroads and leave a large amount of money in Halifax and St. John and also Montreal.

By encouraging return cargoes, it would hasten the date when we shall have a fast Atlantic steamship service. This is neither the place nor the time to speak at length on the advantages of a fast service; but every year and the more I travel, I am the more convinced that it is the bounden duty of this government to provide a fast Atlantic service at the earliest possible moment.

It would give increased revenue to the railways of Canada and especially increased business to the Intercolonial Railway.

To-day goods shipped from Liverpool to Vancouver are generally carried in American bottoms to American ports and thence transported over American railways across the whole length of the continent. Why should we allow this to continue? The Intercolonial Railway is the property of the people of Canada. We are told, in season and out of season, that it is a sink hole, that we are sinking large amounts every year in its upkeep. But what road on earth could be expected to pay its way so long as its owners do not try to divert traffic to it? If it be considered that the Intercolonial Railway is a burden on the people, let the government come to its rescue. Let us insist, as we can, that goods shipped from the mother country to the daughter colony shall arrive at a Canadian port and be transhipped over the government road, thus giving the Intercolonial Railway increased earnings. I propose in a moment pointing out what we have done in the last few years to increase the facilities of the Intercolonial Railway for the handling of this traffic.

Last in the list of advantages is this, that it would remove from the minds of British exporters the idea that Canadians have to depend on United States ports and railways during the winter season. It would show them that the reverse is the fact and thus be an object lesson of our self-reliant position.

A few months ago a gentleman in Ottawa ordered certain goods from a large shipping house in London to be delivered in this city before Christmas. He ordered the goods to be sent by the Canadian Pacific Railway steamship line. They were sent, however, via New York, with an explanatory letter stating that the shippers had tried to get them shipped before the Canadian ports were frozen up but that was impossible. Ask nine out of ten Englishmen whether we in Canada have an ocean port open the year round and they will say no, that you have to get to Canada through Boston or New York or some other American port. I should like to remove this idea and teach the people of Great Britain that we have ports as free as the air itself during every day of the year.

Let me pass to some objections urged against the adoption of the policy I am advocating. The first is the excessive freight rates. Now, in debating this question, I do not want to give any guess work figures, but the actual existing conditions. It is all very well to say that the Intercolonial Railway is frequently snowed up and not available. Let me give the exact conditions on that road and the exact time it has taken to transport goods during the past winter.

As regards excessive freight rates, I may say that to-day the freight rates on goods brought into Canada from Liverpool are the same, if not less, via Canadian ports than via American ports. The Canadian Pacific Railway freight tariff as published

is, if anything, lower than the freight rates as published via New York and Boston to-day. It may be said that if we were to adopt this policy, there would be less competition and freight rates would increase. But I submit that while that might have been said a few years ago with a good deal of reason, it cannot be said with any reason to-day. To-day we have so many steamship lines crossing the Atlantic that we have competition within ourselves.

But the objection is raised by some of our friends—and it is the most reasonable I have heard—that this policy would place the people west of Lake Superior at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But we would not be confined to the Canadian Pacific Railway even if this policy were adopted. We own the Intercolonial Railway so that goods could be landed at Halifax or St. John and carried over the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, and from that city they could be sent either over American or any other railways.

The second objection is that there are not sufficient independent lines to create competition in freight rates between Canada and the old country. Well, we have at present operating between Great Britain and Canada the following steamship lines :

The Canadian Pacific Railway line of boats from Canadian ports to Liverpool, London and Bristol ; the Allan line to London and Glasgow ; the Head line to Belfast and Dublin ; the Donaldson line to Glasgow ; the Thompson line to London ; the Dominion line to Bristol and Liverpool:

I must say, with regard to the Thompson and the Dominion line that they do not run a winter service from a Canadian port to Great Britain but from Portland. We have also :

The Manchester line from St. John, N.B., to Manchester ; the Furness line, running all the year round between Halifax, St. John, Liverpool and London ; the Elder Dempster Company between Canada, South Africa and the West Indies ; the Pickford and Black operating between Canada and the West Indies.

It will thus be seen that there could not be any monopoly enjoyed by any particular line of steamers but on the contrary there would be keen competition, even if this resolution were made part of our tariff.

The next objection is that a British Canadian service could not be depended on for regularity and that there would be considerable delay in the transportation of goods. Well, that objection is purely imaginary. In the first place, it is very doubtful whether any hardship would accrue even if the service were not as quick as via New York. The chief thing a merchant wants to know is when his goods will arrive, and it is not so much a question with him whether the passage will be speedy or not. What he requires is certainty as to the date of arrival rather than speed in the passage. In certain cases, of course, such as express parcels that might be cabled for, it may be necessary to have a fast service, but as a rule that is not of primary importance as regards freight. But what really are the facts? The facts of the case are that during the past season the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Allan Line coming to Canada have given as regular and as rapid a service as any line to any United States port. The fast boats of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Allan Line are making the trip to-day in mid-winter in a few hours over six days, and that speed is not equalled by any of the boats from Liverpool to New York.

Take for instance the slow boats, take for instance the 'Celtic' and the 'Cedric' the two biggest boats on the White Star line ; their average sailing during the last six months from Liverpool to New York has been about ten days ; and the average sailing of the freight boats, not the fast line, not the fast boats, but the average sailing of the freight boats of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the same period of time, has been between ten and eleven days. What becomes therefore of the statement that we are going to lose days and weeks if we bring goods in through Canadian ports ?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman makes a statement—I am not impugning the veracity of the statement—but I would like to know if he has the details upon which he bases the assertion that the fast freight boats coming to New York take about ten days, and that the ordinary freight boats of the Canadian Pacific Railway take about ten or eleven days. That is a very important thing. But we ought to be able to get behind the statement of fact to the data upon which that statement of fact is made.

Mr. LOGAN. I have this data, that I know from my own experience, and other members of this House know from their experience, the time that the 'Celtic' and the 'Cedric' make in crossing the Atlantic. I made inquiry in New York in reference to the sailings of these two ships, because I regarded them as the two model ships of a fast service, the two largest boats in the White Star line service, and I got that information from New York. With reference to the other information, regarding the Canadian Pacific Railway boats, I asked that company to answer a question with reference to the time of their freight boats, to St. John and Halifax, and the reply they gave was that it was between ten and eleven days.

Now let me say a word with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway service between St. John and the western part of Canada. I will speak particularly of that service in the winter time, because I know that gentlemen who are opposed to this

resolution make the objection as regards the winter months and not as regards the summer months. They have told me that they do not object to confining the British preference to Canadian ports when they can bring their goods in to Montreal and Quebec ; therefore I am going to refer merely to the service to the maritime ports which are open the year round. I asked the Canadian Pacific Railway the following questions :

Q. What is the present time of the Canadian Pacific Railway freight service between St. John and Toronto ?—A. Fifty-two hours.

Q. What is the time of freight service between St. John and Hamilton ?—A. Fifty-seven hours.

Q. What is the time of freight service between St. John and London ?—A. Sixty-three hours.

Q. What is the time of freight service between St. John and Winnipeg ?—A. A hundred and forty hours.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that schedule time ?

Mr. LOGAN. I merely asked the question : What is the time, I presume it is schedule time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The hon. member will not pretend to say that goods are carried in that time. I have a letter here stating that they are not.

Mr. LOGAN. I know the hon. gentleman is much opposed to the policy, and he is going to speak on it when I am through. This is the time that was given to me by the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities.

Mr. LALOR. Was that express or freight?

Mr. LOGAN. I am talking of freight. I want to point out that this freight service on the Canadian Pacific Railway has only been announced within a short time ; I also want to point out to the people who object to this motion that we are moving in the east as well as in the west. I do not contend that the Canadian Pacific Railway freight service between St. John and the western cities is carried out to the minute ; there has not been any railroad in this country during the past winter that has been able to deliver its freight on schedule time. We have to figure upon storms upon all railroads, both in Canada and in the New England states. Storms will occur, accidents will happen, freight will be delayed ; but the Canadian Pacific Railway, is advertising to-day a freight service between St. John and Toronto in fifty-two hours. The Intercolonial Railway, the much abused Intercolonial Railway, has within the last two years, established a fast freight service between St. John, Halifax and Montreal. A freight train leaves Halifax, running upon schedule time, only stopping at the most important junctions and stations, and runs through to Montreal carrying the through freight. It is no use for men to say that the service of the Intercolonial Railway is slow, that it takes weeks to transport goods, because I am going to quote to you actual facts of the delivery of freight on the Intercolonial Railway during the months of November and December of this year, which can be verified by the books of that road, and which are given to me by the general traffic manager.

The cargo of the steamship 'Virginian' left Halifax on the morning of November 18 and arrived in Montreal on November 20. The cargo of the steamship 'Tunisian' left Halifax on December 2 and arrived in Montreal on December 4. The cargo of the steamship 'Laurentian' left Halifax December 12 and arrived in Montreal on December 14. The cargo of the 'Ionian' left Halifax on the morning of December 17 and arrived in Montreal on December 19.

These are cargoes of ocean bound steamers transported from Halifax to Montreal. The time occupied in transporting cargoes from Montreal to Toronto should not exceed eighteen to twenty hours. The total time for freight in transit between Halifax and Toronto is therefore from 76 to 80 hours. From inquiry which I have made in Toronto asking for guaranteed delivery of freight from New York to Toronto, I received the reply that they would not guarantee a delivery in Toronto under three and a half to four days.

Mr. FOSTER. What date ?

Mr. LOGAN. That inquiry was made, I think, early in December.

Mr. FOSTER. They would be pretty bold if they guaranteed time delivery during December.

Mr. LOGAN. Probably my inquiry was made in November before I gave notice of this resolution. So, if the actual conditions are that we can transport goods between Halifax and Montreal in two days during the month of December and that these goods can be transported from Montreal to Toronto in a day and a half, what becomes of the argument that it takes longer to transport goods by Canadian ports than it does through American ports ? These are the actual facts, that goods can be transported in three and a half days over the long Intercolonial Railway from Halifax to Toronto. What is your guarantee from New York ? In what time will they transport freight ? From three and a half to four days.

Mr. HAGGART. Why is it that the through traffic on the Intercolonial Railway, with all its facilities, is growing less every year?

Mr. LOGAN. One reason is because the people of this country do not stand by the government road and ship goods that way, and I am afraid that there are many who

do not try to educate their fellow citizens along these lines. There is no reason why through-freight on the Intercolonial Railway should become less every year, because the service is becoming better every year.

We must not forget in considering mileage that Halifax and St. John are much nearer the ports of Great Britain than New York, Boston and Portland. Let me give you the ocean mileage:

From Liverpool	to	New York..	3,169
" "		Boston..	3,017
" "		Portland..	2,985
" "		St. John..	2,700
" "		Halifax..	2,450
" "		Montreal	2,755

Thus there is a difference between the distance from Liverpool to New York and that from Liverpool to Halifax of about eight hundred miles.

It is said that we have not sufficient facilities at Canadian ports. Now in the language of the Prime Minister in 1904, when I moved this resolution in this House: If we have not these facilities the best way to get them is to provide traffic to pour through these channels. If we have not the facilities surely it is a crying shame and disgrace to this country. Has the time come, after all these years of large expenditures in this country, after forty years of confederation, when we have to declare to the world that we have not ports that are properly equipped for the transporting of goods for our own consumption, from the motherland to Canada? If that is the condition of affairs it is time that the government and the people of this country should waken up to this condition of affairs and if for no other reason let it be done for the patriotic purpose of keeping these goods within our own channels. But what have we done in the last few years? I do not want hon. gentlemen to approach this question from the standpoint of conditions that existed on the Intercolonial Railway and in the ports of Canada ten years ago. We have made great strides in this country in the last ten years. We have made great improvements in transportation facilities at ocean ports. We have spent millions on the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal, for the improvement of the channel for the summer traffic. The city of St. John, with noteworthy confidence in its future and praiseworthy enterprise and activity, has spent over $1,000,000 in bettering the facilities at that port. This again has been supplemented by the expenditures of the Intercolonial Railway. With reference to the facilities afforded by the Intercolonial Railway let me cite what has been done on that railroad in the past seven or eight years—and I am bound to say that I think it will come as a surprise to many members that such very large sums have seen spent to improve that railway. From 1897-8 to 1905-6 inclusive, there has been spent on increased facilities by the Intercolonial Railway in the city of St. John, on capital account, no less than $1,226,021 for dredging, $45,722, a total of $1,271,744. At Halifax there has been spent during that period for increased facilities, on capital account, $1,089,490; for dredging, $18,085, a total at Halifax of $1,107,576, or a total expenditure by the government of this country in those two ports alone, during the years I have mentioned, in the betterment of shipping facilities, of $2,379,320. This does not include over $1,000,000 spent during that time in building a branch from Windsor Junction to Dartmouth which gives better facilities in Halifax as Dartmouth is on the other side of the harbour. The double-tracking of the line between Halifax and Windsor Junction and the amount spent at Halifax and St. John in the erection of elevators, but the simple improvements of the ports and the increased facilities have cost the people of this country $2,379,320 during those years.

Then take the equipment of the Intercolonial Railway. On the 30th day of June, 1898, there were only 208 locomotives in service on the Intercolonial Railway and nearly all of these were of small type. On the 30th of June, 1906, eight years after, there were 347 locomotives in service, a large number of which are of the most powerful type. In 1898, the freight car equipment of the Intercolonial Railway was 6,667 cars, on June 20, 1906, it was 10,840 cars.

I want the people of this country in approaching this question to consider not the Intercolonial Railway of the old days, but the Intercolonial Railway of to-day, after so much has been expended on its terminals, on its rolling stock and on the roadbed itself.

The last objection which is urged to this resolution, and the one which I am afraid has the most influence in this country, is that legislation such as this would offend the United States, would cause retaliatory legislation and the abrogation of bonding privileges over certain United States territory for goods in bond destined to Canada. We heard this same statement ten years ago when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) brought down this very preferential tariff policy. There was great fear that the United States of America would retaliate and it was said that they would abrogate the bonding privilege. I think that the people of this country are about convinced that the bonding privilege is as important to the United States of America as it is to the Dominion of Canada and that the abrogation of the bonding privilege is not to be feared in the consideration of a question such as this.

But, Sir, if this resolution is adopted, if this policy which I enunciate becomes part of the tariff policy of this country, we shall be putting in force a policy which has been

made historic by the United States of America. For the past one hundred years, whenever that country has acquired new territory, it has extended its coasting laws around that territory. In 1817, the Congress of the United States provided that:

Commerce between the territories shall be regarded as coastwise and shall be confined to vessels built in the United States, officered by United States citizens, flying the United States flag.

This policy has been continued to the present time. In 1868, the navigation laws as to the transportation of merchandise were extended to Alaska.

In the case of Porto Rico, under an Act approved April 12, 1900, it is provided under section 9 as follows:

The coasting trade between Porto Rico and the United States shall be regulated in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such trade between any two great coasting districts of the United States.

In the case of Hawaii by an Act approved April 11, 1900, it is provided:

The coasting trade between the islands aforesaid and any other portion of the United States shall be regulated in accordance with the provisions applicable to such trade between two great coasting districts.

The United States then has extended its coasting laws not only to its nearby possessions, but has thrown them out half way across the Pacific to the Hawaiian islands, and now, having taken possession of the Philippine Archipelago, let us trace the legislation of the United States in reference to that country. Not only is the special tax upon hemp exported from the Philippine islands remitted to the United State importer, greatly to the disadvantage of this country, but the most stringent law has been passed by the legislative bodies of the United States in reference to the transportation of goods between the United States and Philippine ports. We find an Act passed last year in the United States entitled :

A Bill to regulate shipping and trade between ports of the United States and ports and places in the Philippine archipelago, and for other purposes.

I ask hon. members to follow this in order that they may see the extent to which this principle is applied by the United States.

Be it enacted that on and after April 11, 1909——

—which is the date on which certain Spanish treaties will cease to exist:

—no merchandise except supplies for the army or navy shall be transported by sea, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine archipelago directly or via a foreign port or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States.

Section 2,

That on and after April 11, 1909, no foreign vessel shall transport passengers between ports of the United States and ports or places in the Philippine Archipelago, either directly or by way of foreign ports under a penalty of $200 for each passenger so transported and landed.

In other words, if a Canadian ship should undertake after the date mentioned to carry goods between the Philippine archipelago and the United States of America the goods in that ship would be subject to absolute forfeiture, and if a Canadian ship should start from the Philippine archipelago for any port in the United States and should go even via a Canadian port and land its passengers in the United States that ship would be subject to a fine of $200 for every passenger so transported.

And yet are we to be told in this country that we should not confine the preference to goods brought in through Canadian ports, that we should not confine this family arrangement between the motherland and her daughter colony to ourselves for fear that we should offend the United States of America ? All I have to say is that to admit such a proposition is to admit that we are not a self-reliant nation and that to admit such a policy would not be to the credit of any Canadian who desires to maintain the dignity of citizenship in this great country.

To summarize the argument which I have endeavoured to present in favour of this great proposition, let me say that the fast boats of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Allan lines are making their trips between Liverpool and Halifax and other Canadian maritime ports in as good time, if not better, than the time being made from Great Britain to New York. The other boats on the different lines plying between Great Britian and other Canadian maritime ports are of about the same class and make about the same time as the freight boats running to New York. The actual time occupied in transporting goods between Liverpool and Halifax even in the winter months by the fast boats is about six days. The time between Halifax and Montreal, even by the Intercolonial Railway, is between two and two and a half days. By actual experience during the present winter the service between Toronto and Montreal and other western Ontario points should not exceed a day and a half; so that the total time of transporting goods from Liverpool to Western Ontario points should not exceed eleven days. According to my information, which I consider trustworthy, the time taken via New York is equal to if not in excess of this number of days. If the freight rates are the same, if there are sufficient steamship lines to ensure com-

petition in freight charges, and if goods can be shipped as rapidly via Canadian steamship lines, Canadian ports and Canadian railways, why should we give the carriage of British goods to United States steamship lines, United States ports and United States railways?

These are a few of the arguments which can be made in favour of this proposition. Believing that this policy is in the best interest of a united Canada and that if we have not now the transportation facilities we shall have them within a short time, sharing as I do the national Canadian ambition to be independent of the United States of America, determined as far as in me humbly lies to assist in removing from the minds of the English exporter and others the false idea that we live only in the shadow of the United States and for the purpose of controverting the impression that the front door of Canada can only be approached during certain periods of the year through the gateway of an American port, I desire to move:

That the following be added to the tariff resolutions now before the House : That on and after the first day of May, 1908, the British preferential tariff shall only apply to goods brought direct to Canada by ship to a Canadian sea-port.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, this resolution which has been introduced by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) certainly strikes a loyal chord in our hearts. We would all like to see that kind of thing carried out, but when you translate it into cold, practical, commercial English you find that it is something you cannot carry out. Theoretical facts are one thing.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What kind?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Theoretical facts are one kind, but practical hard facts such as we have in every-day life are altogether different. Theoretical facts are good, but when you cannot carry them out they are not so fine an article. I wish, in the first place, to refer to the resolution which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat read and which was passed, as he said, in the city of Toronto, by delegates from the joint boards of trade. The resolution which I have and which you will find, as given by himself, on page 5074 of the 'Hansard' of 1904, I think, is as follows:

In order to encourage the importation of British goods via Canadian ports, this conference desires that the preferential rebate on goods imported from Great Britain——

Notice, Mr. Chairman, 'imported from Great Britain.'

—arriving by United States ports shall be limited to 25 per cent.

Mr. LOGAN.

I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it would be limited to 10 per cent.

Mr. LOGAN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, what I meant to say—and I think 'Hansard' will bear me out—was that under the preferential tariff the rate will be 33⅓ per cent if brought in through Canadian ports and 25 per cent if brought in through American ports. I said that there would be a difference of 10 per cent; it is 8⅓.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Now, I want to draw your attention to this portion of it; you understand in the first place that there were delegates from the maritime provinces as well as from Ontario and from all other portions of the Dominion. The people of Ontario did not wish to be too discourteous to their friend from the maritime provinces and those who are interested in this matter and consequently they did give them a certain amount of latitude. They were willing to allow the preference should be 33⅓ per cent only on all goods coming from Great Britain on the understanding that this would not apply to goods coming from ports other than those of Great Britain. You must bear in mind that we get a large share of our goods from the island of Mauritius and goods coming from Singapore now pay exactly the same freight to New York as they did to Liverpool. The consequence is that when we are getting goods in by way of New York we only have to pay the freight from New York to Toronto; whereas, if we were getting them via Liverpool we would have to pay the freight from Liverpool to Halifax and from Halifax to Toronto. What are the goods we get in that way? We get sago, rice, tapioca, spices of all kinds, ginger and tea. A very large amount of goods comes in that way and if we had to lose the extra amount that the adoption of this resolution would entail it would be a very serious loss to us. We would be perfectly satisfied if the conditions were such that we could get our goods in an expeditious manner that they should come this way.

Instead of calling on the gods of the thousand hills to come and give us more freight, we should call upon Hercules to help us to take away the freight we have already. The truck is too full now and there are too many parcels and packages, so that we cannot move it. One proof of that is, that one-quarter of the grain in the Northwest has not yet been moved. When will it be moved? Last year, according to the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, we had to send 20,000,000 bushels of our wheat by American ports when we only sent 21,000,000 by Canadian ports. Does not that show that we cannot ourselves take out our produce. And is this parliament going to make it still worse? What we should do is to provide

facilities for taking out our goods, instead of lifting the mailed fist and saying: You shall have to bring your goods in by a certain port, and you shall have to send your goods out by a certain port. Make Canadian ports so that they can handle Canadian trade and then you will have no need for a resolution such as this. It is not for us to feed our farmers and producers on vinegar; we should give them something sweeter; we should try to improve their condition rather than to make it worse. And if you pass this resolution what will be the result? To-day we have only two railway systems bringing goods from St. John and Halifax, and the result of this resolution would be to give them a complete monopoly of the carrying trade, with longer time in transit, and higher rates of freight. If you have facilities at Canadian ports and on Canadian railways the goods will come through Canada anyway. Provide these facilities and you do not need this resolution. My hon. friend (Mr. Logan) has spoken of the thousands of dollars spent on the port of St. John, but let me read him such an excellent authority as the chairman of the St. John Board of Trade, who, dealing with the harbour improvements and aids to navigation in the Bay of Fundy, says, with reference to the congestion of freight:

The unsatisfactory condition of affairs is known to all, and it is our duty to make the greatest effort to remedy it. We have to recognize that it is beyond the financial ability of the city to provide what is required, and we must appeal to the Dominion government for ways and means to carry on the work, commenced, and up to this time executed by, the city.

The city of St. John acknowledges it cannot do the work, and if they cannot accommodate the freight that is coming their way to-day, how will they accommodate a still greater quantity of freight. I have here a letter dated January 15, 1907, from a gentleman in Montreal, who says:

The freight that comes to us from England via St. John, New Brunswick, lies many days after getting into Montreal before the railways can get space to unload the cars. So bad has been the congestion in Montreal that the Canadian Pacific Railway has had to unload railway goods into ship sheds on the wharfs, and goods which arrived by ships in November last have in some cases not yet been delivered.

Here we have goods which arrived in November, not delivered on January 15. Surely that is a state of affairs that calls for a remedy; surely it is proof that we are not now able to provide facilities for the transportation of the goods coming to us. I quote the following from a correspondent of the Montreal 'Herald' of February 15, 1907:

Regarding the new customs regulations which provide that raw sugars, to obtain the benefit of the preferential tariff must be imported direct through Canadian ports; unfortunately for all concerned this arrangement has not worked out satisfactorily owing to the serious delays which have taken place while the sugars were in transit from Halifax. In some instances they have been as long as six weeks in the cars. Against this I have sugar from New York in three days.

Surely you do not want to pile up the agony on a suffering people by passing this resolution. It is bad enough when we cannot get our freight out; surely you are not going to make it so that we cannot get our freight in.

Now, I want to call attention to another point. If this applies to goods coming in, it will of course apply to goods going out.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). How will goods coming in be subject to the same delay as goods going out, and vice versa?

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. If we cannot get our goods in we cannot get them out; it is a poor rule that will not work both ways; the principle is exactly the same in both cases. I want to draw attention to the fact that there are times when we cannot get our goods out by way of Halifax and St. John, and there are times when the freight rates are much less by way of Boston and Portland than they are through Canadian ports. I take it that the man who owns the goods has the right to say what way he shall bring them in, or by what route he shall send them out. We are all perfectly satisfied, that so soon as you give us facilities to bring in our goods by Halifax or St. John, to bring them in by these ports. If our friends down by the sea will bring in a resolution asking for more money to increase the facilities at the ports of Halifax and St. John and to put them in the very best condition possible, I for one will support it with all my heart. But, until you have such facilities, until you have the means of handling goods there, why should you penalize us and make us conduct our trade under such serious disadvantages. I certainly trust that this resolution will not pass the House.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I am sure we are all in hearty sympathy with the object which the hon. member (Mr. Logan) has in view——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask if the government has any policy on this question?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend should not interfere with the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Kemp), who wishes to speak.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see any evidence that the Minister of Finance wishes to speak.

Mr. FIELDING. When I wish to speak I can generally get a hearing.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) has the floor.

Mr. KEMP. I am afraid that the government has no policy to announce.

Mr. FIELDING. Have the opposition a policy?

Mr. FOSTER. Is it for the opposition to have a policy, and not for the government?

Mr. FIELDING. Not necessarily, but you are very anxious about other people.

Mr. KEMP. I am sure that we are all in favour of any proposal which would tend towards the development of our Canadian seaports, and it is because I am in favour of the development of Canadian ports that I rise to speak this afternoon. The hon. member for Cumberland has dealt with several phases of this question; he has referred to freight rates being the same by way of Canadian ports as by way of United States ports, and of course that would be necessary. The freight rates in effect from Great Britain, via New York, Boston and Portland, to Canadian points, regulate the rates from Great Britain to the same points via Canadian ports. The hon. gentleman has also spoken of the number of hours that the railways take to carry goods from St. John and Halifax to western points such as Toronto. That, however, is not a very important matter at the present time, because in these days of railway congestion you cannot calculate on getting your merchandise on schedule time. All over this continent, and especially in Canada, the railways are blocked with freight, and while you might get freight from St. John to Toronto in fifty-two hours, if there was no congestion, it may now take three or four times that number of hours before you get your freight. Of course that same condition might exist in the case of freight from Boston, New York or Portland, so that there is nothing in the contention, at present at all events, as to getting our goods on schedule time.

A case was recently brought to my attention in which it took two weeks to get goods from Toronto to Montreal owing to the congestion that existed. The hon. gentleman referred to the coasting law of the United States. I agree with him that the United States has pursued a national policy in regard to coasting, but Canada is in exactly the same position in that respect; that is to say, while Canadian vessels cannot do a coasting trade in United States merchandise between United States ports, neither can United States vessels do a coasting trade between Canadian ports. If we acquire territory, as the United States has done in the case of Porto Rico and in the Pacific ocean, we would, I presume extend to that territory the coasting laws of Canada, just as the United States has extended its coasting laws to its possessions in the Pacific as well as in the Atlantic ocean. I cannot understand why it should be necessary to adopt such a course as the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has outlined, and which has been endorsed to some extent by the government or by members of the government. According to the quotations which the hon gentleman gave from 'Hansard' it seems that certain members of the government, particularly the Minister of Finance, were in favour of such a policy a year or two ago. I notice also that in the 'Globe' of February 15, in a report of a Liberal caucus, it was stated that the principle of this solution was endorsed, but that it was thought best to leave it for the government to say when the transportation facilities would make it feasible to enforce it. I do not know whether that report was official or not. Then, if we remember the words of the hon. Minister of Finance the night before last with respect to the sugar duties, I take it that he had in his mind the resolution of the hon. member for Cumberland when he declined to put into effect the amendment of the tariff in regard to sugar. So that it appears that the government are pretty well committed to this policy. When we take into consideration the fact that of the $54,164,102 worth of goods which comes into this country under the preferential tariff, we import the greater part through Canadian ports, I do not know why we should want to disturb existing bonding conditions and have a general misunderstanding with the United States. Most of the merchandise which comes into this country under the preferential tariff comes by way of the St. Lawrence during the open season of navigation, by way of Victoria and Vancouver on the Pacific coast, and a certain proportion for local consumption by way of maritime province ports. So much comes by way of the St. Lawrence because that is its cheapest route, reaching as it does into the distributing centres of the country and serving a large portion of the consuming population. The freight rate from Great Britain to Montreal via the St. Lawrence during the summer season is from 10 shillings to 11 shillings per ton; when navigation closes the rate is 23 shillings, 9 pence a ton approximately. So that it is in the interest of importers to lay in all that is possible before navigation closes. Of the total amount of $54,164,102 of merchandise imported last year under the preferential tariff fully two-thirds, I estimate, came by way of the St. Lawrence, Vancouver and Victoria and maritime province ports. As I have said, that would amount to $36,109,402, leaving $18,054,700 which we have to deal with. Now, it is difficult to say just how much of this comes in by Canadian ports. I have followed pretty closely what has taken place within

the last few years with respect to the development of our Canadian ports. Eight or ten years ago gentlemen representing Halifax and St. John addressed our boards of trade in the west, and since that time I have noticed a growing sentiment of loyalty amongst our manufacturers and importers, displaying itself in a disposition to patronize most freely our Canadian ports, This sentiment gives these ports an advantage, and it is a very important one. When there is a loss in an importation coming through an American port, the importer has the greatest possible difficulty in collecting his claim, not knowing what steamship company or railway or other transportation company is responsible; but if the goods are brought in by a Canadian port, he knows exactly where to place the responsibility. And in order to have a more rapid adjustment of claims, in order that the importer will have his claims adjusted and be able to get what he is entitled to, that is a factor of some importance. When we put this question of sentiment and claims together and consider what the Canadian ports would get in any event, I think there will be found a very small amount left which would be affected by this resolution. I do not know how much that would be, but I have here a memorandum of what the total imports were from the United Kingdom during the year 1906, both free and dutiable, which came through American ports. This was given in a reply to a question put by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) either this session or last. I refer to the amount which came through American ports under the preferential tariff.

Mr. DANIEL. Last session.

Mr. KEMP. The answer was that the total amount of goods which came from the United Kingdom, dutiable and free, through American ports was $13,283,428, out of a total import of $69,317,150. I do not know what proportion of our imports under the preferential tariff would be affected by this resolution of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), but I believe it would be a very small amount, and, considering the great risk we would be taking and the radical character of this resolution, I think it would be a very great mistake to adopt it.

The hon. gentleman referred to the international bonding system in force between this country and the United States. It seems to me that this is one of the most serious questions we have to consider in connection with this resolution. We have had for years past an international bonding system between the two countries. Under that system we are handling more American goods through Canadian ports destined for United States points than are being handled through American ports destined for Canadian points. I do not think there can be any doubt about that. My hon. friend has referred also to the question of freight rates, and claimed that this policy would not have a tendency to raise the rates. I have already shown that our freight rates in Canada are regulated by those in existence between British and American ports. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. DANIEL. What was the amount of United States goods handled through American ports and the amount of Canadian goods handled through United States ports?

Mr. KEMP. I have not got the figures, but I assume that the amount of goods which were handled through American ports destined for Canadian points are not as great as the amount handled through Canadian ports destined to American points. That is the statement I made. If you accept the theory I lay down, and which I claim is correct, because I have had personal experience and can give an instance in point and produce the documents, then the adoption of this resolution would undoubtedly raise freight rates. A year or so ago the railway and steamship companies raised the rates of a certain commodity to Canadian points. I was under the impression that they were giving lower rates to American points than to Toronto, and I took the trouble to cable to Great Britain in order to ascertain if my impression was correct. I found that the railway and steamship companies plying to Canadian ports were quoting practically the same rate to Chicago as to Toronto, yet Chicago is 516 miles west of Toronto, and that freight had to be carried through Toronto in order to get to that western city. The reason is this, that the ocean rates from Liverpool or other British points to New York are very much lower than the ocean rates from Great Britain to a Canadian port. I have here some circulars in which the figures will be found. For instance, the rate from Liverpool to Halifax is exactly double what the rate is from Liverpool to New York.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE. On what kind of goods?

Mr. KEMP. I will send my hon. friend the circular, and he can look it over for himself.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. On the same class of goods?

Mr. KEMP. Yes. The reason is this, that the steamships plying between Great Britain and Canadian ports have not to meet the same competition as the great number of lines which ply between Liver-

pool and New York. The rate between Liverpool and New York is seven shillings and sixpence a ton, and between Liverpool and Halifax, fifteen shillings a ton. And the rate between Liverpool and St. John is twelve shillings and six a ton. I am taking these figures from a circular issued by a very reputable firm, which has offices in London and Liverpool—the firm of John Williams & Sons—and the circular is dated February 14, 1907.

What I am contending is this, that the bonding system in effect between Canada and the United States is a very great advantage to both countries, that it is a regulator of freight rates, and we should not do anything to disturb it. The question is a very serious one. Here is this western country, the western United States, which is geographically right behind Canada, and we are in a far better position, as regards mileage and for geographical reasons, to secure the freight which is imported from Europe to these western states. That business is constantly increasing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You mean the business for western points in the United States?

Mr. KEMP. Yes, which might come from Europe through Canadian ports. There is a tremendous amount of traffic taken at St. John, Halifax and Montreal and carried through Canada on to Chicago and the west.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. How does the hon. gentleman account for that if the freight rates from Liverpool to Canadian ports are double those to New York?

Mr. KEMP. I account for it in this way. Where the railways have to meet competition, they have to so adjust their through rates as to secure the traffic and counteract the difference in the ocean rates.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The railways assume the difference?

Mr. KEMP. I think the rate is lower for through shipments in order to meet freight rates via United States ports to points in Ontario and the west. Freight rates via Canadian ports are regulated by the competition via United States ports, but if you legislate to throw all this business into Canadian ports, you will do away with American competition, and the rates will be very much higher than at present.

I would like to know from the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) if he considers of importance this question of the amount of merchandise destined for American ports which go via Montreal, Halifax, and St. John. Does he consider that of any importance? But there is something else just as important. We are working up a tremendous business on the Pacific coast. We are bringing the products of China, Japan, and the Straits Settlements in British vessels to Vancouver, destined for United States points, and there is a tremendous tonnage being carried that way by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will be carried perhaps before long by the Grand Trunk Railway, into the United States. Now, it might not be considered a very extraordinary thing to pass the resolution that the hon. member for Cumberland has proposed; and it might not be considered a very ingenious thing for the United States government to find some way of preventing this merchandise coming in from the Pacific coast and from the Atlantic coast, without interfering possibly with the bonding privilege, if they did not want to go that far. But I do not think they would hesitate to put some consular arrangement or customs regulation into effect which would cut this out. I do not think the hon. member for Cumberland has sounded our Canadian railways on this question, he does not say that he has sounded them. I fear that our Canadian railways would be very much opposed to this motion for the reasons that I have stated, and I am afraid that before long we would find our Canadian railways at Washington, as they were a few years ago, on their knees, trying to prevent the American government from interfering in any way with the bonding privilege. We are getting along very well with the United States just now, particularly since they have become involved in colonial possession they have not paid so much attention to us. But we must not forget that the American people are very sensitive in regard to these matters. For instance, let us go back to 1892, when the United States claimed that we were discriminating against them by giving a rebate on the tolls through the Welland canals, and they claimed that they should have equal privileges in the Welland canal for their products with Canadian products. In 1892 President Harrison proposed retaliation in a message.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that not a treaty right?

Mr. KEMP. I believe that both the bonding privilege and the Welland canal matter were treaty rights. The United States Congress passed a law under which the President could put into effect a certain regulation with respect to freight passing through the American Soo canal, and they promptly did so and retaliated upon us. Now, if the American people were sensitive in regard to matters of that kind they would be sensitive again if we attempted in any way to interfere with the national bonding system, which I understand is a treaty right. The hon. member for Cumberland did not say how this would affect that

large volume of imports which come into this country from all points in the British empire, and that are entitled to the British preference, where we have no direct steamship connection. He referred to a conference which took place in Toronto, I think in 1902, when certain gentlemen, he says, favoured this project. But there were other gentlemen who spoke at that conference who said that their business would be affected by that project because they were obliged to import certain commodities from New York, through want of a direct steamship connection, and they could not, under this project, bring goods through Canadian ports.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another point which, to my mind, is equally important. A few days ago on January 15, Secretary Root made a statement of policy before the National Convention for the Extension of Foreign Commerce, in which he declared in favour of a minimum and maximum tariff system. I think that those of us who have followed the articles appearing in American newspapers and magazines, must be convinced that the Americans are moving in the direction of a minimum and maximum tariff. Let me also remind the House that recently the Massachusetts legislature, by an almost unanimous vote, passed a resolution declaring in favour of a maximum and minimum tariff. I think that only twenty-three out of a total of two hundred and eighty or three hundred members voted against that resolution, and it was sent to the President of the United States. I think, therefore, that we may conclude from all these indications that the United States will have before long a minimum and a maximum tariff. Now, Mr. Chairman, what position would we be in supposing they followed our example in establishing a minimum and a maximum tariff? We might say that importations under our minimum tariff must come in through Canadian ports. Supposing that the Americans said that importations coming in under their minimum tariff must come in through American ports. That would destroy all the commerce that comes into Canadian ports at the present time destined for the United States, both on the Atlantic and the Pacific coast. I believe that this bonding system has been an advantage to Canada, and I do not think that we can afford to trifle with it. I believe that we are profiting more from the bonding system than the Americans are. I believe we are bringing in more goods for American points to-day than the Americans are bringing in through their ports destined for Canadian points. I believe that we shall gain still more from this system by improving the St. Lawrence waterways and all the facilities which we have in all our Canadian ports. I think we are handling to-day all that it is possible for us to handle with our present facilities. I believe in spending sufficient money to develop our Canadian ports, and that our American business will grow if we leave things as they are. I believe that Canadian business through American ports will decrease as time goes on. Just think of what is taking place at the present time. We talk about the $13,000,000 worth of free and dutiable goods that came in last year from the United Kingdom through United States ports. The imports that came in last year through the port of St. John were $10,000,000 in excess of what came in the year before. I hold in my hand the report of the Board of Trade of St. John which has just been received. I find that our imports through that port since 1905, when that port first began to develop on a large scale, are 500 per cent in excess of what they were at that time. I may also say in passing that our exports from the port of St. John have increased during that time 700 per cent.

Referring to the increase in imports through the port of St. John last years I may say that in 1905 the imports were $5,582,477 and in 1906, $15,124,424. When we take all these things into consideration, when we think of the risk we are running, at a time when we stand a chance to increase the American imports of our Canadian ports, and these ports stand a chance to benefit, would it not be a foolish thing to pass such a resolution as that which is proposed by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan)? I believe that this resolution if carried would ultimately have a very injurious effect upon our Canadian ports and that is the reason why I intend to vote against it. We are getting along very well; let us increase our railway facilities and our facilities at these ports and let us not adopt a policy which will kill, possibly for all time, the American business which we are getting at the present time.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). This is the third time that this matter has been discussed in this House, and I think that the discussion this year has perhaps been more thorough, as far as it has gone, than has been the case on former occasions. I think it right that in discussing a resolution of this kind we should have not only what can be said in favour of it thoroughly brought out but also the legitimate objections that may be made to it. I think there is some little lack of knowledge with regard to the amount of business that is done under the preferential tariff through Canadian ports. I know that that is the case with the press, as I have noticed that editors in this city have spoken of the amount and value of goods brought in through the United States ports in very exaggerated terms. I procured through the Customs Department the actual figures of goods that were imported from the United Kingdom through American and Canadian ports, for the years 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906. The figures are as follows:

Year.	Through U. S. Ports.	Percentage.	Through Canadian Ports.	Percentage.
	$		$	
1903	12,796,772 00	21·66	46,271,934 00	78·34
1904	12,685,878 00	20·47	49,275,031 00	79·53
1905	12,399,326 00	20·48	48,139,485 00	79·52
1906	13,283,428 00	19·16	56,033,722 00	80·84

This shows that we are importing through United States ports not more than one-fifth, in fact only 19 per cent during the last year and the other 80 per cent through our own ports, so that when we speak of a change being made such as is advocated by the resolution brought forward to-day we cannot and need not trouble ourselves about the importations through American ports being so large as to disturb the channels of trade, and create difficulties of which we may not know the result, because the matter is really not of such great importance as that. As far as the maritime provinces are concerned, I would say that if the resolution is not passed it will not break us any more than if it pass it will make us. I do say that if it is passed it will be a great and very considerable advantage to the eastern end of Canada for several reasons.

My hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) spoke about the great congestion of freight that takes place on the eastern end of our lines, the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I might say to that hon. gentleman that if we had many speeches such as he has made to-day, there would not, for a very long time, be much congestion of freight in that part of the country; there would be very little freight at all and I would prefer to hear the hon. gentleman taking a different cue and speaking on lines which would go to build up our own ports rather than decrying them as I am afraid he did.

He said also that there would be no competition, that if this resolution were to be passed every thing would have to go over the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is it impossible for the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway to give themselves a little honest competition? Why should there be no competition between those two lines any more than between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway? I must say that his objection seems to me very far fetched indeed. He made a quotation from the Montreal 'Herald,' written by a gentleman who does not appear to have the courage to sign his own name but who writes over the nom de plume 'Merchant'. I do not know whether he is a railway man or a sugar refiner or what he is, he conceals his identity and what does he say, speaking of the new customs regulations which the Minister of Finance brought in by which sugar can only get the advantage of the preferential rate if imported through Canadian ports? He says, speaking of shipments via Halifax and St. John:

> Unfortunately for all concerned, this arrangement has not worked satisfactorily owing to the serious delays which have taken place while the sugars were in transit from Halifax. In some instances these have been as long as six weeks in the cars. Against this I have had sugar from New York in three days.

Now what argument is there in a statement of this kind? In the winter he says one shipment was delayed for six weeks. Supposing the statement to be true, it is something at which we need not be entirely surprised that one shipment is delayed in winter by snow storms, &c., over a long line of railway. One gentleman spoke of the time it took to get freight from New York being so much less than that from Halifax. But this writer says 'I have had them from New York in three days, showing that as a general thing it took a great deal longer than three days to get his freight from New York, and if we take the statement of the hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) the time taken in shipping from Halifax or St. John by the Intercolonial Railway must be, as a general thing, less, or at all events no greater than the time taken when importing from New York.

There is, to my mind, one important reason why a policy of this kind should be adopted, and that is that it would compel shippers on the other side of the water to gain a little more knowledge than they appear to have at the present day of our ports and facilities and of this Canada of ours as a country generally. As a matter of fact it is surprising, but it is true, that there is a very great amount of ignorance in regard to this country on the other side of the water even among merchants, shippers, and other business men of that character who might be expected to know better. Last summer, in the city of Toronto, where a great many people had assembled to attend the meeting of the British Medical Association, when everybody was travelling in the coolest and loosest kind of clothing he could possibly get on, there was received from some part of England a case of goods intended for exhibition at that association meeting and on the outside of this case of goods was printed in large letters 'Please Protect from Frost.' This came out to To-

ronto when everybody was sweltering in the heat and when people could find no cool place to sit in or lie in. This is but one evidence of the ignorance which exists on the other side of the water on Canadian matters. The passing of a resolution of this kind would compel those people on the other side of the water to find out something about the Canadian ports through which they would be obliged to ship their goods if they wish to take advantage of the British preference. Another point that I would like to refer to is this: While the people of the eastern provinces would like to get all they can, or all that belongs to them, I do not think that they would urge upon this country the adoption of that policy if, by so doing, they were going to impose upon the rest of Canada greater rates or greater expense than they are called upon to bear under the present conditions when goods are imported through our own ports. When this matter was up in 1905 I gave the rates of freight which were charged on goods shipped through the port of New York to Toronto, and on all classes of goods from Halifax and St. John to the same place and in every one of these classes—and I would like my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) to bear this in mind—the rate from St. John and Halifax to Toronto is less than the rate from New York to Toronto.

Mr. KEMP. These rates do not affect importation. They are local rates.

Mr. DANIEL. No, sir, and in addition to that I wish to say further that in so far as the ocean rates on these goods are concerned they were actually the same from Liverpool to New York, from Liverpool to Boston, from Liverpool to Portland, and from Liverpool to St. John and Halifax.

Mr. KEMP. I admitted that the rate necessarily had to be the same.

Mr. DANIEL. Your John Williams & Company circular did not say that.

Mr. KEMP. I explained that these were local rates.

Mr. DANIEL. Then what was the object of bringing in the circular?

Mr. KEMP. Well, I thought I made my self clear.

Mr. DANIEL. The freight rates are these per 100 lbs.:

Class.	From Maritime ports to Toronto.	From New York to Toronto.
1..	36 cents.	57 cents.
2..	32 cents.	49 cents.
3..	27 cents.	39 cents.
4..	23 cents.	27 cents.
5..	18 cents.	22 cents.
6..	17½ cents.	19 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these local rates?

Mr. DANIEL. These are the freight rates on goods from New York to Toronto and from maritime ports to Toronto while the ocean rates from Liverpool are the same in all cases. In so far as freight rates are concerned I have here shown that the people of Ontario and the west would do better by getting their goods through Canadian ports than by importing them through the port of New York.

I spoke of the educative effect which would be one result of the adoption of this policy and I think it is needed. It would teach the shipper on the other side of the water that Canada is not part of the United States and while it may seem strange that we have at this day to speak of that, as a matter of fact, I believe the necessity still exists. We ought to be able to teach him that these are two distinct countries, that we are friends and neighbours and always hope to be, but that we are each trying to carve out our own destiny, under our own flag and under our own form of government, that we are each proud of our own individuality and doing the best we can to become nations under our own individuality and under our own government. I would like to refer to the objections which have been made to carrying out a policy of this kind. I do not wish in any way to minimize the objections which have been brought forward by the hon. gentleman who just preceded me. He speaks of difficulties with the United States: he speaks of what might take place in case the United States chose to go in for reprisals. That, it appears to me, is one point which may be urged against the adoption of this policy. At the same time, as the hon. member for Cumberland has already said, here is the United States applying its coasting laws away out in the Atlantic as far as Porto Rico and extending them half way around the world to the Philippine Islands. We have our coasting laws but I think we have not been quite so niggardly in carrying them out as the United States have. We allow some eight different countries to share in the coasting trade with ourselves. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) was a little inclined to doubt that, but the fact is that the following countries are now entitled to share in our coasting privileges: Italy, since 1873; Germany, since 1874; The Netherlands, since 1874; Sweden and Norway, since 1874; Austro-Hungary, since since 1876; Denmark, since 1877; Belgium, since 1879; and the Argentine Republic, since 1881.

Mr. KEMP. The United States do not.

Mr. DANIEL. The United States do not because they do not reciprocate, and because they will not reciprocate. At all events, it would seem that this is the only

serious objection that can be raised to the carrying out of this policy. There is no doubt that we do export a great deal of American goods through Canadian ports, and, should the United States by any customs regulation put an end to this, I am free to admit that I think we should gain very little by the passing of a resolution of this kind. However, the amount involved is so comparatively small that I do not think we need fear any such action as that on the part of the United States, and that factor can be left out of our consideration of this question. Now, as to our shipping business; I regret to say that the shipping of the eastern provinces, including Quebec, is on the declining stage. During the last ten years the registered shipping of the eastern provinces, including Quebec, has decreased 40 per cent. Here are the figures:

Province.	Year.	Registered tons of shipping.
New Brunswick..	1895	122,407
New Brunswick..	1905	40,145
Nova Scotia..	1895	343,356
Nova Scotia..	1905	198,976
Quebec..	1895	158,776
Quebec..	1905	141,406
Prince Edward Island..	1895	19,323
Prince Edward Island..	1905	11,924

The shipping industry of Canada has not been assisted to any extent by the tariff, and in view of the figures I have quoted, it is the duty of this parliament to come to its aid. I saw a statement in one of the newspapers recently, which shows to what a great extent the building of ships is handicapped in Canada by means of the tariff. This newspaper stated, that a steamer called the 'Midland Prince,' a large vessel of 10,000 tons, was launched at Collingwood last fall, and the duties paid on the material which entered into the construction of that vessel ranged between $25,000 and $30,000, while the drawback of $1.15 per ton would only amount to $11,500, so that vessel paid practically $12,000 in custom duties. I certainly would urge upon the House the reasonableness of taking this whole question into consideration, and of adopting the motion presented by the hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Logan). The people of the maritime provinces take a great interest in this matter, the boards of trade have pronounced in favour of it, the legislature of New Brunswick has passed a resolution supporting it, and, coming from a maritime city I feel it my duty to urge upon this House the adoption of this resolution, so that our shipping interests may be benefited, and that the Intercolonial Railway may reap the advantage of participating in the haul of this $14,000,000 worth of goods which come in under the British preference and which now go through American ports.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). I agree with a great many of the remarks made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), who introduced the resolution, and I am sure we all look forward to the time when the trade of Canada will be carried on our own railways and through our own ports. But the question is, has that time yet arrived? Of course, I look upon this question from the standpoint of a western member. We in the west, are now labouring under great disadvantages in the matter of transportation. We have great difficulty in getting our products shipped out of the country, and we would not like to have the conditions made worse by the putting of this resolution into force at the date mentioned in it, for I fear that with regard to the importation of goods to the west we would then be much worse off than we are at present. The hon. member for Cumberland pointed out that $20,000,000 worth of goods from Great Britain and her colonies which came in under the preference, passed through American ports, and that $5,000,000 worth of these goods came in during the summer months. I presume that the lesson from that is either that the rates through American ports were cheaper than through Canadian ports, or that the facilities at the American ports are better than they are at our own ports.

I am sure that the average Canadian importer is loyal enough, other things being equal, to have his goods brought in by Canadian ports. Some hon. gentlemen have claimed that the freight rates from Liverpool to Toronto via St. John and Halifax are lower than the rates via New York. If that is the case, why do the goods not come in that way? The fact is that there is more competition via New York, and for that reason goods coming that way are transported more quickly and cheaply than they would be by maritime provinces ports. The hon. member for Cumberland pointed out that if goods coming in under the preferential tariff were forced to come by way of St. John and Halifax, after they reached Montreal they could go by any route the importer wished. To my mind, as a western man, it is just as important that we should have liberty to bring the goods by the cheapest route all the way from Liverpool to Winnipeg as from Montreal to Winnipeg. The hon. member also said that Sir George Drummond, who was at one time the president of the Manufacturers' Association, was in favour of this resolution. I should imagine he would be; why should he not be? As a manufacturer, he would regard this resolution, if passed, as being in the interest of Canadian manufacturers, because it would be equivalent to adding so much duty to imports coming into Canada; and that is just what I object to in it. If we are going to have more duty put on goods coming into Canada, let it be done in the tariff, and then we shall know what we are doing. We in the west do not want the goods we have to import made any more expensive

than they are at the present time. When we have ample facilities for bringing goods through the eastern ports of Canada to the west, the people of the west will gladly welcome that condition of things. The hon. member for Cumberland said that cargoes of goods were brought from the lower provinces to Montreal in two or three days. When he said cargoes, I do not suppose he meant the whole of the cargoes, but small portions of them. Every member of this House knows that it is impossible to bring goods from the lower provinces to Montreal in such a short time. Only a short time ago, when the question of carrying coal in the Northwest was brought up in this House, an effort was made by the local government of Saskatchewan to have rolling stock sent from the Intercolonial to carry coal for the people who were suffering for the lack of fuel, and what was the answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals ? It was that there were a thousand loaded cars standing on sidings in the lower provinces because they had not engines enough to haul them, and, in addition, there were very many more carloads of goods waiting to be loaded. If that is the case, why should we put more work on these railways, and in doing so increase the cost of goods to the people in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). The American railways also are short of cars.

Mr. TURRIFF. They probably are, but as things are at present, we have two strings to our bow ; if we cannot get the goods in one way, we can in another, and when we have competition they are likely to be brought in more quickly. There is very little likelihood of this condition of affairs being changed for the better for some years to come, for the reason that business in Canada is increasing at a faster rate than the capacity of the railways to furnish rolling stock. One of the leading railway officials stated in the last few months that they were not catching up, because, while every day they had twenty-five cars added to their equipment, there were thirty going into the scrap heap. At that rate how long will it take the railways to furnish additional facilities for catching up with the development of trade in this country ? I know of a case within the last two or three months of two carloads of goods shipped from Ottawa to Montreal, which, after reaching Montreal, one was twenty-one days and the other nearly a month before the consignee could get the cars where he could unload them, such was the congestion of traffic. It would be the greatest blow which could happen to the western country—and I presume the same would apply to Ontario—to hamper the people in any way in getting goods into that country. As one of the speakers pointed out this afternoon about half of our wheat has to go out through American ports, simply because we have not the facilities at the present time to handle it to advantage in Canadian ports. The traffic will go by the cheapest route, and any effort to force it into another route will eventually be at the expense of the consumer. The purpose of this resolution is to force all the goods coming in from Great Britain under the preferential tariff to come in by Canadian ports. That means during the winter season by St. John or Halifax, over either the Intercolonial or the Canadian Pacific Railway. As we all know, the Canadian Pacific Railway runs through a portion of the United States, and, as has been pointed out, if the American people decided to abrogate the bonding system, we would be confined to one railroad which two or three months ago had a thousand loaded cars on the sidings and no engines to haul them. We would not liket to be dependent on one line of railroad, especially when it has more business than it can attend to at present. Let us wait some years until the other transcontinental railroads which we are building are completed and until our ports are so equipped that we can handle the freight in Canada as cheaply and quickly as it can now be handled when brought in by New York, and when that time comes it will be time enough to pass a resolution of this kind. We would all like to have a monopoly of the transportation, but at present to adopt this resolution would do more harm than good. I trust therefore it will not be passed in its present shape, which would bring it in'o force a year from next May, but put off the time when it will come into force until we are in a position to handle the trade. Then it will be welcome all over the Dominion.

Mr. GEORGE SMITH (North Oxford). I am fully in accord with the principle of the resolution, but I believe, with the last speaker (Mr. Turriff), that the date mentioned in the resolution ought to be put further off than 1908. It seems to me the reasons are obvious to all. We have had in Canada to fight against climatic and geographical conditions in all our trade lines from east to west. Only the other day I heard the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Scott) state that his first trip from Toronto to Montreal was by stage coach. Mark you, that occurred within the life time of a member of this government. The next development was probably the Erie canal, when people from Great Britain landed at New York and came up that canal to the Niagara peninsula and thence to western Canada. The next step was the building of the Grand Trunk Railway, with its terminal point at Portland. Then came the Intercolonial Railway, with its terminal at Halifax—a railway built rather for imperial than commercial interests.

The next step in advance was the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with its terminal point at St. John. And we have now under way the Grand Trunk Pacific transcontinental road, and I believe that in the near future we shall have another outlet at Hudson bay. When we have all these lines built, then will be the time to carry out the policy of this resolution. As Canadians, we are the better of all these struggles. It is the struggle that makes the people, just as it does the man. Wherever you find obstacles to be overcome, you find a people developed by the very struggle to overcome them. Look at the building of the Quebec bridge. I do not know that we realize the importance of this project. To my mind, it is one of our most important undertakings, the accomplishment of which will give us an open winter port. The importance of such a port cannot be underrated. Why, Russia went to war with Japan for the purpose of getting a winter port at Port Arthur, and you know the result. Japan rose to the position of a first-rate power, while Russia lost considerable prestige. Here in Canada we have another barrier to our transcontinental trade, and that is Lake Winnipeg, running 200 miles north and south. Our Grand Trunk Pacific had to go around—I suppose through the drawing powers of Winnipeg—the south end to within a few miles of the United States boundary, but in the future the probabilities are that we shall have a road running directly north from Quebec to Edmonton, going to the north of this 200 miles of Lake Winnipeg. We see this northern development going on in many other lines. Look at our summer resorts. When I was a boy we used to hear about Saratoga. Later on it was the Thousand Islands, then the Muskoka islands, and possibly, in the near future, our summer resorts will be on the shores of Hudson bay. I should like to know just what effect the adoption of this resolution would have on British trade with Canada. It unquestionably would operate as a restriction, because it would restrict the preferential tariff to goods coming by Canadian ports. Any one who comes from Toronto to Ottawa knows the difference in climatic conditions. You may leave Toronto while it is raining and you have almost summer conditions, and before you get to Ottawa you are into winter. Why should you compel the people of western Ontario to take their chances of snow blockades and delays, for that is the main difficulty? I have been in conversation with merchants in the city where I live, and they have told me that the difference in rates is immaterial, but that the delay in getting goods is a very great barrier, and it would be an injustice to subject the people of Ontario at this date to such a handicap. Taking a broader view, we find in the world to-day a gigantic struggle for commercial supremacy. We find nation competing against nation for commercial supremacy. What effect would the adoption of this resolution have on our relationship with the old land? Would it draw us any nearer or wider apart? I would be inclined to favour the postponing of this measure for a considerable length of time, say until the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific or the building of another line from the west to the Hudson bay, thus giving the Canadian people an outlet at Hudson bay. I shall not take up the time of the House any longer, but shall conclude by stating that while I am in favour of the principle of this resolution, I think we should delay carrying out the policy it embodies until these facilities are furnished our people.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, I thought when the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) announced his resolution and supported it with so much eloquence and power, that it would receive the unanimous assent of the committee, but subsequently, some remarks which were made caused me to alter that opinion. I thought that the resolution was a harmless one, and in line with the generally avowed and expressed sentiment of the country; but this afternoon my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) has regarded it as a bomb-shell intended to disturb the amicable feelings existing between us and our mutual friend Mr. Root, Secretary of State of the United States, and that it might have the malignant tendency of preventing him from applying the minimum clause of his minimum and maximum tariff to Canada. On the other hand, my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. George Smith) is alarmed lest the passage of this resolution should outrage the mother country and destroy the amicable and cordial relations existing between the mother corntry and Canada. So, between these two fires, the American fire and the British fire, this resolution may suffer. My opinion is, however, that it does not deserve the criticism of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp), nor has it the aspect in which it appears to my hon. frend from Oxford (Mr. George Smith). The British preference was intended as a material advantage to the British manufacturers, in order that the trade so created might have a sentimental influence upon the relations between Canada and Great Britain, and that as a consequence of the sentiment so created Canada herself might reap a reciprocal advantage. So that sentiment and material interests are blended together. We took the initiative, we held out the

olive branch to the mother country and gave her a preference, and we hoped that the advantage given the mother country might result in a reciprocal advantage to Canada as a consequence. I have no doubt that that preference will result in advantage to both the mother country and to Canada. Therefore, if that be an advanatage, and it is conceded to be an advantage, the adverse speakers this afternoon acknowledge that it is an advantage, and they approve of the preference so given why it should not be applied to its utmost limit, to the greatest extent of which it is capable? Why should not all portions of the Dominion participate in that advantage? Why should not the preference and all that results from the preference be made a common benefit to each province and to each constituent part of Canada?

My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) quoted some statistics to show the insignificant amount of goods which would come into Canada if this preference were applied, if the advantage of coming into Canadian ports were made obligatory. The amount of goods introduced, he thinks, would be exceedingly small. From the figures read by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) the proportion of goods that could enter through the maritime ports during the winter time was about one-fourth as compared with those that were imported into the whole of Canada through all sources and at all times. Now, the figures of dollars and cents do not present this subject to the eye and to the mind as they should do. Dollars and cents are not an adequate criterion and test of the value of the trade. A truer test is the value of the trade, the bulk of goods which are carried from the mother country to Canadian ports and distributed throughout Canada. That is a closer criterion, and presents a more correct idea of this special trade than does a comparison in dollars and cents of the receipts through the maritime ports as compared with the general receipts. Under the tariff I think there accrues an advantage to the consumer of about ten per cent on high priced goods which would be subject to thirty per cent under the tariff, and the reduction of one-third would amount to about ten per cent on the value of the goods. I would like my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) to attend to that point, because that element will enter into the whole calculation of the value of this trade with Canada and to the maritime and mercantile interests. Now, the difference on the whole amount of freight upon the high priced goods would not be greater, I think than one per cent. I have not calculated it, and I have no figures in that respect, but I think the difference in freight upon the whole of the high priced goods would not amount to more than one per cent. So, if the consumers of the goods received under the preferential tariff ten per cent, and they would pay at the utmost one per cent freight the proportion of that which would be in excess on account of coming through the maritime ports would be an insignificant sum. Now, if, as my hon. friend says, the proportion of freight received in this way would be insignificant in itself, insignificant in comparison to the volume of trade otherwise received, why would it be so serious an impediment to good relations between us and our friend Mr. Root? If it be an insignificant matter, why would it destroy this good feeling which has been produced at the expense of so much dining and wining? Thus the increased payment on account of freight by the consumer in Canada is a very insignificant element.

Now, Sir, having started with that little statement with regard to the value of heavy goods in contradistinction to light goods and asserting as I do that the efforts made by steamboats and railroads is to secure heavy and bulky goods as cargo and freight, I shall go on to show that the consideration of receiving heavy goods for carriage westbound outweighs the mere amount in dollars and cents received in freight rates. Steamers on the Atlantic carry full and heavy freights from American and Canadian ports to Europe. On the return voyage they carry ballast or a small proportion of cargo. Ship owners must supplement that in order to meet the exigencies of an Atlantic voyage with either an excessive quantity of coal, or water ballast or adopt some other expedient to sink the ships in the water. Therefore they will carry heavy goods westbound for an insignificant rate of freight. For instance, my friend from Toronto has sent me the paper by which they profess to carry heavy goods from Liverpool to New York for 7s. 6d. a ton whereas to St. John they charge 12s. 6d. The amount of the freight on the value of the goods is insgnificant, it amounts to a very small item but the value to the steamboat of this heavy freight is great. It shortens the voyage, it obviates the necessity of discharging a lot of cargo or water ballast or handling coal at great expense. The steamer can afford to carry heavy goods at cheap rates simply for the sake of having back freight. Some of these liners carry grain for nothing or carry it to Liverpool or Glasgow for a penny or a penny and a half a bushel, but to London and Hull and other places the rate is twice that. Some liners, for the purpose of procuring grain for ballast, bring it back again to America and carry it over again. Captains of steamboats have told me that they have had three passages of grain in the hold at a time simply because it paid them better to carry it back and forward than to discharge it and get other ballast. The railroads need heavy goods to haul to the west. The traffic in heavy and bulky goods is from the Northwest, from Ontario, from Montreal, from all parts of Canada down to the sea-board, and the railroads want heavy and bulky goods to carry back in their cars as otherwise the cars

have to go back empty, and the sea-board freight has to pay a double rate; it has to pay for the carriage of the goods to the sea-board and also to pay for the haulage of the cars back again. Thus if we could secure heavy cargo to load the cars on the west bound haul it would largely diminish the rate of freight charged on western goods which are going to their destination in the east, to maritime provinces ports and to other places along the line.

Therefore, this is not a simple abstract question of rate against rate, we must also consider the collateral advantages which will accrue from having westbound cargo to carry on the steamers and on the cars. In this way the haul to the eastward is reduced by the amount of return freight which the railways and steamboats obtain on the goods they carry to the west.

This is the object, to cheapen the rate on the steamboat and on the railroad and therefore those in the west who must secure the carriage of their products to the sea-board at the lowest rate, especially when they enter into close competition so that the obtaining of the lowest possible rates on the carriage of these goods is of importance to them, are especially interested in obtaining heavy freight for westbound carriage by steamship and boat. Such differences have often turned the trade in favour of the Canadian shipper in markets where the competition is very close and where the sale depends on the cheapness of transport by both rail and water. Not only is this problem of importance to-day but it will become more and more important in the future as trade increases, as the railroads multiply, as more steamers are built, as there are more competing lines and as tramp steamers come to ply on Canadian routes. With this expansion in trade the importance of such a measure as this and the importance of securing westbound cargoes will become more and more manifest and the advantage it will be to the country will become more evident.

The importance of this subject has been recognized not only by members of parliament, by merchants, by ship owners and railroad managers in Canada but by American capitalists. At the present time lines of steamers are being constructed to carry on trade especially on these lines in order to procure for the American ports the trade of the Northwest through the cheapening of freight rates on the Atlantic by carrying westbound cargo destined for western Canada and for the American ports in these vessels. It is hoped by that means to be able to place agricultural products, grain, cattle, &c., in the British market at a lower rate than that at which they can be transported by Canadian routes. This project is now definitely under way, the capital has been subscribed, the lines are being built and before we waken up to the results of delay in this matter, the Americans will have captured the trade of the Northwest and then we can have what there is left, we can then say: The time has come when we will have cheap freights, when we will have cheap transportation to the coast and have goods come through Canadian ports—but it will then be too late and it takes a long time to capture trade that has set in a certain channel and to warp it into new channels after it has been secured by powerful competitors, who will do anything to secure and hold the trade which they have won by their enterprise and by their promptitude. We should not wait until a thing is manifest to every one, until the competition actually exists, until the trade has slipped away; you should foresee what will transpire five or ten years hence. When the Transcontinental Railway is built, when the other railroads are completed from the interior to the sea-board, every body will see it and many will complain that at a favourable juncture the opportnnity was lost for want of foresight, by not grasping that opportunity, and anticipating the demand which would arise later on. Not only will there be lines of steamships constructed to effect that purpose, but they will be especially constructed for the grain trade. We know that the oil traffic was formerly carried on in sailing vessels and the loss of shipping which has been deplored was mainly in consequence of the loss of the oil trade to Canada. Many of our vessels carried oil in barrels.

When the Standard Oil Company introduced tank steamers the cost of the barrel being carried across and brought back was removed altogether from the calculation. They were able to handle their product in all the cities of Europe at the minimum cost. The effort will be made in the future, I venture to predict, to carry grain over in steamers specially constructed for that purpose. Self-trimmers, quick discharges, vessels constructed with beam bulkheads enough to make the voyage and possessing all the requisites of modern steamships will be provided. Whoever applies them to this trade captures the trade. Whoever provides modern facilities, if they are calculated to reduce the cost of transport, captures the trade in these days of competition. Argentine is contending with Canada, Russia is contending with Canada, all the grain producing countries are contending with Canada and we are to stand still and see that trade pass us when we can supply these facilities and obtain that trade by means of promptly investing in it and making use of the facilities that we have?

This advantage, Mr. Chairman, will not only accrue to the maritime provinces. This advantage will be obtained by the Northwest because the cheapening of freight on the long trains will cheapen the cost of the sending of their products. It will be of advantage to Ontario with respect to its eastern freight. Every car load of freight which is sent to the maritime provinces is

increased in cost because of the car having to be hauled back empty or very nearly so. It will result in advantage to the maritime ports in the labour and in the prestige which they will obtain. It will also have a tendency to bring carriers to the maritime ports. Wherever ships congregate, wherever there is competition, freights are lower in both directions. Vessels will start on a long voyage to a port at a cheaper rate if they are sure of securing return cargoes. That is the reason which my hon. friend ought to give for the lowness of freights to New York. We know that every vessel that comes to New York from the East Indies or Liverpool wants to secure a return cargo of grain or some other cargo. Are we then to give facilities to our rivals, to throw whatever we have to contribute to our rivals when these are the impediments which stand in the way of the development of our trade and the cheapening of our freights? Therefore, St. John, New Brunswick and Halifax will benefit to a small extent during the winter months. The large bulk of the trade as the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) observed, will pass through Montreal in the fall of the year. The merchants will anticipate their wants. They will procure by the cheapest way the bulk of their goods to be used during the winter. That will increase the value of Montreal and consequently it will increase the value of Quebec if that port be longer open in the fall of the year. So that, it is not for the value of the maritime ports alone, but every interest in Canada will be benefited by this assistance which is given apparently to the ports of the maritime provinces. The Canadian Pacific Railway, from their possession of steamships on the Atlantic and from the long lines of railway running into the interior, will be able to give as cheap a rate of freight from ports in Great Britain as any American railway and steamship connecting line can give and as they are anxious for these heavy goods to ballast their ships and to give freight to their cars which they have brought down long distances to the maritime provinces. They will be compelled to compete with the American railways and American steamship lines for the traffic, and the competition of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway with the American railways will be for the benefit of every importer of goods throughout the whole of Canada. The Intercolonial Railway will benefit from the carriage, the Canadian Pacific Railway will benefit from the carriage, and they will also receive all the incidental advantages which accrue from the traffic.

Now, I have a word to say to the hon. member from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp). The little anomaly which he presents in regard to freights from various ports may be accounted for by the fact that the great volume of trade is going in the other direction and that these rates may be on special lines. I believe that you can get a whole cargo just as cheaply by way of Halifax or St. John as you can by way of New York. The owner of a vessel will make a freight rate for a whole cargo just as low by way of Halifax as by way of New York, and you can get a rate which will be just as cheap from Halifax to any place west of Toronto as any American railway can give you. The ordinary rates on American railways are not less than over a Canadian railway. The ordinary rates charged between railway points in the United States are high. My hon. friend from York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) will corroborate that. Where there is competition to obtain other freight, where they can secure Canadian trade by lowering the rate they will go to great lengths. They will carry it for comparatively little. My friend Mr. Root may have most benevolent ideas in regard to Canadian trade and the introduction of our goods under a minimum tariff and I would like to see some effort made in that direction, but I would like to have an inspection of that tariff so that we would not see some goods figuring under the same rate as they do in the present tariff which bristles with impediments against Canadian trade or have some articles penalized under the same high rates against which my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) so eloquently declaims.

Some remarks were made by my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. A. A. Wright) this afternoon. He is always right politically, but on matters of trade and finance, I think he is sometimes heterodox. In regard to freights from ports in the east, Mauritius, Singapore, Philippine islands and China, from which large cargoes come a number of ports are grouped together. For instance, they will group New York, Boston and Halifax together at one rate. If the cargo is not sold when the vessel starts the vessel may go to Sandy Hook for orders, or she may call at Halifax, but the same rate of freight applies to the whole group; so that, where we had a cargo sent 'to order' we could obtain as cheap a rate to Halifax or St. John as could be obtained to New York. The desideratum is return freight. If they cannot get a return freight at Halifax or St. John then the inward freight has to pay the compensation to reduce the Canadian freight or to bring the level of the inward and the outward freights to the limit of the rate charged to New York. It is the same with the West Indies in regard to cargoes of sugar and other produce. If we have as large or bulky a cargo and if we can furnish a return freight the ports are grouped together and we would obtain as low rates as could be obtained at New York provided we could guarantee that the steamer which brought these goods obtained a return cargo suffi-

cient to remunerate the owners in proportion to what they would receive by going to a port like New York where they always can get return cargoes. My hon. friend from Renfrew and my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and other gentlemen have spoken of the blockade which existed on the Canadian Pacific Railway preventing the goods coming out from that country and they thought that that blockade would be increased by the shipment of goods bound for the west.

On the other hand, if these goods came from the west to the east, and the cars were returned loaded with this preferential freight, a car supply would be provided for the west. The shortage of cars does not exist in the east, and under this system the west would obtain more cars from the east. The fact is that the shortage of cars in Canada resulted, in a large degree, from the number of cars which were sent to the United States and which were held up there. The truth is, that under the system proposed by the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) there would be a greater supply of cars in the west; and in that respect the arguments of my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. Wright) and from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) fail. Now, this question is founded to some extent on sentiment, and if there is any sentiment which would result to the advantage of the whole country, we should try to cultivate it. We should not look upon this question merely from the point of view of its results to the maritime provinces, or as to its effect upon Ontario as distinct from the other provinces, or its effect upon the Northwest Territories as distinct from the rest of Canada. I think this parliament has advanced to the higher level of opinion, which holds that what makes for the benefit of one part of the Dominion makes for the benefit of the whole. As the hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and other hon. gentlemen have shown, the principle proposed in this resolution, if given effect to, would be of benefit to the whole of Canada, and therefore I trust it will receive the unanimous endorsation of this House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I intend to give this proposal, not only my sympathy, which is sometimes of the cold potato nature, but my vote as well. I have no great belief in a measure of trade based on a preference, where the government offering it asks for nothing in return, and where the government receiving it does not see the propriety of giving anything in return. On that ground alone I would vote for this proposal. But I am inclined to vote for it also because it is based on the principle of the great transcontinental road which we are building. The policy of that transcontinental scheme is that it is a national Canadian road, and throughout the agreement calling for its construction and operation there are conditions imposed upon the contracting company for the development of Canadian trade through Canadian ports. The best and only way to improve our Canadian ports is to direct to them all the trade we can control. In the case of the preference, we can more or less control that trade, and if we have confidence in our own ports, and if we are spending millions and millions to develop a national transcontinental system, it is our duty to endeavour to develop these ports on the lines laid down in the resolution. There is the old motto: If you wish to play upon the harp, play upon the harp; in other words, if you wish to build up your national ports, you must encourage them on every occasion. Hence it is that I support this resolution. The hon. gentleman from Cumberland wishes to see the Intercolonial Railway system developed. So do I. The best way to build up the Intercolonial Railway is to remove its administration absolutely from politics. Not only am I in favour of that, but I would antagonize, in the strongest possible manner, all the efforts now being made to deprive us of the national asset we have in the Intercolonial. There are to-day rival railways that would like to see the Intercolonial Railway put out of business, and there are public men in Canada who sympathize with that movement to destroy the Intercolonial. All my sympathy is with that national railroad, and all my sympathy is with the maintenance of the independence of that road, which is an essential factor in the development of our national ports. I wish to see Canada independent of the United States in every respect in the matter of seaports. We can only achieve that by self-reliance and by making our own seaports efficient wherever they are deficient. It is only a question of money after all, but if we are going to spend money let us spend it wisely. The money that is now wasted in the maritime provinces on building inferior wharfs and harbours that are not required, should be devoted to making the maritime province ports thoroughly efficient for our national trade. All my sympathy is in favour of a liberal treatment of the maritime provinces and towards building up our national ports. We should go further. We should control the transatlantic trade of this continent. We should build the best and fastest steamships and run them from the nearest Canadian port to the nearest British port. We can control the express trade of the Atlantic, the fast freight trade, and the fast mail and passenger service, and we should set about doing it at once. But you can only do that by first believing that you are able to do it, and then putting your money in it without any regard what-

ever to party politics or party considerations. So that if we have a preferential policy —and we have one, such as it is—let us make it part of a national policy, as the mover of the resolution said this afternoon. If we wish to build up Canadian ports and keep them national ports, and connect them with railway systems in the west, let us concentrate everything we can in that direction, and not abandon this national policy for a temporary consideration. My hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) this afternoon urged us not to disturb the United States or the bonding privilege. I am ready to disturb the United States or the bonding privilege any day if it is to the advantage of Canada to do so. The hon. gentleman speaks of the bonding privilege. What would the bonding privilege be worth if we kept in this country the hundred millions of money that we send every year to the United States for American goods? I would keep that hundred millions in this country, and that would be a fitting answer if the United States saw fit to cancel the bonding privilege which they now concede to us and which we concede to them. So that, on the whole, I have no hesitation in saying that the motion of the hon. gentleman is on the line of the national policy which has been advocated by some of us for a great many years, which the government laid down in regard to the Transcontinental Railway, and avowed in regard to our national ports. This proposition seems to me in every way a thoroughly national proposition. In line with it, we ought not only to control the fast Atlantic passenger service, but we ought to have a great national ship-building industry in Canada, and it ought to be in the maritime provinces. The way to have such an industry is to do this very thing—to make St. John, Halifax, Sydney, or possibly a port in Newfoundland, the national port, and with it to have all these other things; and, having a spirit of nationality and a confidence in our own country, we can so weld all these things together that they will go to make what we desire to have, but what we shall never have unless we have the courage of our convictions and not only believe in the national policy, but a determination to realize it. Therefore, I shall be only too pleased to vote for this motion and to uphold any motion tending to make us more self-reliant, more self-contained, more confident to work out our own destiny, and, most of all, to build up our own country, even if for the time being this may entail some temporary or apparent injury to ourselves. No great or progressive object, nothing in the direction of nationality, is obtained without sacrifices of some kind; but any sacrifice we make in this direction must be of a temporary nature, and the ultimate result will be the upbuilding and strengthening of our nationality.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Chairman, when this matter was brought up some little time ago, realizing how great was its importance, I corresponded, in the first place, with one of the leading importing houses in Canada. I made no comment that might in any way direct their reply, but simply sent them a copy of the resolution and asked them to favour me with their opinion. On the 14th of January they wrote to me as follows:

> We have yours of the 11th instant re British preference if confined to goods brought through the Canadian seaports, and in reply would say that if such a scheme were carried into effect we consider this would be ruinous to the commercial interests of the country. Our experience has been that the best way to keep the railroads in any bounds is to allow competition, and no doubt if the measure you refer to were passed it would give them a complete monopoly.

Mr. DANIEL. What railways?

Mr. MILLER. The railways that carry the goods from the seaports to the interior. They, of course, mean that it would limit the competition. (Reading):

> Our freight contracts as a rule are made year by year, and one has just been completed via Boston. Should this measure pass it would practically put us out of business. We are inclined to think that the Americans would retaliate, and as both our Canadian roads run through part of the territory of the United States they would be liable to cut off our bonding privileges which would demoralize railroad traffic.
>
> We see no argument in favour of the scheme and can find it hard to realize how a business man would bring up a measure so far reaching in its ruinous effects on the country.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. Where is that letter from?

Mr. MILLER. It is from one of the best known, largest and wealthiest importing houses in the Dominion. The firm have not asked me to treat this as a private communication, neither have they given me liberty to make known the name of the firm.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member cannot read it without giving the name.

Mr. MILLER. Then I will give the name. It is from Messrs. John Macdonald & Company, the well-known importing house of Toronto.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. Does my hon. friend say that both of those railroads run through American territory?

Mr. MILLER. That was not my statement; I am simply reading the communi-

cation. Any one who knows the firm of John Macdonald & Company will not, I think, accuse them of any disloyalty. I think they are as loyal as any Canadian citizens. It may be that their fears are not well founded; it may be that this would not bring to them the dire consequences they seem to think. However, that is the opinion of men who are in business, and who view this matter from a practical standpoint. About the same time, I wrote asking for the same information from one of the largest commercial agencies in Canada. I refer to the Bradstreets Company. On the 17th of January Bradstreets wrote to me as follows:

The writer was in Ottawa on Tuesday last, and hoped to see you in reference to your correspondence of the 11th instant, but did not manage it. I may say to you that I have been seeking opinions upon the subject you wrote about, viz., Hance Logan's motion, and I may say that the feeling is decidedly against any such motion being carried. The Americans will doubtless regard it as hostile, and in some way or other make the Canadians 'sweat for it,'—possibly by abrogating the bonding privilege. All those I have spoken to feel that such legislation as proposed would do us decidedly more harm than good.

Mr. GANONG. The hon. gentleman knows that that is a Yankee concern.

Mr. MILLER. No, I do not know that it is. I know that the Bradstreets Company operate in the United States.

Mr. GANONG. Its head office is in the United States.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Thomas C. Irving, the Canadian manager, is a very well known Canadian. I believe that the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution did so from the most patriotic motives; I have no doubt that his intentions are perfectly good, and that in time the resolution will be in place, and the effect good and not evil; but it seems to me that this is not an opportune time to bring into effect any such legislation. Loyal sentiment is a good thing; it is a good thing to have confidence in ourselves; it is a good thing to be independent and to feel that we are independent. I do not know that we make ourselves independent by shouting independence or that we are really dependent to any extent upon the United States. I was much impressed by the remarks of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) who pointed out that while our imports come in some measure through American ports, yet a large volume of American imports come through Canadian harbours. We must realize that we have Canadian harbours on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic. When the Lord's Day Bill was before the House and the committee, we were told that a large number of trains were being regularly brought in over the Canadian Pacific Railway, laden with silks and teas for the United States market, and which were carried through Canada to towns in the eastern states. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), in my opinion was quite correct in saying that if the Americans, to use the language of one of the letters I have quoted from, should endeavour to make us sweat, as they naturally would, if we were to adopt the policy now advocated, we might lose a great deal more than we would gain. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has spoken of our doing that which would be to the advantage of Canada. It seems to me that it would be to the greatest advantage of Canada and be an evidence of the greatest degree of loyalty, if we were to choose that policy which will bring the greatest good to the greatest number of our own Canadian people. As has been pointed out, less than 20 per cent of the goods referred to come through American ports today, and it would not add much to the prosperity of our Canadian seaports if the remaining 20 per cent were to come through them. It would not build up Halifax or St. John to any extent if that $13,000,000 of additional imports were brought through those ports nor would that small amount have much effect in building up our shipping interests. The figures quoted to-day were somewhat interesting. In 1903, we imported goods entitled to the British preference, through United States ports, to the value of $12,000,000 and in 1906—three years later—to the amount of $12,500,000, or about half a million dollars increase. But the goods entitled to British preference, which were brought in through our own Canadian ports, had increased, not half a million, but $10,000,000. So that if things be allowed to go on as they are, in three or four years the amount of goods brought in through American ports to Canada will be comparatively very insignificant. I think that we are all loyal; and if without doing any injury to our Canadian business men or consumers, if when the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed and the ports of Halifax and St. John are further improved, such legislation as that which is now proposed may be enacted, and if the enactment of such a policy will bring any degree of benefit to even one or two Canadian seaports, we will all be very willing to have it put upon our statute-books.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In view of the different opinions expressed to-day upon this very important question, it ought not to be difficult for the House to come to a unanimous conclusion. Every member who had addressed himself to this question has, with one exception—the exception of my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp)—pronounced himself in favour of the principle of this motion. My hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) is the only one who has taken exception to the principle

itself. But doubt has arisen as to whether, admitting the principle, the time is opportune for declaring such a policy as that embodied in the motion of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan). My hon. friend's resolution is quite in keeping with the policy followed by this country for the last fifty years, namely, the developing of Canadian trade within Canadian channels. Everybody in this country for the last fifty years, especially since the inauguration of confederation, has favoured such a policy. Fifty years ago, when we began to build railways, we began to build them north and south, and the objective point of all of them was some American port. The ports of Boston, New York and Portland were the three through which we got our imports in the winter. But after confederation we began to build up another policy. We began to dispense with American harbours and to bring the trade to our own ports. This policy we have followed to the present day and with reasonable measure of success. Take our importations from Great Britain, from seventy to seventy-five per cent come through Canadian harbours and only twenty-five to thirty per cent through American ports. The question now is whether or not, following out that policy, we are in a position to adopt the policy proposed by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan). He proposes that the benefit of British preference should be given only to such goods as come through Canadian ports. My hon. friend, however, is not ready to have his motion apply immediately. Whilst he desires to have it incorporated in the tariff, he is not ready to have it come into force before May, 1908, or a year from next May. I put the question to the House, will the time have come, twelve months from May, when this policy can be applied successfully and without detriment to any body? That the time will come ultimately we are all agreed, with the exception of my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp). But in my judgment the period left for a lee way by my hon. friend from Cumberland is altogether too short. In my opinion we would not be ready twelve months from to-day to put that policy into force. My hon. friend himself has given a reason why we could not apply at once this policy in its entirety. He has said that all the goods from Great Britain might safely come through Canadian ports, that they can reach Montreal by either of two lines of railway, the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and then can reach the new provinces in the west by either the American or Canadian railways. But the objection has been taken that any goods which come to Montreal through Canadian channels would, in order to reach the Canadian west, have to go by the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that there would be no competition, or if we must have competition, these goods would have to go through American territory. Well, it seems to me that my hon. friend has thereby given a reason why it would be premature to adopt this motion now and apply it next year.

But I look upon this motion as a completion of the policy which we inaugurated four years ago when we resolved to construct another transcontinental railway from the Pacific to the Atlantic ocean. When this railway is in operation, as by the terms of the contract it must be in operation in the month of December 1911, then will be a fitting time to adopt this policy. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would not be disposed to agree altogether with the motion of my hon. friend if it is intended to apply it in the month of May, 1908; it will, however, fittingly apply in 1911 when the transcontinental railway will be completed. Then we shall have two competing lines from the maritime harbours to the great new centre that is developing west of the great lakes, and then when the people of the Northwest will have two lines in operation to carry their imports and exports, we will be in a position safely to apply the policy indicated in the motion of my hon. friend from Cumberland.

My hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), however, objects in toto to the policy, if I understood him aright. He is afraid that if we adopted this policy we might offend our American neighbours. Well, Sir, we know from past experience that our American neighbours are very sensitive in their trade relations, we know that they are not disposed to give anything if they can help it. But they cannot find fault with us if we take a leaf out of their own book and copy their own methods. Is it not a fact that the Americans have never neglected an opportunity of bringing trade into their own channels when they were able to do so? If we adopt the same principle of bringing trade into Canadian channels, certainly our neighbours cannot find fault with us. Now, would the adoption of this policy at the present time have any effect upon the bonding privilege? I do not think so. The bonding privilege merely gives us the privilege of carrying our own goods through their territory, and gives them the privilege of carrying their goods through our territory. But if we choose by domestic arrangement to bring trade into our channels, we do not thereby abolish the bonding privilege, we simply become independent of it. Well, Sir, was not one of the objects we had in view when we introduced the policy of building a new transcontinental railway to get rid of our dependence upon the bonding privilege? Our policy is to be absolutely free of the need of using American harbours and of the need of a bonding privilege; we desire to be in such a position that at all times we can bring our imports and send our exports through our own channels independently of American harbours and the bonding pri-

vilege. Moreover, we are to remember that the benefits of the bonding privilege are reciprocal. The Americans use our territory and we use their territory. But if it should come to this, that the bonding privilege were taken away from us by the United States, we can take away from them the bonding privilege which they enjoy of carrying their goods through our territory, and in that case I think the United States would have more to lose than we would have. However, I would be sorry if it ever came to that, we do not want to have with our American neighbours any but the most friendly relations. I would be sorry if the bonding privilege was interfered with, but if it is ever interfered with at all, I am ready to say that in my humble judgment we have less to lose than our American neighbours, and they would hesitate before interfering with the bonding privilege. They may do so, however. Twice already they have threatened us with the destruction of the bonding privilege, and at that time it would have been a serious blow to us, because we were not equipped then, as we shall be by and by to be able to do without it. When we have another transcontinental railway in operation I think we shall be absolutely independent of the bonding privilege. Therefore, holding these views, though I think the motion of my hon. friend is all right, it is a little premature. But it is well to have it on our statute-book, it is well that we should know it is there, and that we intend to make use of it at the proper time. But the proper time would not be in 1908, the proper time would be when our new railway is in operation. Therefore, if my hon. friend would permit me, I would move this amendment to his motion:

That on and after a date to be named by the Governor in Council the British preference shall apply only to goods brought into Canada if shipped through a Canadian seaport.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I have only to observe that the Prime Minister three years ago was ready to adopt this policy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, certainly some members of his government were, the Minister of Finance was ready to vote for it at once, and when passed it directed the government to carry this proposal into force at once. My hon. friend was in control of the House. His Minister of Finance said he was ready to agree to it at once. The observations of the Prime Minister were to this effect, that he was in favour of the principle in the abstract, that there was a question as to its effect upon retail traders who might require quick delivery, and he said that any change such as this should be heralded, otherwise, there might be disturbance, and that the government should not take a leap in the dark. Well, he has had three years to investigate and to herald, he still controls this House as he did then, and now he proposes, after reflecting on this question two years and a half, to emasculate the resolution of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and to substitute a resolution which absolutely leaves the whole matter in abeyance. Now, the resolution of 1904 was definite and explicit. The Prime Minister had had two years to consider it at that date, because the hon. member for Cumberland gave notice of it, in the first instance in 1901; he did not introduce it till 1904. Well, after having had the two years' consideration to which I have alluded, the Prime Minister said he required further time before putting it into effect. Nevertheless at that time he supported this resolution, and it passed the House:

That in the opinion of this House the preferential tariff shall only apply to importations through Canadian seaports.

It was a resolution much more definite, much more effective, and having a much more immediate effect, than the resolution the hon. member for Cumberland has proposed to-day. Well, if a resolution of that kind was proper according to the view of the Prime Minister, and especially according to the view of the Minister of Finance, who said definitely that he would vote for it if it came to a division, why is it that the matter is to be left in the nebulous condition which is proposed by the Prime Minister to-day? My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was extremely explicit on that occasion. He said over and over again that if it was necessary to divide the House upon it, he would cordially vote in support of the motion. He did, of course, refer to the educational effect of the discussion, but he committed himself to a resolution which called for immediate action and did not suggest any delay. As far as the general observations of the Prime Minister are concerned they, of course, leave this matter practically where it would be if no such resolution passed. It confers a power uopn the Governor in Council which the Prime Minister has told us will not be exercised before 1911 at the very earliest. He has given his reasons for that, I do not intend to enter into any discussion of them. It seems to me that, apart from the considerations which have been advanced to-day, one very effective method of bringing trade to Canadian channels is by rendering the mode of transportation from Great Britain to our ports and through our country as cheap and expeditious as, or more cheap and expeditious than, the means of communication by ports in the United States. That is the most effective way of all, there can be no doubt of that. It may be, and I have no doubt is the case that some assistance might

be given by a method such as my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has suggested,—and he has made a very interesting and instructive speech in support of his proposal—but after all when you come to the real test as to the channels through which traffic will pass, it will in the end always pass through those channels which are the most expeditious and cheapest; and by properly equipping our Canadian ports and by making our mode of inland communication both by rail and by water as good as or better than those in the United States we will accomplish the end sought by my hon. friend from Cumberland, more effectively than in any other way.

If this proposal, the principle of which has been sanctioned by the Prime Minister, is a good one why should it not be applied to the intermediate tariff as well? If it is good as a principle to apply the British preferential tariff only to goods which enter by Canadian ports why is it not an equally good principle to apply the intermediate tariff only to goods which come to this country by direct shipment to Canadian ports? If the principle is good in one case I cannot believe it is not good in the other case, and I would ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of that, he would not be willing to amend the resolution he has himself suggested, which by the way, is not in proper technical form—by including, after the words 'British preference' the words 'intermediate tariff'. There is no such expression to be found in the tariff resolutions as 'British preference' which the Prime Minister has used; the proper technical expression in the resolutions brought down by the Minister of Finance is the British preferential tariff. I would suggest to the Prime Minister for his consideration whether or not the words 'intermediate tariff' should not be added after the words 'British preferential tariff' which should appear in this resolution instead of the expression the Prime Minister has used.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The suggestion of my hon. friend is one which is worthy of consideration, but I could not be prepared to accept it at this moment for this reason: The British preferential tariff—I stand corrected, since my hon. friend prefers it so—is in force now; the intermediate tariff comes into force only at a later time. It does not apply to any country now, it is there only to be applied at the proper time and the question is a proper one to consider at that time, but I would not take it up to-night as suggested.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) appears to forget that this is to come into force by order of the Governor General in Council as well, and therefore. Thus when you bring the intermediate tariff into force by proclamation and order of the Governor General in Council, you will also bring into force by exactly the same means the terms of the resolution which the Prime Minister has proposed. The two proposals run exactly along the same line. The intermediate tariff is to come into force by order of the Governor in Council. This particular provision of the tariff resolutions is also to come into force by order of the Governor General in Council; there seems therefore no good distinction in that respect.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pardon me, there is. The intermediate tariff can come into force only by negotiation. Suppose we have that tariff on goods coming from Italy; we have no direct line to Italy and therefore it would not be right to apply this resolution to the intermediate tariff with Italy, our goods might have to come through the United States. All this may come in time but at the present time we are dealing with the British preferential tariff and the motion covers that.

Mr. KEMP. We have no direct line to certain portions of the British empire, to which the British preferential tariff applies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think we receive much from those portions of the empire.

Mr. KEMP. Oh, yes, a great deal. Mr. Hugh Blain, a wholesale grocer of Toronto, made a statement to that effect and a number of other wholesale grocers have said the same thing. Mr. Blain said at the conference held by the boards of trade to which the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) referred:

> My friend asks me if I were ever down there and I suppose he means I would discover that they had facilities. Take my own business; we import goods from the Straits Settlements, Ceylon and other eastern parts and there is no direct connection between any of them and any Caaadian port. We cannot issue a letter of credit bringing goods by any port except by way of New York or Boston.

These are the sentiments of a good many wholesale grocers.

Mr. R. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence). I think the country is under a debt of gratitude to the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) for introducing this motion. One point has not been touched on by either the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and that is that old John Bull should be taught that there are ports in Canada. They seem to still think in England that Portland and the State of Maine are in our country. They forget the Ashburton treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They ought to be.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. They ought to be in our country, there we agree. Now, Sir,

who will suffer ? I do not know of any one who will suffer. Perhaps a few merchants in Toronto who are importers might suffer but surely that good city is sufficiently patriotic——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. BICKERDIKE—to be willing to lose a few cents on the carriage of freight to protect our own ports. I cannot understand why any one will suffer at all. The Prime Minister says that probably the time is too soon. I think both my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and the Prime Minister are procrastinating in this because in four or five years from now when the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed the population of the west will have increased and some one may then suggest that we have to postpone this action until we get another transcontinental line. That will be the result and therefore I feel sure with the way the west is filling up now, we cannot do this too soon, and I did hope that the Prime Minister would change it and make it come into force at once. That is the proper thing to do.

Mr. FOSTER. Put your pressure on.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Yes, it is not very strong. The British people, especially British manufacturers, are receiving great benefits under the preferential tariff and we are all pleased to have it so, but would it not be well that they should learn what route to send their products by ? I believe they do not go to the trouble to find out. I do not believe it is a question of freight. It is simply that they do not go to the trouble to find out. The continuation of the flirtation going on between John Bull and our friends to the south of us is in many cases detrimental to our interests. Canada unfortunately has to furnish the music very often for that flirtation and the band comes high. I would like very much if we could have this brought into force immediately.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, almost every speaker has commenced with a profession of his sympathies, and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came to the conclusion that everybody was sympathetically, at least, in favour of the proposition of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), with the possible exception of my hon. friend on my right. Well, I may be allowed to ask whether there is anything else but an expression of sympathy on the part of the right hon. gentleman and his government. They were given notice, and consequently were asked to consider this question when the member for Cumberland, in 1901, first brought this matter before the House, and that is nearly six years ago. Then the matter came up in 1904. It is a thing which is passing strange, and I think not in good form, that the government, when it has control of the matter, allows an explicit declaration of a policy to be made and to be carried in the House with its assent and with the strong support of its members, and yet without any intention at all, as has been confessed here to-day by the right hon. gentleman, of putting it into force. Surely the country has a right to expect that when this parliament, led by the premier, makes an explicit declaration of policy and embalms it in a resolution, supports it and passes it without any qualification at all, that the resolution really means what it says, and that it means something and is not simply an idle flirtation. The business world are advertised, not only in Canada, but outside of Canada, that the right hon. premier and the parliament of Canada have put in the form of a resolution of parliament in the most formal way you can do outside of the statute itself, and have advocated an immediate line of policy, and they are advertised to guide and govern themselves accordingly. When they go to work and think it over, and it sinks into their minds, they suddenly awake—may be not suddenly, but a while afterwards—and they find that the Prime Minister of Canada did not mean at all what was said in that resolution; nor was there any intention of carrying that resolution out on the part of the Finance Minister, who, in a matter of this kind, speaks with as much authority as the Prime Minister, because he presides over that very important branch of the country's business. They find that the Prime Minister did not mean at all that he said he did, what the resolution which he allowed to pass, and which he allowed his own colleagues to definitely declare they were in favour of and would vote for coming into force immediately, affirmed. This has not a good influence in the country nor outside of it. No resolution should be allowed to pass by the government unless it is an honest resolution and honestly meant. Now, we see that this was simply a flirtation, that my right hon. friend is simply preparing himself for a more extended flirtation of we know not how many years on this subject. He has not had anything to do in regard to it since 1904. He is proposing to go on just coquetting with it, not denying that he wishes to continue that for an indefinite period in the future. What happened? The matter of the revision of the tariff has been before the country for three or four years. The right hon. gentleman's commission went through this country from one end of it to the other obtaining all the information that they could possibly get to mould a tariff which should meet Canada's wants, and which should embody the true principles which had been subscribed to by the government and by the party which had supported that government. Yet that commission had

gone from one end of this country to the other without having, as far as I have heard, or as far as I now know, touched the question as to whether the business men and the transportation interests of this country were favourable or what their view was in regard to such an important question as the confining of the preferential goods to the ports of Canada. That shows, in the first place, that the government did not take seriously their own subscription of faith. The creed that they declared to be their creed in 1904 they absolutely threw aside, and they absolutely neglected the opportunity in the course of the investigation which would have enabled them, if they had put the proper questions and carried out the proper inquiry to have come back to this House with an authoritative idea of what the sentiments of the business and transportation interests were. That great privilege they did not avail themselves of, and the thing comes to this pass, that to-day, when my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) wishes to have his resolution put into actual working within a year, the government have no definite information upon which to act, and we have gone through this debate to-day without a single member of the government being able to tell us what they believe the effect of this will be upon the transportation and business interests of this country. That shows, in the first place, that it is simply coquetting with the question. Unready, they toy with it and dally with it, using it to create a sentiment favourable to themselves where it may be used in that way, and, where it may be used in the other way, to say: We never intended to put that into force; do you not see that at least we put it up in the clouds with a long string attached to it by which we may pull it down at some time in the dim and distant future, and we may not. We pledge ourselves to nothing except sympathy. But what has been the defect in this discussion to-day, despite the able speeches that we have had, and they have been interesting and able to a certain extent. A person listening to this debate has this difficulty: He says that there is really at stake the injury or benefit of the transportation and trade interests of this country, and yet there was between the different speakers an absolute disagreement as to whether these will be in the main injured or whether they will be helped. Take it by and large, and not one single man has been able to give much more than his own experience and some statistics which he has been fortunate enough to gather out of his own trade and business or from the transportation and other companies. So that when one gentleman reads a letter from one of the most prominent importers of this country—a very old and very responsible house—why, it does not seem to come with any authority, for somebody says that is only one man's opinion. It is one man's opinion; it is a good opinion, in so far as it goes, and I believe it is an honest opinion; but how much better we would have been equipped if the commission, which spent two or three years and a lot of the country's money in finding out what the sentiment of this country was in reference to tariff matters, trade and transportation interests, had collected the opinions of the trade and transportation interests, technical men engaged in business who know just where this would strike and who could give reasons for their opinion.

We have none of this equipment, because the government did not discharge its duty to get all this information on the broadest and most general grounds. I have unbounded faith in the future of Canada; I believe in strengthening the sentiment of nationality, but I don't believe it is necessary for us to bite off even a portion of our own noses, unless we are sure the result will be beneficial to the whole body. The transportation and the business interests of this country, are, outside of sentiment, the two interests which will guide us in this as a matter of policy. Sentiment will be reinforced by the consideration that our transportation and business interests will be bettered, and if that be so, we may embark on this new policy with assurance. But I do not know what the general effect on the transportation interests of this country will be. I see a population of 6,000,000 here; I see our transportation interests with connections in England and connections in China and Japan, and intermediate connections in the United States. If there are 30,000,000 people in the middle west of the United States who export and who import, and if the facilities we have built up at so much cost are able to feed the business requirements of that 30,000,000, should we not be mighty careful as to whether we shall put the least straw in the way of our getting the full benefit of that trade. Our own population is sparse at present; true it is constantly increasing, but I reiterate with all my strength, that before we adopt any such policy as is foreshadowed here, we should know just how it is going to affect us.

I thought that the Prime Minister rather put a chip on his shoulder and invited the United States to knock it off. That chip was a sort of defiance from him, about the bonding privilege. Make yourself independent of the bonding privilege and do it as soon as you can, but don't make yourself independent of it with the idea that you want to get rid of any mutual advantage that come from it to both countries. Does it hurt Canada to have the United States ship goods from Vancouver to Boston, over

the whole length of Canadian territory? The Prime Minister does not think it does; the Minister of Customs does not think it does; the government does not think it does, for the government has absolutely violated a treaty and knocked into a cocked hat the customs laws of this country in order to give that free transportaion in at least one notable instance. The treaty of 1818 forbids any use of Canadian ports for transhipment and the buying of bait, and yet, in order to get the transportation of certain products through Canada, from Vancouver to Boston, the government—on the slim foundation of an Audit Act which was never meant and never used for that purpose—have absolutely knocked a hole though the treaty of 1818 and set the customs law at defiance. And why? Just to do the very thing that was so lightly spoken of by the Prime Minister to-night, when he thought the United States might take away from us the bonding privilege just as soon as they liked.

Now, Sir, the bonding privilege is mutually good. Does it not help Canada to have great quantities of goods from the United States passing through our territory? Ever hour that these goods are in this country, every mile they pass over the rails, is an hour and a mile which feeds some Canadian mouth and which makes some Canadian arm all the stronger for the development of the productive forces of this country. Along the whole line, rich drippings, which go to build up and fertilize this country in the development of its wealth, come from that kind of traffic. Don't we want all of it we can possibly get? Let us make no show of bravado with reference to the United States; let us not put a chip on our shoulder and tell them to knock it off if they like; let us not tell them their bonding privileges are no good, but let us admit that the bonding privileges are mutually beneficial to both countries. Above all, don't forget that any kind of an arrangement this country makes, which may be construed by the Congress of the United States into an attempt to take away from them any trade they would otherwise get, will be met by an equal measure of restriction by that Congress, just as sure as we are here. It has done it in every single case so far; it will do it in every single case in the future. The United States is out for trade; it is out for foreign trade. Its immense productive power can satisfy its own needs and its great pressure now is to get foreign markets. Read the speeches of Mr. Shaw; read the speeches of Mr. Root; read the speeches of any great United States publicist, and the whole beat and trend is: We need trade and we must push for foreign markets. If, by this legislation, you deprive the United States of $20,000,000, or $1,000,000 worth of its trade, the United States Congress will be ready and quick to put into its next tariff legislation what will be a counterpoise as against our trade.

We do not want it in either case. Unless we can show that it is of greater ultimate benefit to us—in fact, almost a necessity—there is no necessity for us making any provocation in order to incite the United States to do away with the bonding privilege; and I cannot help thinking that the illusion of the Prime Minister to that was not at all a fortunate allusion. Now, until we get the proper information, so that we are enabled to gauge just about what this thing will do, and what effect it will have on our business interests by and large, and on our transportation interests by and large, with reference not only to what we carry for ourselves, but to what we carry for other people, I am not in a position to vote in favour of such a policy being put upon the statute-book. But what I am in favour of is having an investigation. I am sorry that we have to take money that we might have saved; sorry that we have to give these gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches another year of the trouble of going about the country asking questions. The answers seem to have been so voluminous in one case that they fuddled the brains of the ministry and it took them two years to get their conclusions into shape. After their conclusions had simmered for two years and got the proper jellification, they bring them down, and we get the astoundingly wise statement from the Minister of Customs that a month ago he had put on 60 cents and less than a month ago 40 cents, and now it is 50 cents; and when I asked him how it came to be 50 cents, he said that he had added sixty and forty together and divide the result by two. Let the ministers appoint their commission and get at the bottom of this thing, with reference to the business interests and the transportation interests, and let them bring that information to us as a basis, and we shall have something tangible to go upon. At present we have sentiment, which is good as far as it goes, and the sentiment of this House is Canadian. I am glad to see that it is so Canadian as it is. The comparison is very pleasant indeed. My hon. friend from Cumberland said that what we wanted was a unifying national policy—a national spirit; and, as he said it, he looked over to the Minister of Finance, no doubt with the thought somewhere in the back of his head of that time not yet passed from the memory of man when the same Minister of Finance was endeavouring to take Nova Scotia and if possible New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island outside of this confederation. How pleasant the change; how glad we are for the conversion. How glad we are for the conversion of the right hon. gentleman as well. I can remember and I do not have to go very far back, the time when he

thought we were treating the United States most scandalously; when he thought that of all countries in the world that was the country to be cultivated, that there was our natural market, that there was where we must look for the source of our prosperity. One time he pinned the flag of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States to the top of his party mast and swore by all the gods that it should stay there until they came into power, if it should be a decade or two decades. Then he declared that we did not get reciprocity with the United States because the Tories, stiff-necked and rebellious, did not want it and only made a pretext of trying to get it. Well, he came in, and his powerful men with him, and he marshalled his giants and marched on Uncle Sam, and used sunny ways, or threatening ways. or any way he could in order to accomplish his designs. Now he takes the opportunity of telling Mr. Root, right in the face, that we are not very anxious at all about having trade relations with the United States; that, in fact, we think we are better off by going our own road. All this is pleasant. It shows that at last logic and reason and a consistent course by the Liberal-Conservatives of this country have had their effect even upon such obdurate people as these old-time free traders and lovers of the United States.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And that is the reason you want more investigation?

Mr. FOSTER. I want investigation because I find that my right hon. friend is very faulty in his knowledge. May I give him an instance? When we had a debate here not a month ago, in which the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) struck out, in his strongest and most effective way—not this time against the Englishman as compared with the Doukhobor, but against the Swedish privateers who, having access to our country in a free coasting privilege, were taking the birthright from our people, I ventured to say a word with reference to it, and I had no more taken my seat than my right hon. friend jumped on me with both feet. These Tories are forgetful, he said; my friend forgets that these people were let in to the reciprocal casting privileges of Canada by the old Tory government. Now, let my right hon. friend look up the record, and he will find that all these countries but two—and one of these was Argentina, which does not trouble us much—were let in to the reciprocal coasting privileges by the Liberal government which was in power from 1874 to 1879. And so I advise my right hon. friend to be sure of his facts, and get from other people the information which he does not very often have accurately himself as when he makes such a mistake as he did in this case—effective at the time, for all behind him cheered him mightily for the way he floored the members opposite. Well, we are not going to cheer over it because it was a case in which the Prime Minister had not the knowledge, but had the courage, which was greater than his knowledge, and his courage got the better of his knowledge and led him into a misrepresentation of the facts. And now, with regard to my good-natured friend from Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), I want him also to revise his methods. I want him to take the Minister of Agriculture by the ear and lead him away into some private corner, and have one real heart talk with him; because when my hon. friend, if I understood him to-night, berated John Bull because he did not give us enough preference for what we gave him, I remembered that not two weeks ago Lloyd George, a member of the British cabinet, declared in a speech that the British people were not called upon to give any preference to Canadian products because the Hon. Sydney Fisher had declared in so many words that the Canadian farmer did not want a preference from Great Britain. Now, will my hon. friend use his persuasive ways, which are so well known, on the Minister of Agriculture and just give him a private wigging for making that most unfortunate and unfounded statement which he did make with reference to that subject.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I want to allude to the only point that troubles the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). He wants information, and he thinks the tariff commission ought to go through the country and procure that information for him and for the House. Now, supposing we did so, is the member for North Toronto prepared to act upon the suggestions?

Mr. FOSTER. No, he is not prepared to act upon the suggestions of the minister, but he is prepared to act upon the information.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, he can make up his mind what he would do in the following contingency. Here is an invitation to all parties, to all classes of business men, to come before us and state their wishes and their views on trade and commerce, because the hon. member for Toronto says he cannot give an intelligent vote until he knows what these people say. Well, suppose that Mr. Smith comes before us and says: I have invested ten thousand dollars in a tape manufactory and I want the preferential not to apply to as great an extent as it does. Well, Mr. Smith, there is a gentleman in the House of Commons who was Finance Minister, he has been to Washington on one occasion, if not more, to ascertain the views of the American government, and he wants to ascertain your views in reference to this matter so that he may be able to vote intelligently on the question when it comes up. If we do this do you think the United States will do away with

the bonding privilege? Well, I do not know much about that question; I think you have men in the House of Commons who ought to be able to determine that better than myself. Was not the member for North Toronto Finance Minister at one time; has he not interviewed the American government and would not his opinion upon this question be as good as mine? Then, Mr. Jones comes forward and says he is engaged in another line of manufacture, and the preference will affect him somewhat. Mr. Jones, we wish to get your opinion upon an important mattter. There is a question coming up in the House of Commons and the member for North Toronto does not know what to do unless he has your opinion. He wants to know if you think that if we interfere with this preference it will lead Uncle Sam to do away with the bonding privilege? The member for North Toronto wants to know your opinion upon that point. Then Mr. White comes before us, who is engaged in another line of business, and he presents his case. The member for North Toronto thinks it was our bounden duty to ask him. What do you think? If we interefere with this preference and confine it to goods coming through our own ports will Uncle Sam do away with the bonding privilege? Would he not be apt to give the same answer. The House of Commons, as representatives o the people of Canada, have to deal with great questions like that, and they are in a position to know better what to do with reference to these matters than I am. Why, such an idea! Of course, this House has to consider questions of that sort; this House, with its knowledge of public affairs, after discussion of the course of trade, must consider how it will affect us; how any action we may take will affect Uncle Sam. I will not follow up this line of argument any further, but I could not help being amused at the position of the hon. member for North Toronto who says that he cannot determine this question until Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones and Mr. White have told him what their opinion is upon it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Suppose I were to turn the tables and ask him what under heaven was the Tariff Commission doing for two or three years when they were going through this country from one end to the other, asking Mr. Smith one question about it, and Mr. Jones another question about it, and Mr. White another? Was it not the duty of the members of this commission to report this information to parliament?

Mr. PATERSON. We asked Mr. Smith about his business, supposing that he knew more about it than any member of this House possibly could; therefore, we asked him for the information of which he was in possession and which we wished to obtain. But if we had asked him what the hon. gentleman thinks we ought to have asked him, why he would have told us what I have said before: You had better ask the hon. member for North Toronto who is better posted on public affairs than I am.

Mr. FOSTER. But suppose my hon. friend and his colleagues had asked th great transportation interests whom they met in every quarter of this country, how their business would be affected by putting into operation a resolution which the government affirmed in 1904, and suppose he had asked the business interest, the importers and others, how their interests be affected. Now, if he had asked them that would he not have had a body of information which would be just as cognate to the question which we are discussing to-night as the questions that he asked the business men with reference to tariff conditions upon which they spent so much time and money? But my hon. friend assumes that I was not able to make up my mind as to whether this should be put into active operation because I did not know whether the bonding privilege would be done away with or not. That was not my position. I discussed the bonding privilege because it was introduced by the Prime Minister. My position was that the information I lacked was information which my hon. friend ought to have given, as to how the transportation interests and the business interests of this country would be affected by the incorporation of that declaration in the tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. The transportation companies and the whole country had had notice of the motion of the member for Cumberland for some years. The representatives of the transportation companies had the same invitation that every one else had to come before us and make known their opinions. Such representations as they made known to us will be found embodied in the report, if there is one, just as the representations that were made by other parties. There may be a difference of opinion among transportation companies upon certain points, and their interests may be at variance. And out of it all, it comes to this that the House of Commons must determine for itself a question on which large conflicting interests are not agreed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs a question.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not undergoing a catechism.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend has answered a question put by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), is he going to discriminate between him and me?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, he needs information while you do not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I admit that I do not need information so much as the minister does, but I need some, and I would like to know whether or not any inquiry was made by the Tariff Commission into this question. They had very good notice of it. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) had assented to this resolution. He had made himself a party to it——

That in the opinion of this House the preferential tariff should only apply to importations through Canadian ports.

That was proposed for the purpose of bringing about an amendment to the tariff and the government had accepted it but said they desired further information. The right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Minister of Customs, said that he desired further information. This Tariff Commission went perambulating about the country for the alleged purpose of obtaining information on all questions pertaining to the tariff. Did they or did they not procure or seek any information on this question? Or did they regard it as of so little moment, although the principle was affirmed by a resolution of the House of Commons, that they never gave it a thought?

Mr. PATERSON. I shall do the hon. gentleman the courtesy of answering as far as I can. In the first place, the motion referred to was not moved as an amendment to the tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was moved in relation to the tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. The tariff was not under consideration. It was moved as an independent resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a very fine distinction.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I want to keep my hon. friend right even on minor points. There was every opportunity for the transportation companies to make before the Tariff Commission any representations they saw fit. Speaking for myself alone, I should not have cared to ask every one who came before us: What do you think the United States government will do if we should take such a course? Do you think the bonding privilege will be in danger? I would not care to put any such question. We are the parties to determine what course we shall take, after looking at the subject from all points of view and discounting all the possibilities and probabilities. And in my opinion this parliament is better fitted to determine that point than any individual we might question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not asking about the bonding privileges with the United States at all, but I am asking whether the Tariff Commission made any attempt to procure that information which the Prime Minister said in 1904 it was necessary for the government to obtain before putting this resolution into force. The terms of the resolution itself show that it would have application to the tariff if carried into effect, and the First Minister told us that certain information was necessary. I am asking whether or not the members of that Tariff Commission took this question into consideration at all; and if they did, what is the result of their inquiries?

Mr. PATERSON. I have replied to my hon. friend. I said that I did not intend to discuss the subject generally but wanted the committee to go on with the consideration of the items. But I was somewhat amused with the argument of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who objected that the commission, as it went around did not ask the views of Smith, Jones and Robinson as to the probable action of the United States government with regard to the bonding privilege, should a certain course be adopted by this government. I answered him on that point. I said that we did not make any such inquiries of individuals. My own view was that if even any such question had been suggested to us, I would not have cared to put it. But with reference to the general question as to whether it is desirable that the British preference should only be given to goods brought through Canadian ports, I believe that representations were made in that connection at one or two points in the maritime provinces. I think that in the city of St. John, some gentlemen there brought before us the desirability of having the preference apply only to imports through Canadian ports and there were perhaps others who brought up the question, but there were only a very few who took sufficient interest in the matter to bring it before us. I speak of course subject to correction because we had a great many interviews at a great many places.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. However much the hon. gentleman may have been amused at the remarks of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the House is still more amused at the minister's inability to give the slightest information on the very important question I have put to him. He says that no one took any interest in the matter. Certainly the members of the commission do not seem to have concerned themselves much about it. Yet we had a proposal put forward in this House by one of the government's own supporters—a very important proposal, which the government accepted without qualification—and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is forced to admit that this Tariff Commission took no interest in it. And he re-

garded the matter as of so little moment that it did not impress itself upon his memory. No inquiry was made by the commission, the subject was never mentioned, but was considered as not deserving the attention of the members of the government who composed that commission. What was the Tariff Commission doing? Why did it not occupy itself with this matter? Was it not a matter of considerable moment? Had it not been introduced by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) a year or two before? Had not the resolution of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) received the approval of this House with the consent of the government? If there was one matter more than another which should have engaged the attention of the Tariff Commission, it was this.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is it the commission should have inquired into?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let me quote from the right hon. gentleman's own remarks:

The hon. gentleman does not appreciate that this is a business government, that we look before we leap, and that we try to ascertain where we will land before we attempt to jump.

Mr. FOSTER. He had already jumped.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Further on he says—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no necessity for inquiry into that, it is known to every body.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Further on he says:

My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) knows perfectly well that while at present most of the wholesale houses import through Canadian harbours, I understand that the retail business in Toronto and Montreal, and London and Hamilton, is still largely done through United States ports. The retail houses wish to have their orders filled in a hurry; they cable for their goods and they give instructions to send them by the cheapest—not by the cheapest, but by the quickest route—so that they may have them at the earliest opportunity. This is a circumstance which we have to look into.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did not the Tariff Commission look into that, that is the question.

I think it is possible even in that case to force trade into Canadian channels.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He thinks it is possible but he does not know; therefore, the Tariff Commission should have inquired.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. (reading):

By giving due notice to importers of all classes, that they will get the British preference if they send their importations by way of Canada, we should, I think, accomplish that. But, if without giving notice of the policy which the government intend to pursue on this question, we at once adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), there would probably be a great deal of disturbance caused in certain lines of business.

There will be a great deal of disturbance and therefore the Tariff Commission should have investigated. He understood that disturbance in these lines of business would be occasioned and I could quote still further illustrations from his remarks if it were necessary to do so. If the Prime Minister did not desire further information why did he not act then? It was either for the purpose of obtaining information or giving notice, one or the other. Now, which was it, or was it both? Will the Prime Minister tell me, was it for the purpose of giving notice merely or was it for the purpose of giving notice and obtaining information? If it was only for the purpose of giving notice then the Prime Minister announced on that occasion in the concluding portions of his remarks the policy of the government. I shall read his words:

Therefore, I think it is quite proper that this discussion should take place, and that all parties should understand that the government would be actuated and guided by it, as to what its future course should be.

Therefore the position is just this, as I understand the Prime Minister's remarks, he wanted information and he wanted notice given to the country. He has given the country three years' notice; has he obtained the information?

Mr. FOSTER. The ministers never got it for him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He has given the three years' notice, has he obtained the information? If the Tariff Commission has obtained the information let us have it, let them state what it was. If information was not desired, then we have had three years' notice and the policy then affirmed by the House should be put into force.

Mr. PATERSON. The Tariff Commission was appointed to inquire into the conditions of the trade and commerce of the country—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is not this part of it?

Mr. PATERSON—in its different lines and branches, and it did it. With reference to the question that is under consideration at the present time or the questions that have been raised as to the probable effect of certain action if taken by this government upon the action of another government—that is the question he is asking—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not ask that.

Mr. PATERSON. As to the question he asks with reference to the trade and commerce there is no one who will be able to give better information than we can get from our own statistics of trade. These statistics have been brought before the House to-day by many speakers. That information we have got. When this question is taken up and is being dealt with those statistics can be supplemented by inquiries that will be made in a few quarters from people who are supposed to have information other than what is in the public records. I shall not discuss this matter further but I take this opportunity now and I demand in courtesy an answer from the hon. gentleman having attempted to answer his question, to ask: Where is my hon. friend on this question? He voted for that resolution in 1898, or four years ago he says: Did I understand that he now is prepared without this information that he says it is absolutely necessary to get, to say that this course should be adopted in May, 1909, or where is he on this question?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say that I desired any more information; that is the answer to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister allow me to present another nut for him to crack? The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) accompanied occasionally by another minister travelled this country over from end to end asking questions of Tom Smith and John Jones and Edward Brown which they knew all about, because they knew all about this trade question before they came into power; they were so cock sure over all the commercial conditions of this country that before they came into power they knew exactly what they would do on obtaining office, they would eliminate protection and remove the curse and ban from this country.

Mr. PATERSON. And did we not do it?

Mr. FOSTER. Now you went through the country for two or three years, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance; you asked questions of this one and that one and the other, and you had in mind once in a while this idea of forcing preferential goods through Canadian ports, did you not? And you decided that you would adopt the policy and you did adopt the policy, and you brought it down to this House in your resolutions, making it necessary that sugar importations, in order to have the preference apply to them, should come in though Canadian ports and through Canadian ports alone. That you decided was the proper thing to do, you brought your resolution down and you intended to pass it through the House. Had the small boys been caught doing something that the larger one did not know any thing about? The smaller boys meeting together determined they would put this particular idea into practice as far as sugar was concerned. Suddenly they were called off. Why? It must have been that the right hon. gentleman found out what they were at and he called them off. You made the policy, you adopted it with reference to sugar and you have not been strong enough in your opinion or strong enough in you power of will to put through what you declared by bringing down the resolution was the proper policy in reference to sugar imports. Now where is the difference between applying the principle in part and in all? You applied it in part until the Prime Minister got hold of you and then he made you drop it quicker than a hot potato.

Mr. PATERSON. I fear I am monopolizing the time of the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, we like to hear you.

Mr. PATERSON—but really I do not often trouble the House you know unless they are kind enough to ask me and then my good nature always prevails on me to answer, especially when information is sought. I was appointed with two of my colleagues, three in fact, to ascertain the condition of the trade of the country after ten years of the tariff which had been introduced by the Liberal party on attaining to power in accordance with the platform laid down three years before, at the convention of the great Liberal party. That policy made a very radical change in the tariff of this country. It had been in operation for ten years and we wanted to see how it was operating, whether there were any changes in the current of trade and the conditions of the country that necessitated changes in the tariff and it was a most gratifying thing to us to find as we went from the Atlantic to the Pacific, as we met the representatives of the fishermen, the miners, the agriculturists, the professional classes, the merchants, wholesale and retail, and every other person, that as a general thing the tariff which had been adopted in accordance with the principles laid down by the Liberal party in 1893, whereby revenue was to be—

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, oh, be easy on us.

Mr. PATERSON. Whereby revenue was to be the basis on which the tariff would be founded—for wherever there is a customs duty of course there is a certain amount of protection—but this was a tariff founded on revenue as we were instructed in that platform to introduce and we wanted to see what its effect had been. It was predicted that if we went on the principle of a revenue tariff and eliminated the principle of protection, which principle is prohibition to shut out the goods that would otherwise come into the country—the principle of prohibition that the Liberal party protested against—disastrous results would follow.

That is what the principle of protection is. We said: No, that is wrong; you may impose taxation—and we provided in the resolution of the convention for the imposition of taxation—and the rates should be levied by customs duties as they had been in the past, but that they must be levied for the purpose of raising a revenue and whatever protection there was in them came in as an incident. The principle of protection is to prohibit goods coming in and if perchance any little money does come into the public treasury as a result it is merely an incident and not a working out of the principle. We reversed that. We carried out our policy. What was the result? We have been from end to end of this country and we found that the operation of our tariff policy was giving unbounded satisfaction. We found a degree of prosperity prevailing that is not equalled in any other country at the present time, and that the requests for changes, except on minor points, were very few. People said: Yes, you have your revenue; it is a revenue tariff. Is it not a revenue tariff in view of the fact that when we came in we found a tariff enacted by hon. gentlemen opposite, that was bringing in from $17,000,000 to $19,000,000 a year which we changed with the result that we get a revenue in ten years afterwards of over $50,000,000. Again I ask: Is it not a revenue tariff? Yet, men rise here and parrot like, repeat again and again that we have been false to that plank which we laid down in the Liberal platform. I utterly deny it.

Mr. FOSTER. You will deny anything.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I will not deny anything; but I will deny anything that is not true. I was on the committee that framed that platform.

Mr. FOSTER. Worse still.

Mr. PATERSON. I was on that committee. I understood it. I had the honour, I think, of being the one who seconded that resolution and I pointed out in the speech which has been referred to that under a revenue tariff, while you were securing the necessary revenue for the country, there would be as an incident enough protection to sustain the industries of this country. This was denied by these hon. gentlemen. They said that it might produce a revenue but that it would open the flood-gates to foreign competition at the expense of crushing out Canadian industry. One of the gratifying features of our travel from the Atlantic to the Pacific was to find that hon. gentlemen opposite had not the first conception of the needs of the trade and commerce of this country, that every prediction, every suspicion, every thought that they had in the past from the beginning of this tariff has been falsified, and that the prinicple which we adopted was a principle that had conduced to the prosperity not in one line or in two lines but in every branch of industry. We found industry prospering to a degree that was never experienced in any other country. We were sent out to ascertain what were the changes, if any, which were necessary to be made owing to the changed condition of the country. One of the important results was that we ascertained, or believed we ascertained, what had been the operation of the tariff that we instituted in reference to sugar in 1904, when we extended preferential treatment to the British West Indies. At that time there was a problem as to how that would work out which time alone could solve. We were going to take one-third off the duty on raw sugar and we were going to reduce the duty on sugar refined from that same raw sugar which was to be admitted at the preferential rate. On the face of it that was reducing the protection to the refiner to a very material extent, to an extent that I do not hesitate to say would have been unfair to the refiner, but we thought that the British refiner could not at once fit himself to enter our market in competition against our own refiners with a product refined solely from cane sugar until some time had elapsed. After three years had passed and when we came to examine this tariff we found that the Englishmen and the Scotchmen had not availed themselves of the opportunity of refining this raw sugar from British grown cane and of sending it into our market. They had only done it to a small extent and they had therefore left the market for refined sugar almost wholly to our Canadian refiners. As a result of that and with the very great benefit that they had from the reduction of the duty on raw sugar they were able to take some hundreds of thousands of dollars more than was necessary in our judgment to carry on their industry profitably. When we discovered that we proposed the change which has been submitted to the House and approved by the House and that is that the duty on raw sugar coming from the British West Indies should be reduced by 7⅓ cents per one hundred pounds. I do not want to stand here and say that we are infallible or that in our examination into these things we did exactly strike everything. There fore, we have been willing to receive representations, informations and light on every subject from that time up to the present when we are about to close the discussion of the tariff, and in subsequent explanations and considerations that were given to the question we made up our minds, that, though we recommended at first a 7⅓ cents advance on the duty on raw sugar, as the refiners were disadvantaged to the extent of 1½ cents on the package and for other reasons, we had perhaps gone too far and therefore we modified that by reducing it by 2½ cents. But, there are not many changes of that kind. You may count the alterations and amendments that we have

asked the House to make. Many of them are merely verbal, merely to make the thing clearer. As a result of the—what shall I call it?—trip, if you like, of the tariff commissioners, a tariff is before the House, the House has sanctioned it, I believe the country will sanction it, and I believe you will have a tariff that will contribute, as the tariff in the past ten years did, very materially to the best interests of the country. That is why the Tariff Commission was appointed, that is the work that the Tariff Commission did and this is the result. As to whether a certain course may have an effect upon the bonding privileges is a question that the government and this House will be able to deal with when occasion arises, but I do not consider that it is the question now before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Just time for a statement and a query.

Mr. PATERSON. Another query?

Mr. FOSTER. The statement is this: That after having the admission from the Minister of Customs that he attended that convention of 1893, that he helped to form its different planks into a platform, that he actually spoke upon that and that now after seven or eight years of power he comes to the conclusion that they have carried out these planks in their platform and have embodied in their policy all the principles that they laid down in that platform—I say the statement that I wish to make is that if the hon. gentleman puts himself in that position he furnishes such a glaring example of absolute depravity that I conclude he is irreclaimable and incorrigible and there is no use in spending any more time on him. The query is this: In the course of that peregrination did you find out what the opinion of the Grand Trunk Railway, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, of the Canadian Northern, of those great trunk lines, was in reference to this question of bringing preferential business only through Canadian ports? Does the minister remember whether he ever came into possession of the opinion of these great transportation companies as to what would be the effect?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think there is any use carrying on this conversation, further than to tell the hon. gentleman that we laid on the table of the House nine volumes of information on all kinds of subjects. It is nicely indexed, and if he takes the trouble to examine it, he need not take up the time of the House and delay business.

Mr. FOSTER. And when the Minister of Customs was asked why one item was put at 60 per cent, and then at 40 per cent, and lastly at 50 per cent, he made no reference to the nicely bound up information laid on the table, but he took to the arithmetical rule of adding the two highest rates together and dividing by two, and he considered that proper. The amendment proposed by my right hon. friend is vicious, in that it puts into the hands of the government an airy something of tremendous import for the transportation and business interests of Canada, and it enables the First Minister, whenever political or other influences impel him, to threaten to pull the string and to let loose the consequences upon these great interests. I can conceive how that power may be very deftly and very dangerously used by my right hon. friend. At the proper time, when these great transportation companies feel they would be injured by a proclamation putting this thing into force, and if they are asked by this government to help them out of very great difficulties at a critical time, the Prime Minister can say: You had better be careful as to how you carry sail; I have it in my power to close all foreign ports to preferential imports. It is a disciplinary if not a menacing measure, which is capable of very vicious and hurtful use, if people desire to use it so.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The views of the Prime Minister with regard to the bonding privilege, as announced to-day, are in direct antagonism to his pronounced views of a few years ago, when he submitted to parliament his Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. He told us then that the bonding privileges were so important to Canada, and the danger of their abrogation was so imminent, that we could not wait a month, a week, a day, or an hour, but that we must do something to protect ourselves. But to-night the First Minister proclaims that if the United States should abolish that privilege we can get along without it, and it would hurt them more than it would hurt us. Why this change of front? He has done nothing for the last three or four years to cause Canada to be less dependent on the bonding privileges now than it was then. Had the government perfected Canadian routes of transportation in the meantime, had they established a fast Atlantic service instead of playing with it from year to year and getting bottled up with their bottle-necked steamers, had they done anything to improve our transportation facilities, then the Prime Minister might, with propriety, have proposed this amendment to-night. But nothing has been done by the government in the interval, and so their action of to-day shows that the announcement by the Prime Minister three years ago as to the bonding privilege was not the result of any sound judgment or of any settled policy. Had the government given a bounty to ship-building to develop that trade had they done anything to

foster that industry in Canada, had they put fast steamers on the Atlantic and the Pacific had they improved our transportation facilities in any way. I could understand how the Prime Minister might, with some show of reason, propose this resolution and say as he has done—it may result in depriving us of the bonding privileges, but if he does we can stand it. But in view of the government having done nothing in the meantime, the resolution of the Prime Minister to-night is inconsistent with the statement which he made when he proposed the Transcontinental Railway scheme to the House. If it is important that this resolution should be carried to-night, why was it not important four years ago? It has been dangled before the House for years by one of the friends of the government, whom they could control at any time. Just as they gave him an intimation to proceed with the motion now, they could have given him that intimation at any time during the past few years, and he would have spoken or remained silent at their suggestion. But now it seems to suit their convenience, and they tell the hon. gentleman to go on with his motion. Is not the same inconsistency shown in their tariff policy? The Minister of Customs told us that after the tariff policy had been in force for seven years they found, on inquiry, that the people of Canada were satisfied with it, and therefore they did not change it. But is not the tariff which is now proposed different from any tariff which they ever had before? Have they not a minimum tariff or preferential tariff, an intermediate tariff and a maximum tariff, something that never before existed. They went through the farce of perambulating the country, on the supposition that they were to make inquiry and base a tariff on the result of their investigation, but did not the Minister of Finance tell us two years ago that we were going to have exactly the kind of tariff which has been submitted to parliament? Did he and his colleagues not know before they ever started on their investigation that just such a tariff would be propounded by them, and was not their investigation more or less of a sham?

If the country was satisfied with the tariff that had been in operation for ten years, why did hon. gentlemen make this radical departure from it? What justifies it? Is not the very fact that they are making these radical changes an evidence that the country was not satisfied with the tariff? Again, I ask, if these changes are made on the strength of the knowledge the hon. gentlemen acquired when they went through the country to get information, how is it that the principle on which the changes were to be made was announced before they made any inquiry at all? It seems to me that they are just about as inconsistent in this respect as they are in regard to carrying Canadian trade in Canadian bottoms and about bringing preferential trade through Canadian ports. In fact, they seem to be taking a leap in the dark; they seem to be moving on lines of expediency rather than on lines of statesmanship, judgment and knowledge. They did not entertain the same views with regard to the United States doing away with the bonding privilege when they were in opposition, and when they declared that if we put an export duty on saw logs, we would be incurring the greatest danger we could possibly incur. There was no danger in it, and to-day the Prime Minister says that we do not fear the doing away with the bonding privilege, that we would not suffer as much as the United States, and that it is our duty to go on and do what is best for Canada irrespective of what the United States may do. This is what hon. gentlemen opposite were told to do years ago. They have changed the views they had when they first came into power, when the First Minister was prepared to give away the fisheries and everything else to the Americans if they would settle the various subjects of dispute with Canada. Now he comes out and takes the statesmanlike view, but it is from force of circumstances and not from conviction or good judgment; because intelligent men saw ten years ago what the Prime Minister sees to-day.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to find that the resolution which I have moved has received at least the sympathetic consideration of all the members of this House. I say all, because I do not except even the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp). While he may not have made his sympathy with the resolution very clear this afternoon, I have in my mind another speech of his on a similar motion in which he said

> I am in hearty sympathy with the motives that are behind the resolution which has just been moved and seconded, the idea of shipping Canadian goods through Canadian channels.

So I think I can truthfully say that the House is unanimously in favour of the general principle of this resolution.

Mr. KEMP. I said that again to-day.

Mr. LOGAN. I am not going to deal with all the points that have been raised in opposition to this resolution, but let me say, in reply to a remark of the hon. gentleman who last spoke, that I do not think he is correct in saying that I am prepared in this matter to jump when the government pulls the string. The facts of the matter are that in 1903 there was nothing said in this House on this resolution, nor did I introduce any such resolution either in that year or in 1902.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did the hon. gentleman not give notice of it in one of those years?

Mr. LOGAN. I did not. I gave notice of it in 1901.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did the hon. gentleman not move it in 1901?

Mr. LOGAN. Because I could not get an opportunity; it was too far down on the order paper. In 1904 I moved the resolution, and it was accepted by this House. On that occasion it was endorsed by the hon. leader of the opposition, although it failed to have the endorsation of that hon. gentleman to-night. There was no revision of the tariff until this year, and what was the use of my reiterating that resolution every year? This year, as soon as the tariff was brought down, I took the first opportunity to give notice of this resolution, and to-day is the first day I have had an opportunity of moving it. So that the charge that I have been derelict in this matter is not well founded. I admit that I am a little disappointed that the government has not seen fit to adopt this policy, because I am convinced that it is in the best interests of our country. But I realize that there may be difficulties in the way with which I may not be conversant, but of which the government may know. I realize, too, when the Prime Minister moves an amendment to the effect that this policy shall only be brought into force at a date to be named by the Governor General in Council, he is speaking for the government, and as there has been so much opposition manifested to this resolution that the resolution of the Prime Minister is to be accepted. For these reasons I have to bow to the decision of the Prime Minister. I am glad, however, that although I have not been able to secure the adoption of this amendment to the tariff in the manner in which I have introduced it, yet to-night we are putting into a Canadian tariff for the first time a provision which means that we shall bring into this country through Canadian ports British goods entitled to the preference. For that condition of affairs I am very thankful. I only want to say in conclusion that if the facts are as stated here to-day with reference to the congestion of trade in the eastern seaports and on the eastern railways, it is high time for the government to grapple with this situation and grapple with it in no uncerain way. If it is a fact, as stated here to-day, that the Canadian Pacific Railway is so congested between St. John and Montreal that certain steamship lines are not plying between St. John and the mother country because they cannot get cargoes over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to St. John, and if it is a fact that the facilities in St. John, Halifax, Sydney and other maritime ports are not sufficient for the handling of Canadian trade, it is the paramount duty of the government to set itself at once toward the betterment of these conditions. If it is a fact that the magnificent harbour of Halifax, a harbour in which the British fleet could be hidden from the outside world, in which the largest vessel that floats on the ocean could draw up at the wharfs, is not provided with sufficient facilities for the handling of our Canadian trade, and if it is a fact that the facilities of St. John, a good harbour, though not so good as Halifax, are not sufficient, then I beseech the government to take hold of this question at the earliest possible moment and provide the necessary facilities.

After all the preferential tariff is a family matter. The granting of a preference on British goods is a concession by the daughter to the mother, and surely it is not to the credit of this country that we are to be told that the goods on which we give a preference cannot be brought from the mother to the daughter without going through the hands of some foreigner. Hon. gentlemen may speak as they like of some material disadvantage which may possibly come to some localities from the adoption of this policy, but we cannot build up a country on material considerations alone and leave out of our calculation all question of sentiment. If we are ever to become a great nation we must be patriotic, we must be true to Canadian institutions true to our own interests, we must give predominance to Canadian institutions and Canadian trade and Canadian ports throughout the length and breadth of this country. The government is putting this resolution into the tariff to be carried into effect at a date to be named by the Governor in Council. Let me tell them that the people will not hesitate on every favourable occasion to urge them to name that date, and until they do name it no man in this country can say that we in Canada are absolutely independent of the great republic to the south. So long as we are compelled to import our goods through foreign channels, no one can say that Canada is a self-reliant and self-contained country.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not wish to take up the time of the House at all, but I must express my regret that the right hon. the First Minister has thought it necessary to postpone indefinitely the putting into force of this resolution, because really that is the only result which can follow the adoption of the amendment he has offered. He urged that this policy should remain in abeyance for at least four years longer until the Grand Trunk Pacific is built, because then we would be entirely independent of the United States as regards bonding privileges. Well, when the Grand Trunk Pacific is built, we shall be no more independent

in that respect than we are now. We have now the Intercolonial Railway running entirely on Canadian soil to the ports of St. John and Halifax. What more shall we have when the Grand Trunk Pacific is built? When the Grand Trunk Pacific gets to Moncton, it will reach St. John and Halifax over the Intercolonial Railway. So that we are now just as independent of the United States, in so far as bonding privileges are concerned, as we shall be when the Grand Trunk Pacific is built. I am in sympathy with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) regarding the lack of facilities in our ocean ports at present. There is no doubt the duty devolves upon the government of seeing that the facilities at the terminal points of our great transcontinental railways are sufficient. They are not at present. At the same time, I would take some slight exception to his remarks that the Canadian Pacific Railway was not hauling to the ocean ports in the maritime provinces as much freight as it should.

Mr. LOGAN. What I said was that if the statement which had been made today was true—I only took a hypothetical case.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I understood him to make a reference of that nature. I do not think that the Canadian Pacific Railway are at all to blame in that respect because, as a matter of fact, there has been a very considerable lack of freight during part of this winter—so much so that they were unable to fill up their own ships and these ships had to cross the Atlantic only partially loaded. That of course was not the fault of the Canadian Pacific Railway but was due to weather conditions and other matters beyond the control of that company. We have had an hon. gentleman say that there was considerable opposition to this resolution from this side of the House. I think that if he will recall the facts and the members who have spoken, he will find that his statement is not warranted. In the former part of the hon. gentleman's speech, he referred to the expression of opinion in this House as being practically unanimous in favour of the proposition. But as the matter stands now, if this resolution should pass as amended, it will go by the board for an indefinite length of time. We have not had any expression of opinion from the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on this occasion. On former occasions he gave expression to a great deal of sympathy for the resolution and said he was in favour of it. I hope his opinion has not changed, and I think that really he is in duty bound to give us his view before this matter is finally disposed of. Otherwise the impression might be created that he has perhaps changed his mind. I do not think he has, but I should like to receive his assurance to that effect, and I think that such an assurance is due the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I am exceedingly happy to learn that my hon. friend attaches so much importance to my remarks on this occasion. I wish he did at all times, because then he would be willing to be guided by me and I might sometimes lead him into better paths. Several references have been made this afternoon to some remarks of mine made in this House on the resolution of 1904. From occasional observations regarding this resolution, one would think that the resolution then adopted was adopted only by the government and the members supporting it. But the fact cannot be gainsaid that it was supported practically by the whole House, including my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) although he has not manifested as much zeal on its behalf to-day as he did then. It was supported without division by practically the whole House. Only two gentlemen expressed some qualified opposition to it, and the House generally seemed to accept it as a principle which at some reasonable time might be carried into effect. It has been stated here that I said I was prepared to put it into effect at once. That is not a correct statement of my remarks. My remarks, even as referred to by some hon. gentlemen and imperfectly quoted, will not justify any such statement. What I did say was that I heartily sympathized with the object of the hon. member for Cumberland, and if a division was taken I would vote with him. But I said at that time that it was not a policy which needed to be put into operation at once, and I ventured to express the view that at an early date we might be able to do so. Lest there might be any misunderstanding, I will quote the words I used. I stated, both at the beginning and the end, that I sympathized with the views of the hon. member for Cumberland, and I still sympathize with the great object he has in view, the only question is when is the proper time for carrying it into effect. I went on to state:

> It is a subject on which there is need of education, not only outside of the House, but, possibly inside the House. I am aware that possibly, from some points of view, objections may be raised to the motion of my hon. friend. But, for my own part I am heartily in favour of it, and, if he decides to divide the House upon it, I shall have pleasure in giving my vote in support of the motion. For the purposes of the present budget and the present condition of affairs we cannot deal with it. But I hope there will be such an educational movement on the question that, at no distant day, we may adopt it as part of our practical legislation. If that can be done at no distant day, no one will rejoice more than I shall. I

think that the reasons that my hon. friend has given in support of his motion are strong, and I believe that the more the subject is discussed, the more likely we are to reach the conclusion that he has reached after so much consideration. So, while I do not say that his motion will receive the assent of the House, to take effect at once, it is a move in the right direction.

Therein, Sir, I definitely stated that I recognized the fact that there was a great want of an educational movement on this subject. Now the discussion that has taken place in the House to-day has given us the evidence of that. It is a sad fact that forty years after the beginning of confederation, after all the hopes and expectations that were entertained, and justly entertained, with regard to the utilization of the maritime ports as, to use a common expression, the wharf of the whole Dominion, it is a sad fact to have to confess, after forty years have elapsed, that we are not yet independent, commercially, of our neighbours to the south of us. One of the strongest arguments used by the advocates of confederation in the lower provinces was that this inner portion of our territory required access to the ocean. If you turn to the debates of that day, you will find that that was the view held very strongly before the people of the maritime provinces. They were told that the people of what was then called western Canada—which has now become central Canada—had no desire to do their business by way of the south, but they did desire access to the ocean, that they would have railways built, and the result would be that the trade which crossed from old Canada to the United States would thereafter pass through the maritime provinces, and that the cities of St. John, Halifax and other ports in the lower provinces which were to grow up, would become indeed the wharfs of British North America. Well, we have had since not only the building of the Intercolonial Railway, but we have had the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have not only the line of railway which was contemplated at the time of confederation, but we have a second line; and yet we are told to-day that the facilities of our ports and the facilities of our railways are not equal to carrying the trade which is referred to in this resolution of my hon. friend from Cumberland.

Now, I think that so far as our friends in central Canada are concerned, in the province of Ontario notably, they are needlessly alarmed. I think even with the facilities which exist to-day there would not be any great unfairness in asking our friends in Toronto to support this resolution and to receive their goods by way of Halifax or St. John.

Mr. KEMP. They come that way now, most of them.

Mr. FIELDING. No, most of them come by way of Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. KEMP. I beg your pardon, by Canadian ports.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, Halifax and St. John are Canadian ports, though some gentlemen do not seem willing to admit it. But I say that even if we were to put this into operation to-day as respects central Canada, really I do not think the disadvantage to the trade of Toronto, for example, or of other cities of western Ontario, would be anything like as serious as some hon. gentlemen imagine. I think that even if they had to pay a little more freight, even if they had to suffer a little disadvantage in their carriage, there is sufficient public spirit in the province of Ontario, when it is properly appealed to, to make the little sacrifice they might well make in order to carry out what would be in the best sense of the word a truly national policy. So far as transportation is concerned, I think, my hon. friends in that province rather overestimate the difficulties. They are reasoning from the operations of the present season. We have had a very severe winter, and transportation has been interferred with to a large degree, but that interference has not been confined to Canada. If you look across the line you will find the same thing, stories of hundreds and hundreds of cars side-tracked along the line of railways. The other day I read in one of the western papers that in a train yard of a western town, there were a hundred cars of Christmas goods not yet delivered to their destination in the western United States. It would not be reasonable therefore to infer that because the difficulties of transportation have proved to be so severe during the current winter, we would be justified in concluding that to be the ordinary current condition of affairs. I admit however that there might be some disadvantage, some embarrassment, and I hope and believe that as it becomes necessary to deal with this question in the future, our friends in the province of Ontario will satisfy themselves that this is a meritorious movement, and that they will be prepared to support it, even though it would call for some little sacrifice on their part. But still I think the disadvantage is somewhat magnified as respects Ontario cities. I think there is greater force in the argument presented to-day by the hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) from the point of view of the western settler. Undoubtedly there is a congested condition of traffic in our western country. Not only the east bound traffic, not only the traffic of bringing out the grain of the country, but the traffic westbound, I may say, is also in a congested condition; and there is much ground for the feeling expressed by our western friends that if they were confined to this one line of railway which is now

running through the western country they would suffer a serious disadvantage. In my judgment there is force in that, to a larger extent than there is in the similar line of criticism of the hon. gentlemen from Ontario.

Now, I think a step has been taken to-night of great importance. The hon. member for Cumberland has not accomplished all that he desired ; but, as he says, he is receiving to-day from the government a recognition of the principle, the principle which was voted upon by the House almost uanimously three years ago. We are not in a position, it is contended, to apply that principle to-day and carry it into effect at once. I do not believe that we could put it into force at once, successfully. Possibly, however, we do not take as enthusiastic, or, as some would say, as patriotic view of the question as we ought to take, and some of us might think that we could put it into force at an earlier day than we are able to do. At all events, we recognize that there are some such difficulties as have been suggested, and so it becomes a question of when we may bring this new scheme into operation. Upon that question there is a difference of opinion. There are some who would put it off for a longer period; there are others who think that we shall increase and improve our facilities of inland transportation very rapidly, and that the day may come very early. The government have concluded therefore, recognizing the fact that there are difficulties in the way of bringing this principle into operation at once, that it is best to recognize the principle and to insert that declaration in the tariff, throwing upon the government the responsibility of bringing it into operation whenever, in their judgment, the transportation facilities and the port facilities are such as will enable the project to be carried out without unduly burdening the trade of the country. Now, I suppose, as a maritime man, I should take a more enthusiastic view and say that I would be glad to have this policy go into operation at once. But I recognize the need of the educational process to which I have referred. We are able already to declare the policy in a concrete form, and to put in the tariff a declaration that in the opinion of this House it is the true principle, that it is the true national policy of this country, and the House is prepared, I believe, to accept it in that spirit. I believe that in taking this step to-night we are going as far as we should be asked to go. I think that the hon. member for Cumberland, who has given us so much information, and devoted so much time to the subject, who has done himself so much credit by his promotion of this policy, would be wise if he would now recognize the great progress that is made, and allow the resolution of the Prime Minister to

Mr. FIELDING.

become the main motion rather than divide the House upon it.

Mr. BARKER. I always endeavour to listen with respect to the arguments of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) but when he comes to an opinion on the trade and business of a merchant, I would prefer even to his opinion that of an ordinary man in the trade. He undertakes to say that the merchants of Ontario, especially of western Ontario, are unduly timid and afraid as if the minister with his little experience of merchandise and merchant traffic is more capable of expressing an opinion on such a matter than men who have spent their lives at their own business and understand it from the bottom up. I as a representative of an Ontario constituency, am opposed to the motion of the hon. member who has introduced the main motion. I oppose it because it ignores the geography of this country.

Mr. FIELDING. So does the Union.

Mr. BARKER. It ignores the facilities that the western portions of Ontario and those carrying on business there naturally have by their nearness to the sea. There is an enormous trade among the grocers of Ontario in the autumn. Spices and other things of that kind of which the importation is enormous come in at the very end of the season at a time when land transportation from the maritime provinces is subject to delay and inconvenience and the expense of long land carriage. Spices, &c., come from the East and West Indies via New York because there are no lines of water communication running to our own ports and we are asked to say that shipments via Boston and New York shall be barred to the merchants of Ontario, especially western Ontario, in order that the preference shall drive the trade through St. John or some other maritime port. There are no lines to St. John, there is no business done in St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. Where from ?

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman asks where from. That is a perfectly fair question. I have said that these spices from the Indies go to New York by lines of shipping that never touch Canadian ports. When they arrive at New York they are within 500 miles of western Ontario and they have the competition of the American lines of railway, several of the best lines, perhaps the very best railway accommodation obtainable in America. Coming via Halifax or St. John they would be subject to delay. Why is it that the government do not accept the resolution of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) ? Because they do not think under the present conditions it is wise to accept it and they

object to it. If it is good it is good now, but what do they propose ? They propose to go one step further in the role of this government, government by order in council. That is the remedy they propose. Between the straight resolution by which this House will take the responsibility, and the resolution to govern by order in council I would accept the main motion rather than that of the government. I propose to oppose the resolution of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) because it is unduly injurious to a very large section of Ontario, which is as much entitled to the consideration and the protection of this parliament as New Brunswick or any other province ; and I still more strongly oppose the amendment because it is shirking the question, the government neither propose to accept the hon. gentleman's resolution nor to squarely vote it down. Instead of the question being dealt with three or four years hence in parliament, they propose to take power to deal with it by the judgment of the cabinet. That is not parliamentary government as I understand it, and I shall vote against the original resolution and still more strongly against the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I should have strongly desired to have seen the motion of my hon. friend from Cumberland accepted by this House. He presented excellent reasons that should cause the committee and the country to reach the conclusion that it is desirable for many reasons that the policy he has propounded and submitted to the committee should have been accepted. I agree entirely with what he said that the day will come when this policy will be adopted by the people of this country. I have been surprised at the reception of this resolution by certain members, bearing in mind the reception it received from them in 1904, when my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) proposed the same resolution to the committee. I am somewhat surprised at my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who was in parliament when my hon. friend from Cumberland presented this resolution in 1904. He did not raise any opposition to it then. He has asked what has brought about changes ? I might ask what has brought about the change of heart on the part of my hon. friend.

Mr. BARKER. There has been no change of heart on my part.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I say there is. He did not rise in his place in 1904 and protest against the passing of this resolution.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to assert that I supported it or was present—

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am going to by reason of the fact that I have the records to show that the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) did not rise in his seat in 1904 as he did to-night—

Mr. BARKER. Can you produce the record that I did not rise in my seat ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think I have the record right here and it will not bear out the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) in the statement that he stood up to protest against the passing of this resolution. I might refer to something that might make it somewhat unpleasant for my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) in this connection.

Mr. BARKER. Do not stop on my account.

Mr. JOHNSTON. He says that the Minister of Finance to-night spoke as if he knew more about the business of the merchants of western Canada than the merchants did themselves.

Mr. BARKER. I said I think so.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I might read to my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) for his enlightenment the views of a merchant of western Canada who, I take it, knows just as much about conducting mercantile business as my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Is my hon. friend from Hamilton aware that when the resolution of my hon. friend from Cumberland was before the House in 1904, Mr. W. R. Brock, who is a merchant prince of the city of Toronto, expressed some views upon that question ? Perhaps the hon. member for Hamilton will stand up to-night and ask : What does Mr. Brock know about merchandise ? Perhaps he will and yet if he looks at the views expressed by the late member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) he will find that these views are practically in line with the observations made by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to-night which observations were dissented from by my hon. friend from Hamilton. The observations of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance are almost in line with what Mr. Brock said upon that occasion and I would commend to the careful perusal of the hon. member for Hamilton, if not for his enlightenment, the remarks made upon that occasion.

Another word. Something has been said as to the equipment of the ports of Halifax and St. John. The hon. member for Hamilton was good enough to say that practically no trade was done through the port of St. John and I suppose he intended to convey the same idea in regard to the port of Halifax. I may say to my hon. friend from Hamilton that if he takes the trouble to go down to the city of Halifax—and I am going to speak of Halifax because I have a personal knowledge of the equipment of the port there and I am not going to speak of St. John for the reason that my knowledge of the port of St. John is not as accurate as it is of the equipment of the port of Hali-

fax—he will find that as far as the equipment of the port of Halifax is concerned it is equal to the requirements of this country. I am sure if any one will take the trouble to inquire into the matter he will find that the port of Halifax is equipped to take care of all the trade that comes to this country from Great Britain. I make that statement as a statement of fact, I know something of what I am talking about and I say without fear of contradiction that if hon. gentlemen who are not acquainted with the situation go down to Halifax and examine the equipment there they will find that they have nothing to fear. I share the view of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to a very large extent that some people are unduly alarmed as to what the results of the passing of this resolution will be. As far as I am concerned I hope that in the very near future the policy which has been propounded by my hon. friend from Cumberland will become the policy of this country and that it will be accepted by the people generally from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) who has just sat down would lead the committee to believe that I was present and that if I did not support the resolution I apparently acquiesced in it. He seeks to refute me by referring to the remarks in 1904 of a member of this House, a Conservative (Mr. Brock), a well known merchant and a man whose opinion certainly commanded respect from this side of the House and, I think, from the other. The hon. gentleman has chosen to represent Mr. Brock as taking the very opposite position to that which he assumes I took upon that occasion and apparently he would lead the House to suppose that Mr. Brock supported the views which the honourable member has just endeavoured to express. I would like to read what Mr. Brock said :

I had hoped to get through with this session, Mr. Speaker, without your having to hear my voice, but we have had such an exhibition of insincerity on the part of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that I cannot keep silent any longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Go on.

Mr. BARKER. (reading):

When the Finance Minister was advocating the building of a railroad from the Northwest down to the sea-board he assured gentlemen on this side of the House that the patriotism of Canadians would lead them to send their goods to Canadian ports in preference to American ports. The present exhibition will confirm the opinion that there is no sincerity whatever in any of the motions brought up by gentlemen on that side of the House. I can tell the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat——

Mr. JOHNSTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is not finished yet.

Mr. BARKER. Oh, you will get it all. Do not be in a hurry.

I can tell the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Logan) that many merchants bring all their goods to this country through Canadian ports,——

As has been said over and over again in this House and nobody disputes it.

—and do not allow their goods to come through United States ports so far as they can help it.

Is there anything inconsistent with what I said there?

Mr. JOHNSTON. There is a good deal.

Mr. BARKER. (reading)

The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) says the effect of this resolution will be to make goods dearer. All I can say is that I bring all the goods I can to this country through Canadian ports, and I manage to compete with other people pretty well.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. Does that show that he approves of the position taken by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. It shows the very opposite.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Not at all.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly it does. Mr. Brock goes on:

I am sure the Finance Minister will give me credit for patriotism, not that I think it makes much difference, but because the Finance Minister has insisted that the farmers of the northwest will be induced by patriotism to bill their grain to Canadian ports.

Mr. Brock goes on:

I think the hon. minister will require to hedge a good deal before he gets through. But I just wished to draw the attention of the House to this most remarkable exhibition.

This is the gentleman who is said to be supporting the resolution.

I think the country will see it and I know this House will see it—that there is no sincerity on the other side of the House. This notice has been long enough on the order paper——

So it has this session.

—to allow the Finance Minister to take note of it and to have made it a part of his budget speech; but it has been put off now so that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) who certainly deserves a certain amount of credit for it, might get the credit of bringing it up himself. I would like to see him take hold of it with the same energy that he manifested with regard to the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific to Moncton. In that case he forced the government at the point of the bayonet to fall in with his wishes ; why should he not now be just as sincere in favour

of Halifax and St. John as he was in favour of Moncton ? Simply because he wanted, I suppose, to make a little political capital out of it.

That was Mr. Brock's view.

But if he is going to make political capital out of anything of that kind, there must be a little more sincerity than there is in this present motion.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the speech referred to by the hon. member for Cape Breton?

Mr. BARKER. That is the speech.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is now after half-past eleven o'clock. I agree fully with the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that this is a question which does and will materially affect the people of the Northwest. An important event happened there to-day, and I would like to inquire at this time of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as I presume the returns are all in now, if he has heard the result of the elections in Manitoba?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It has just been announced that the Attorney General of the province of Manitoba in the late government has been defeated.

Mr. BRISTOL. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the discussion of an important matter of this kind, which is really a matter of national importance, is advanced by degenerating into personalities. There seems to have been a considerable amount of that this evening. Perhaps we had better discuss the question before the House. Personally, I cannot claim to have much knowledge of the subject, but I am free to say that I listened with a great deal of interest to the very excellent speech of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan). I think he deserves the thanks of the members of this House for the excellent speech he made, for the very large amount of information he gave us and for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I must take issue with the Minister of Finance, when he says that the people of a portion of Ontario are raising objections to this, because they may have to pay some slightly increased freight rates. That is not a fair suggestion to make as to the people of my province.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is not doing me justice ; I did not cast any reflection on the people of Ontario. I said I thought they were needlessly alarmed, as I did not think there would be any increase; but if there was an increase, I believed they would be patriotic enough to be willing to pay it.

Mr. BRISTOL. I think so too, and I am glad the Minister of Finance has made that explanation.

Mr. FIELDING. I said that before.

Mr. BRISTOL. The question is one as to which there may be honest difference of opinion. I shall quote from the remarks of Mr. Hugh Blain, who was a Liberal candidate in Toronto, who is a very eminent business man and a man whom we in Toronto all respect. Mr. Hugh Blain said :

My friend asks if I was ever down there, and I suppose he means that I would discover that they had facilities. Take in my own business ; we import goods from the Straits Settlements, Ceylon and all these eastern parts, and there is no direct connection between any of them and any Canadian port. We cannot issue a letter of credit bringing goods by way of any port except by way of New York or Boston, and it is quite evident we must develop our eastern facilities for doing business infinitely more than they are to-day before we could possibly enforce a resolution such as this.

Mr. LOGAN. Is not the date of that speech five years ago?

Mr. BRISTOL. Yes. One of the real points in this question is : Have we the transportation facilities which would justify the government in adopting such a policy as is being considered to-night? It occurs to me to say that, as I understand the idea of a preferential tariff, it was to develop trade between Great Britain and her colonies. Can we develop trade between Great Britain and her colonies if, when we start the progress of trade on its way to this country, we hamper the methods of transportation? That is a crucial point to consider. If we compel the trade of Great Britain, to which we desire to give a preference, to come to this country by a more expensive route, necessarily we increase the cost of the product when it reaches this country, and necessarily we will lessen our volume of trade with Great Britain, and lessen the preference we desire to give to Great Britain and the colonies. Under the circumstances, and as the matter is one for grave consideration, I think we have not yet before us the facts on which we can come to a determination on this question. As I believe there is no urgency, for the member from Cumberland only asks that it come into force a year from now, surely this is a matter which can stand for a later session, and then, when the government has fuller information, the decision should be left to the House, and the responsibility for determining such an important matter should not be cast on the government.

Amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agreed to on division.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Shall item 411 pass?

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me we have had a pretty hard, long day, and we will not make much progress to-night.

Mr. PATERSON. Take half an hour longer.

Mr. FOSTER. That will take you past midnight. I think we will get as far ahead if we go on with it to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. The day has not been entirely without profit, but I was hoping to get through with some items to-night. Of course, at this late hour we could only make progress by common consent. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same thing.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Pius Michaud, Esq., member for the electoral district of Victoria, New Brunswick; introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. H. R. Emmerson.

THE LATE MR. EDWARD COCHRANE, MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, it is once more my duty during the present session to announce to the House that we have lost one of our colleagues in the person of Mr. Edward Cochrane, member for the electoral district of East Northumberland. I am quite certain that the loss of Mr. Cochrane will be sincerely felt by all the members of this House, above all by his party friends and perhaps no less by those who had not the privilege of being his party friends. Mr. Cochrane, as all those who had the privilege of being associated with him for many years know, possessed many traits which endeared him to his colleagues on both sides of the House. He had an impulsive Irish nature, a warm Irish heart and a good Irish wit and humour. All those who were associated with him here, we on this side of the House as much as his own friends on the other side, will miss his cheerful countenance, and I do not know but that for my part personally I shall not miss the very fiery but very good natured lectures which were sometimes delivered to me on the many shortcomings of this administration. He took part in the debates and always did it with a good deal of earnestness and at the same time always generously. We shall join with hon. members on the other side of the House in offering to his family our sincere condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, I thank the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for his kindly references to our late colleague. Mr. Cochrane was all that the Prime Minister described him to have been and in addition to that he was of very manly character, of strong intellectual grasp and possessed a vast fund of information respecting public questions. He had his strong opinions, his intense likes and dislikes. He was not only warm and impulsive but even passionate, and when I saw him last only a few days ago I recollect very well that he was inclined to express himself with the same old passionate earnestness respecting any thing that did not meet with his approval. He was warm, impulsive and passionate, but above all he was kind hearted, tender, lovable and had every quality and trait that could serve to endear him to every member of this House, I am sure, and especially to those who had the privilege of being his colleagues and who shared his political opinions. I am sure that the sympathy of hon. gentlemen, irrespective of politics, will go out to those who are near and dear to him, and who are called upon with us to mourn his loss.

PRIVILEGE—JUNIOR JUDGE OF SIMCOE COUNTY.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, for the purpose of making a personal explanation in regard to a question which was asked in this House on the 25th of last month, and answered on the same day, regarding the junior judge of the county court of the county of Simcoe. The 'Northern Advance,' a paper published in the town of Barrie, speaks in this way in regard to this question:

> Now, who could have suggested this impertinent question? No one will for a minute imagine it was prompted by Mr. Lennox, M.P., or Mr. Bennett, M.P., who certainly would have been manly enough to have placed their names to the question had they suggested it. Besides which, even if it were either of the above gentlemen, Conmee would have been the last man they would have applied to, to do such work. Who, then, was it? Because,

Conmee could not have acted on representations made to him by any one resident in the county. If Mr. Leighton McCarthy, M.P., can throw any light on the subject, he should embrace the opportunity to-morrow night at the Grit pow-wow. How the hungry wolves are howling for the prey.

I desire to say that I had not in any way whatsoever anything to do with the propounding, asking or instigating the asking of the question with reference to the junior county judge of the county of Simcoe referred to, as to which the hon. member (Mr. Conmee), who asked the question, will corroborate me. I have been at some pains to ascertain who was the instigator of the question, for it could only be some one who had some spite or spleen to vent, or who desired to wound the feelings of that judge and his family. It is my endeavour always to avoid being placed in that class, and besides I have always had the most friendly and cordial feelings for that judge, and have also most highly respected him as a judge. The result of my inquiries has been to enable me to say that the instigator of that question is the same gentleman who, some weeks ago, sent a petition asking for the retirement of that judge to a practitioner in Collingwood, asking him to have it signed by his professional brethren there, and then he followed it up by propounding this question and sending it to a member of this House, who handed it to the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) who asked the question, and then this Conservative paper, the 'Northern Advance,' evidently inspired from the same source, charges me with being the instigator of it. Sir, the gentleman to whom I have referred is Mr. A. E. H. Creswicke, a Conservative barrister in the town of Barrie.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I notice that my name is mentioned, together with the name of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) in connection with this matter. Mr. Bennett is not in the House at this moment——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, he is here.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) is here. As representing the riding in which the junior judge of Simcoe resides, and as a member of the bar, I may say that I regret that the question referred to was asked. The information could have been obtained without putting it that way. I particularly regret that such a mode was taken to elicit the information that was sought. As regards Mr. A. E. H. Creswicke, who is said by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to have inspired this article——

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) now speaking to a question of privilege?

Mr. LENNOX. I am speaking to a question of privilege, as I am mentioned in this newspaper article. Mr. A. E. H. Creswicke is a personal friend of mine, and he no doubt will have occasion to refer to this matter in some other way. At present I am not advised one way or the other, but I should be exceedingly surprised if Mr. Creswicke did anything of an underhand or dishonourable nature.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND COMMUNICATION.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the First Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Marine, if the passengers who, a few days ago, were landed on Pictou island from the steamers 'Stanley' and 'Minto,' have yet been taken off? I understand there are one or two lady passengers, and the conditions on Pictou island cannot be pleasant for ladies so situated. I know that one lady has been landed on the island, whose mother is in a dying condition in Alberton, P.E.I. What steps have been taken to get the passengers off the island, and in what position are the steamers 'Stanley' and 'Minto' at the present time? I should like also to give the First Minister an opportunity of denying the imputations made with regard to certain words of his in addressing a delegation from St. John a few weeks ago. The report went down to the Prince Edward Island newspapers that the First Minister had said that the question of a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland had been mooted——

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman now speaking to a question of privilege?

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is a question of privilege; I am asking the First Minister to explain.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is the privilege of the First Minister to offer an explanation. The Prime Minister is alleged to have said that this tunnel would cost some $20,000,000, and for his part it was out of the question, and he did not think seriously of it. I understand that since then an hon. gentleman, on behalf of the First Minister, has denied that the right hon. gentleman said that; but I should like the Prime Minister to give an explanation himself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As to the first part of the hon. gentleman's question, I am sorry I have not any information on the matter, but I shall ask my colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to get the information and to give it on Monday. As to the other part of the hon. gentleman's question, in reference to what I said to the delegation from St. John, it is quite easy for me to answer. I was waited upon by a delegation from the city of St. John, and the hon. member who represents that city (Mr. Daniel) was present. I said, amongst other things, that the works which we were asked to undertake in the harbour of St. John were expensive; that the government were engaged at this moment in the building of the Transcontinental Railway; that we were asked to build the Georgian bay canal, which would cost $100,000,000; and that we were also asked to build a tunnel to Prince Edward Island, which I thought would cost all the way from $10,000,000 to $20,000,000. I expressed no opinion at all antagonistic to the idea of a tunnel. On the contrary, if I said anything at all, it was rather in the way of indicating my own feelings that I was quite in sympathy with the movement and with the idea. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) permit me to say that he would do well not to believe everything he sees in Conservative newspapers.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It was published in an independent Liberal paper.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry for that paper.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That paper is sorry for the government.

WAYS AND MEANS—RAILWAY RATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PATERSON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to place on the table of the House——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I desire, Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair— —

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, pshaw!

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I desire to bring a matter before the attention of this House, and if the Minister of Customs, and especially if the Prime Minister, wish to get on with the public business they will pay some heed to the question I raise. I will be very brief, but I may have to refer to the subject again if satisfaction is not accorded. Something happened within the precincts of this House yesterday in regard to a question which I have raised here more than once, namely, the conduct of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in regard to a charter right of the people who live along that line of railway. The Grand Trunk Railway Company is compelled by the law of this land to give those people a penny a mile passenger service. That is so clearly set out in its charter that the company applied to this parliament this session for an Act repealing that provision, and it was rumoured yesterday that the reason why the company had withdrawn the application for this legislation was that the government of the day or the Minister of Railways had insisted on its withdrawal. Whether that is so or not I am not able to say, but the fact is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has now abandoned its intention of asking for the repeal of the law which gave the people along its line the right to a penny a mile service. In view of this confession on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company within the court of parliament that that law is still in existence, I desire to ask the government whether they intend to enforce the law and to secure for the people along the line of that railway a penny a mile service? That right of the people is most clearly set out in the statutes of 1852, and when I raised the question in this House as to the enforcement of Dominion law, I am told that it rests entirely with the provinces, and that I should go to the attorney general of the province of Ontario. Now, I want again to place this case before the Prime Minister and to give him the opportunity of declaring whether or not that is really his view, because if the charter rights of the people, as contained in the Act of 1852, are not to be enforced by Dominion authority, and if the charter rights of the people with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway are not to be enforced by the government of the day, I ask the Prime Minister how he intends to enforce the charter rights of the people which he created four years ago in connection with the National Transcontinental system and the Grand Trunk Pacific, when he entered into an agreement with a railway corporation to secure to the people of this country things of the utmost national import? For instance, he provides that all materials and supplies must be purchased in this country; that the Railway Act shall apply to this road that the control of rates shall be under the government; that there shall be an efficient service; that there shall be a standard of service. Now, if there is to be no enforcement by the Dominion government of the charter rights of the people as set out in Acts of parliament, does he mean to tell us that all the protection he claims to have secured for the people in that Act of parliament is to be left to the attorneys general of the provinces—that this government, after having signed an agreement of that kind, does not concern itself any more

with it? If that is so in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway charter, it must be so in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway charter and in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific charter. Where are we at in this country? Are we making these contracts with these companies and giving them all these franchises and imposing on them the performance of certain obligations in the public interest, and at the same time saying that parliament, in so far as it is concerned, and the government of the day in so far as it is concerned, and the Minister of Justice in so far as he is concerned, and the Minister of Railways in so far as he is concerned, do not intend to enforce that Dominion law? The answer is, in substance—I have heard of it given before—that the member for South York is asking us to enforce the Criminal Code. I have hardly mentioned the Criminal Code, but we have a type of Minister of Justice—and I have great respect for his office—who is only indulging in legal quibbling when he makes that statement. This parliament is sent here to make laws, and it is responsible for carrying on the government of the country. There is something besides legal quibbling; there is such a thing as statesmanship, and if hon. gentlemen abandon that, there is such a thing as carrying on the government of the country. Are they carrying on the government of the country, through the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways, when they say that any enforcement of the law concerning these three great railway lines in this country is to be purely a matter for the attorneys generals of these provinces? Are we living in a house of mummies? Are all these laws mummified laws, so far as this parliament is concerned—laws which are not to be enforced? I am speaking now for the people of South York who live along the line of the Grand Trunk Railway and are entitled to a penny a mile service. I am also speaking for the following constituencies of Ontario in demanding this charter right for the people, although it probably now applies to the whole Grand Trunk Railway system for which Mr. Hays speaks; because I believe that this Act is broad enough to cover that. At any rate, the following constituencies are involved in the matter: The five constituencies of Toronto, South York, South Ontario, Durham. When the present Minister of Justice ran in Durham would he have told the people there that if he came to be Minister of Justice and the Grand Trunk Railway Company came to be charged with wilfully disobeying the law of the land in regard to the concession of a charter right to the people, he would stand up in parliament and say go to the attorney general of the province for your rights; don't bother me; you are annoying me about enforcing the Criminal Code. The other constituencies are: The two Northumberlands, the two Hastings, Prince Edward. Lennox and Addington, Frontenac, Kingston, Leeds, Brockville, Grenville, Dundas, Stormont, Glengarry. If the hon. members who represent these counties cannot join with me, then I myself, on behalf of all the people who live in these counties, insist on this government making it their business to see that the Grand Trunk carries out this law, or else let that government be put on record as a government which imposes a solemn obligation on a railway and then takes no interest in seeing that that obligation is carried out. In the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company it is set out that the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall be a party to it, so that the Prime Minister makes an agreement with a self-confessed and recognized law-breaker.

Will the company ever make good that solemn obligation which Mr. C. M. Hays and Sir Charles Rivers Wilson signed, so long as the First Minister and the Minister of Justice declare it is not their duty to enforce the law, but that it is the duty of the provincial attorney generals? Are these laws that we are making every day simply mummified laws? Have we reached that stage that we are enacting mummified laws in a mummy house and that we have no means of enforcing the laws we pass? When I ask that these laws be enforced, with what reply am I met? I am met with legal quibbling, I am met with this reply from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth): Oh, the hon. gentleman is trying to enforce the criminal law and that is outside our jurisdiction. That is not what I am arguing. I am arguing for the enforcement of Dominion law. I am arguing for the vindication of the charter rights belonging to the people who live in all these counties from Montreal to Toronto. This railway has not only deliberately refused to comply with the law compelling it to provide a passenger rate of a penny a mile, but is guilty of discrimination. In the Act governing railways, there is a clear clause against discrimination. And this company not only refuse this penny a mile service east of Toronto, but are discriminating against these people and charging them three and a third cents a mile. Where are my hon. friends on both sides? Where is the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell), whom I have heard so often declaim about the rights of the farmers? Where is he when he sees the farmers charged three and a third cents a mile when they are entitled to a penny a mile? Where are the other hon. members representing counties thus discriminated against? Are they chloroformed just as the government is? It looks as if the Grand Trunk Railway owned this country and could defy the government and can defy the members who represent the people living along the line of that railway. I am not going to be satisfied with

any such subterfuge as has been advanced heretofore. If necessary I shall go into every county and call a public meeting there, and will ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and the Prime Minister to come and meet me and see whether the people will accept their view that this House has nothing to do with the enforcement of the charter rights of the people who live along the Grand Trunk Railway. The right hon. gentleman can have an early and a quick session, so far as I am concerned, if he will do what I conceive to be his duty in the matter and not assign it to somebody else. Let him instruct his Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and his Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) to see that in the next two or three days Mr. Hays is brought to a recognition of his duty to the people and compelled to carry out this law which has imposed on his company this penny a mile service and which forbids discrimination. It is all fudge to talk about the great rights which the First Minister has secured for us, such as the obligation of the Grand Trunk Railway to build up our national ports and buy its supplies in Canada. It is all mere fudge for him to say he has secured these things, when he has no intention of enforcing these obligations, and when it is only the attorney generals of the different provinces who can bring this company to book. If the right hon. gentleman will make Mr. C. M. Hays, with whom he has entered into a hundred million dollar contract, carry out his obligations and thus show that he is a law abiding citizen and a man of his word, I shall be only too glad to facilitate the closing of the session and allow the right hon. gentleman to go on and attend to any great public business he may have on the other side.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). Possibly coming from the far west, I may not be interested in the question which the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has brought up, but I have a very distinct recollection of the conduct of the hon. gentleman in the railway committee on a Bill affecting the province of British Columbia. When the representatives of that province had their backs to the wall fighting to break a monopoly in that province, I have a distinct recollection of the hon. member doing his best to drive us from the wall.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has made a statement against me which is not true. I assisted the hon. gentleman and all the members of British Columbia on the occasion to which he refers.

Mr. MACPHERSON. He assisted us only when the attention of the public was drawn to his conduct, but what was the first vote he gave in the Railway Committee of this House on the Victoria, Vancouver and Edmonton Bill? His very first vote was in favour of a provision which would have made that Bill impossible.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I say it is not so.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Why, I was there and heard the hon. gentleman's name called.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order in referring to what took place in a committee and his statement besides is false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, not true. I withdraw the expression 'false.'

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman is fair in claiming that I am out of order. If I am treading on the corns of the hon. gentleman, he ought to keep his toes away from my feet.

Mr. FOSTER. Very difficult for him to do that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman ought to withdraw the statement.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I shall withdraw the statement if I have said aught against the hon. gentleman's conduct in this House. If his conduct does not back up my statement, then I withdraw it. But his conduct does corroborate my statement. Why then should I withdraw it? Will he deny that in the Railway Committee—I will put the question fairly to him. My hon. friend is fond of doing the high dive act in this House. He is fond of getting up before the footlights and doing the hootchee-kootchee and the high kick act when there is anything to be made out of it. But I want to tell him that he is not sincere and all his high flown talk is no evidence of sincerity.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not want to disturb this little friendly intercourse, but the question now raised is the question of the enforcement of a federal statute governing the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not think that on that question, it is in order to discuss the vote which may have been given by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) in the Railway Committee on some railway legislation affecting British Columbia.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The point is no doubt well taken, but the question before us is the motion to go into supply. What I am bringing up now is the question of principle on which the hon. gentlemen from South York (Mr. Maclean) is so fond of pluming himself. Well, we must be judged by our actions outside of this House as well as in it. And when I say that the hon. gentleman has not, in the course of his career, always upheld those high and lofty principles which he is now vindicating, I am stating what is a fact; and I am in the judgment of every man who was present at that meeting of the Railway Committee

two years ago when I say that the hon. gentleman voted for the very thing which would have made our Bill, the Victoria, Vancouver and Edmonton, impossible. Is he capable of denying that ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Let me hear him deny it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have only one way of denying it and that is by saying it is not so.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am very sorry that I have not got the newspaper reports of that time, but the first vote cast in the Railway Committee of this House——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I think the hon. gentleman should not continue to repeat the statement after the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has denied it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Then I withdraw the statement that my hon. friend asked me to withdraw. But I will state—and I think I am within my rights as a member of the House in this—that the hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is thoroughly inconsistent as shown by his action in this House when he has a political point to gain as contrasted with his action in the Railway Committee. I have nothing to do with this two-cent rate, so far as the Grand Trunk is concerned; but what I object to is that any hon. member of the House, when he has an opportunity to make a little cheap popularity for himself should act in one way in this House and then refuse to carry out in the Railway Committee the high principles which he has declared here, and that is what the hon. gentleman has done in relation to a proposal the carrying out of which was necessary to secure competition for us in British Columbia.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL (Glengarry). When the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) referred to Glengarry and said he proposed to come into that county and hold public meetings to show the people of the county as well as the people of Leeds and Brockville, that their members were not doing their duty properly, I can only say that I have no objection to the hon. gentleman coming to Glengarry at any time. We have had plenty of people in Glengarry who have talked as he talks, who have talked nonsense and blatherskiteism of every kind. But I should not feel that the hon. gentleman was doing me any harm if he came to Glengarry and talked there as he has talked here this afternoon. If his statements meant anything, he meant to convey the impression that it was possible to have a two-cent-rate on the Grand Trunk with the same accommodation as is given for the three and one-third cent rate. I am quite satisfied that the people of Glengarry do not want to ride in a cattle car at two cents a mile, when they can ride in a second class passenger car at two and one-quarter cents a mile. I do not know that they are very anxious to be able to ride second-class or to claim that they must have the two-cent rate on the same basis of accommodation as for the first-class rate. When the hon. gentleman wants to come to Glengarry and state his case fairly, honestly and openly, I can only say I will welcome him to Glengarry and be one of the spectators or will meet him on the platform, whichever he may prefer.

Mr. D. DERBYSHIRE (Brockville). If the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) desires to test the feeling of the people of Brockville on this subject and will resign his seat, I will resign mine and will run against him in Brockville. That is a speedy way of settling the matter. Why should we have this hon. gentleman taking up all the time of this House talking nonsense? He is always on the floor taking up the time of this House. And not only that, but the other day he took up the whole time of the sitting of the Railway Committee, shouting his two-cent rate and these other foolish things with which he hopes to make himself popular. Let the hon. gentleman come to Brockville and I will give him a rousing welcome.

INSURANCE COMMISSION REPORT—ALLEGATIONS AGAINST MEMBERS.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer for a very few moments to a question which has already been the subject of some comment in this House and the discussion of which, by the joint action of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), was postponed. When, on February 21 last, I brought before the House the subject of accusations which have been thrown from either side of this House, especially by the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) and the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), the Prime Minister expressed himself in this way:

> I have not made up my mind that at this moment the time has come for the House to take any action upon the matter which has been brought to its attention. But that the session cannot pass without this matter being brought to the attention of the House goes without saying. For my part, I believe that we should wait until we have the report of the Insurance Commission, and then the whole matter can be threshed out.

To which the leader of the opposition replied:

> If there is any charge contained in the evidence taken before the Insurance Commission, or if there should be any charge in the report of that commission against the public honour of any man on this side of the House, stand-

ing here, as I do, and in the position I occupy, I pledge myself that I will give to the Prime Minister of this country and to this parliament the best of my assistance to probe such a charge to the very bottom. That is all I have to say about that. I agree with the Prime Minister that it is impossible that the session should close without those charges which have been insinuated either being withdrawn or brought on for discussion and adjudication. So far as I am concerned—and I speak for every man on this side of the House in that regard—we do not propose that this session shall end until that matter has been discussed, and until that investigation has been made.

The report of the Insurance Commission, as everybody knows, has been before the House for some time. I did not raise this question before, because I thought it might be objected that it should not be discussed until the report had been placed in the hands of every member of the House. The report has now been in the hands of hon. members for some days. I suppose my colleagues in this House have taken the time, as I have done, to read this report, especially that part which relates to the investigation of the Independent Order of Foresters and the Canada Life Assurance Company. There is no doubt in my mind that the report contains adjudications, as we may describe them, on the part of the commissioners, which are clearly of a very damaging character against one member of this House and one member of the Senate. Whether it is the business of the House to deal with the matter, to pass judgment upon the conduct of that member of this House or that member of the Senate, is a question which will have to be discussed by both sides of this House. Undoubtedly, after this report and the comments that have been passed upon the conduct of this member of the House and this member of the Senate—and, as it is just as well to be clear in these matters, I may say that I refer to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and to Hon. Senator Cox—parliament must do something. This parliament must decide whether or not it is proper that members of the Canadian parliament, whether in one House or in the other, should be connected in the way that has been proved before that commission of inquiry with the administration of a public trust——

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) having brought this question up again and having gone so far, will go a little farther, and will kindly define what charge there is that can be brought by any member of this parliament against the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster); and when he has done that, will he or any other hon. member be good enough to make his charge and get to work on it as soon as he can.

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) need not grow warm——

Mr. BOURASSA.

Mr. FOSTER. No, only earnest.

Mr. BOURASSA. I want to be fair to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) as well as to the hon. Senator Cox. If the hon. gentleman will follow me cooly to the end he will find that I am not stating that either he or Hon. Senator Cox has been guilty of deeds that are within the right of this parliament to adjudicate upon.

Mr. FOSTER. From whom did my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) get the information? Does he mean to affirm that the report of the Insurance Commission states that I, as a member of this House, have been guilty of conduct which is unworthy of me?

Mr. BOURASSA. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will possess his soul in patience——

Mr FOSTER. I would like to have that information.

Mr. BOURASSA. I will endeavour to make myself clear. I am not making any charge against the hon. member, nor against any member of either House; I am simply stating that in a matter of the highest importance to the people of this country, an inquiry by a commission has been held for several months, testimony and evidence have been given before that commision, and a report has been made. In consequence of the evidence given before that commission, a suspicion has been aroused throughout the country that some members of this parliament, whether of the upper House or of the lower House, have been guilty of acts that are not in accordance with their duty as public men, nor in accordance with their duty towards the institutions with which they were connected. I am ready to agree that the business relations between the Independent Order of Foresters and the member for North Toronto, and the business relations between the Canada Life Assurance Company and Senator Cox, are not, strictly speaking, political matters. But I take this ground, that when the time comes for parliament to deal with this insurance business, I think that those gentlemen should feel that they are not in a proper position to be present in parliament, or to have anything to do with such legislation as may be adopted with regard to insurance companies. But that is a question to be dealt with in the future. The question at present before the House is a question of the confidence which the people of Canada should have in their institutions. Now, I repeat, I make no charge against these gentlemen; I have not yet decided in my own mind as to whether their acts in this relation are proper matters of discussion in this House. But other members of this House have made accusations against the member for North Toronto, against the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and against the member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Lefurgey), and

against the member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler). To these accusations the member for King's has retorted that if his conduct was attacked he would prove that members on the government side of the House, both ministers and private members, were guilty of improper conduct, that he would make that charge good if an accusation was brought against himself. Now it has been said, both inside and outside of the House, that after all we should not be so severe in regard to insinuations, and I myself have been charged with having made an insinuation on one occasion. I will not discuss at present whether I was guilty of that or not. It is not so much a question that insinuations have been made from one side of the House to the other, but the question before the House and country is that the hon. member for King's says that he knows of certain facts of the most damaging character against members of the administration and against members of parliament, which he will conceal if no charge is brought against his own conduct. That, Mr. Speaker, is a position which I claim ought to be cleared up from the bottom. It is not that accusations and insinuations have been made in the heat of debate. I agree that, although accusations and insinuations should not be made in the debates of this House, after all, perhaps, every one of us has been at some time more or less guilty in that respect, in a moment of heated debate. But I repeat that the grave question before the people of Canada at this time is that a certain member of parliament says he has procured data—that is the word which he used—showing that members of the government and members of the House of Comons are guilty of immoral conduct, both public and private, are guilty of such acts as would make them unworthy of sitting here as representatives of the people, and at the same time the statement is made that these acts will be concealed if no accusation is brought against other members of the House. That is a saw-off business against which the sentiment of the Canadian people is aroused to-day. The Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition have agreed that this matter must be cleared up. It is not sufficient to say that such words have been used in a moment of heated debate. The Prime Minister has said:

> If, however, when the report of the commission is before us, and if, as a result of this report, his conduct is impugned, it shall, I think, be his duty to make good the insinuations he has made.

I understand the Prime Minister to mean that if the report of the Insurance Commission is of a character to prove that the member for King's is guilty, then the latter is bound to prove that some members of the government are guilty of graft. Sir, to my mind that is not sufficient. Even if the report of the Insurance Commission does not warrant this House in bringing the member for King's to task, still I claim that ought not to release the member for King's from the necessity of making good his charge that members of the administration and ex-members of the administration are guilty of graft. I protest against the idea that in case the Insurance Commissioners' report does not incriminate the member for King's, then the members of the government and members of the House against whom the member for King's makes his charge, shall escape an inquiry and be allowed to go scot free. I say this is a point which ought to be cleared up. I repeat, because I want to make myself clear with the Prime Minister and with the leader of the opposition, as well as with all my colleagues, I repeat that it is not my desire to pose as a censor of the debates in this House, or to apportion blame on any member. I do not pose as a censor, or as a perfect man in that regard. But I claim that these charges and counter charges ought to be cleared up, in the public interest; and that when accusations of graft and of immoral conduct are made against members of this House they cannot be allowed to remain uninvestigated, even though the report of the Insurance Commission does not incriminate the hon. member for King's. The people of Canada demand that this matter should be sifted to the bottom, so that if any one is guilty he shall be punished, and if he is not guilty his reputation shall be justified.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). While this question is on I desire to say that on one occasion the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) introduced my name in connection with this so-called Northwest land scandal in which I and others were concerned. On that occasion I told the hon. gentleman that by virtue of holding a seat in this House he should at once take the matter up upon his own authority. I have not his exact words before me, but he said at an early date he would refer to it, or something to that effect. However, later on the question was renewed, and I find that on the 21st of February the hon. member made this statement, referring to myself:

> I am not going to lay any charges now, I am not called upon to do so, I have no instructions to do so. But I will tell the hon. member for East Simcoe that whenever an opportunity presents itself, while I am a member of this House, to discuss the connection of these gentlemen with land deals in the Northwest Territories and in British Columbia, I for one will only be too happy to meet the occasion, and I will tell the people of this country my views on that transaction.

Well, from the arrogant tone of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., who I regret is not in his place, I would have expected that

he would have had the manliness to have followed this up at an early date especially as he has had in his possession for many days the finding of this investigating commission which has been referred to. But, that hon. gentleman, up to the present occasion, has seen fit to be silent. . . I shall not refer to that hon. gentleman in terms such as I would outside because they would be unparliamentary, but I think that hon. member for Carleton, N.B., must stand to-day before the general public of this country as one who is not to be credited with much authority on any statements he may have to make, and I am here to tell that hon. gentleman, who, I regret is not here, that I court the fullest discussion upon this question in so far as my actions are concerned. I will be only too pleased whether the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa)—and the duty is not cast upon that hon. gentleman because he has not said any thing about my conduct in this connection—or any other hon. member of this House wishes to introduce that question for open discussion and I shall take advantage of the opportunity to discuss that question with him in so far as I am concerned. As to the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., who, I again repeat, I regret is not here, I think he will be held up to the general public as one who cares to make statements and one who cares to throw braggadocio charges and to retreat at the earliest possible opportunity as he has retreated on this question. As far as the whole question is concerned we had the statement of the hon. member for King's, N. B., (Mr. Fowler) in regard to the charges he has to make and not only has to make but has made in this House of which he has never retracted one word. Let the House and the country understand that.

Mr. BOURASSA. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Let the House and the country understand that and I quite agree with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) in that regard. I have in the past week or two had occasion to visit my own home and I can tell the right hon. leader of the government and hon. gentlemen present that there never was a question presented before the public of Canada that has stirred it to the very centre like the grave allegations that have been made against this government. Not only are the good name and fair reputation of this government at stake but what is something higher than that the fair name and reputation of Canada are also at stake. It is being discussed. What happened the other day in an adjoining county? If any one had read it in England or any other country he would have been surprised that a man could stand on the public platform and make the insinuations—aye, Sir, more than insinuations—the charges that he made against a minister of the Crown in Canada to-day. It is not a matter for the hon. member for King's N.B., it is a matter for this government and more than that it is a matter for the people of Canada and as far as I am concerned this government will find that if my vote counts for anything I will give it for a full and thorough investigation. You must either make the hon. member for King's stand up in this House, apologize and retract every word or force him to have an investigation. The country will not be satisfied until that is done and I am sure the country will not be satisfied with the conduct of the premier until this matter is probed to the very bottom and to the very core.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, when this matter came up a few weeks ago I stated that we had better wait until the report of the commission on insurance should be before the House to ascertain what action should be taken. The report of the commission is now before the House; it was delivered last week and has been in the possession of the House perhaps for two or three days. The commission have reported that in their judgment there was a necessity for legislation and they have submitted a blank bill for the consideration of the House which is now in the hands of hon. members. Beyond this they did not report; they made no report against any body. In the course of the reasons which they gave for this legislation they brought in the names of certain members of this House. Whether or not there is in the report any thing which would warrant this parliament in taking any action against any of its members, I, for my part, am not prepared to say at this moment. The matter is still quite new amongst us and I have no opinion to express either one way or the other at the present moment. In regard to the charges—I will not say charges but rather insinuations—of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), this is what I said when the matter was brought up by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa):

Now, in connection with the other incident, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) made some very grave insinuations. The hon. gentleman did not make charges. He told us he had provided himself with certain material, as he said, to carry the war into Africa, and that if his conduct was discussed, or charges made against him, then he would take means to defend himself by accusing other parties—making insinuations of a very grave character against some members of the government and of this House, but without making any specific charges. I thought at the moment that the matter was very grave and exceeded the bounds of what might be expected in the heat of debate: still it arose in the midst of a heated discussion, and there might perhaps not be so much importance to be attached to it. If, however, when the report of the commission is before us and if, as a result of this report, his conduct is impugned, it

shall, I think, be his duty to make good the insinuations he has made.

To the opinion which I then expressed I do not think I have any thing to add nor from it have I any thing to retract. I do not understand at the present time how it is possible to investigate any thing that has been said by the hon. member for King's. He did not mention any name, he did not mention any offence, he spoke in a general way and I am at a loss to know at the present moment what charges there are to be investigated. Of course, if the hon. gentleman made no charges himself, the report of the commission is now before the House and he could, if he has any thing to say, say it, or if he has any thing to charge, he could make the charge. He may have some thing in his mind of a grave character and it may be that what he has in his mind may not amount to any thing. Words of that kind are not words upon which you can base a charge or an insinuation of any kind, but it may be that the hon. gentleman has something against the character of members of the administration. If he has it is for him to decide whether or not he shall make his charges. I have not heard any thing so far which would lead me to believe that the hon. gentleman has any thing upon which he can base charges against any body and therefore I have nothing more to say at the present moment than what I have just said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, I merely rise to state that in so far as the insurance report is concerned I have made many attempts to get through the whole of it but up to the present time I have not accomplished more than half of it and I might say to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that perhaps it is because some of us attend in the House a little more regularly than he does that we have not so much leisure to devote to these reports.

Mr. BOURASSA. I think that I can very often find out more in studying in my room than listening to the speeches in this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very likely; perhaps that might be said of some of us, today I would be inclined to disagree with my hon. friend when he suggests that I did anything to postpone the discussion of any of these matters. There is not one word in my remarks from beginning to end that invited any postponement. When the hon. member for Labelle says, as he did say, that the discussion of this matter was postponed by some joint arrangement between the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and myself he states that for which he has no warrant. There has never been any understanding of any kind between the Prime Minister and myself and there will not be.

Mr. BOURASSA. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will allow me I will quote his own words, and that may perhaps explain. I did not mean by 'an agreement,' that there was any arrangement in words between the two hon. gentlemen. I simply stated that both hon. gentlemen took the same view, and my ground for that statement is to be found in the following words of the leader of the opposition:

> If there is any charge contained in the evidence taken before the Insurance Commission, or if there should be any charge in the report of that commission against the public honour of any man on this side of the House, standing here, as I do, and in the position I occupy, I pledge myself that I will give to the Prime Minister of this country and to this parliament the best of my assistance to probe such a charge to the very bottom.

I did not mean there was an agreement between the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition to postpone this matter beyond the time when the report of the commission would be presented. Now that the report of the commission is brought down I ask the leader of the opposition to join with the Prime Minister, to have the accusations of the member for King's (Mr. Fowler), cleared up, and I may say these accusations have nothing to do with the report of the commission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not one word to withdraw from what I said then, and I do not think I have anything to add. I was referring more particularly to charges against men on this side of the House, and speaking from the standpoint of one who is the leader on this side at the present time, I declared to the House then, as I again declare to the House now, that if there is any charge against any man on this side of the House in connection with that insurance investigation, or in connection with any other matter that affects his position as a member of this House, or as a public man, I will join with the Prime Minister, or I will join with my hon. friend from Labelle in probing that charge to the bottom. I invited no postponement, I invite no postponement now. I do not know exactly what my hon. friend from Labelle desires. Does he desire to discuss this matter, and to make a charge this afternoon, and to have it dealt with this afternoon. I am ready to go on with it this afternoon, or at any other time. I invite no postponement whatever.

Mr. BOURASSA. Does the hon. gentleman ask me a question?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. BOURASSA. What I desire is that the member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), should make his charges good, or, that he should withdraw them. That is what I desire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The member for King's (Mr. Fowler) does not happen to be in his place this afternoon, and it is idle for my hon. friend from Labelle to get up and address an empty chair, and ask the member for King's to go on this afternoon. If he means that we ought to go on to-day—

Mr. BOURASSA. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then if we are not invited to go on this afternoon, I do not know what object the member for Labelle had in lecturing me——

Mr. BOURASSA. Fix a day for the hon. member for King's to make good his charge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let my hon. friend from Labelle bring up the matter in the presence of the hon. member for King's. It is open to my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) just as much as to any member of this House to take action. Let me say again, that I have invited no postponement of any charges against members on this side of the House. I have already informed my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) and I inform him again, that if there is any charge of any character affecting the public status of any one of these men, I shall be prepared to join hands with him or with any other member of this House, to have that charge probed to the bottom. There has certainly been no postponement at my instance, nor do I think there has been postponement at the instance of any one else. I simply rose to make this statement because any one reading the words of the hon. member for Labelle, without the explanation he has given by quoting from my remarks, would be inclined to think that there had been some arrangement between the two sides of the House, that some investigation should be postponed and the discussion of some charge should be put off to a later date, or put off altogether. So far as I am concerned I repeat that there has been no arrangement and further, that there will be no arrangement with regard to any such matter or for any such purpose as that.

STATEMENTS IN THE TORONTO 'WORLD.'

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to an article in the Toronto 'World' of the 6th instant, in which my name is referred to in connection with the Bill regarding railway tickets which the hon. gentleman for South York (Mr. Maclean) had before the Railway Committee on Tuesday last. The Toronto 'World' says:

> Indeed the significant event of the day was the undignified scamper resembling a panic, among the members of the committee, when it became evident that Mr. Maclean would muster sufficient strength to call a division. Among those recorded as present at the meeting, but missing from the roll call are:
>
> Mr. BOURASSA.

Then follows the names of some members of the House, including my own. I want to say to this House that I was not present at the committee. Through the courtesy of the Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Fletcher appeared before the Agricultural Committee that morning in regard to a matter in which my county was deeply interested and I considered it far more important that I should attend that committee than to attend the Railway Committee. I say it in the most friendly manner to the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), that if he was the instigator of that reference to myself there is absolutely no truth in it. There is no power in possession of either the Prime Minister or the leader of the opposition, that would compel me to scamper from any committee to shirk any vote.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). My name appears in this black list that has been published by the member for South York. He has no foundation whatever for saying that I shirked a vote in the Railway Committee. As a matter of fact I was not present at the deliberations of the Railway Committee that morning, further than that I passed through the room in company with another gentleman with whom I had business elsewhere. It was impossible for me to attend the committee that morning, in view of my other public engagements. I did not know that the Bill of the hon. member for South York was under consideration, nor that a vote would be had upon it. Now, I want the member for South York to understand something as to the relations between brethren in this House; I want him to understand that he should be fair to other hon. gentlemen in this House. I want him to understand also, that although he may not be liable to the criminal law or to the civil law for any libel or slander he publishes about his fellow members, yet, he has indulged in the most miserable form of slander, when he attempts to damage a person's reputation in such a way that he cannot be held accountable for it in the civil or criminal courts. I resent the imputation that, together with other hon. members, I sneaked away from the vote on the Bill which the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) was talking about in the Railway Committee. I express my resentment now against the imputation which the hon. member has made in his newspaper. I ask him to retract it. I ask him to be a man of honour and to retract that false statement; because so far as I am concerned, the statement is utterly false.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale and Cariboo). In reference to the matter that was brought up by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), and which was dealt with by my colleague from Vancouver, I desire to say that as I had charge of that railway legislation I had a distinct recollection that the member for South York voted for the am-

endment that was introduced solely for the purpose of killing the Bill. I have before me the division list in the Railway Committee, and his name appears among those who voted for the amendment. That vote of his was commented on in the newspapers of the country, and I have before me a very strong editorial which appeared in the Toronto 'Globe,' in which, with regard to that vote there is a criticism of the inconsistency of the hon. member for South York; and in which it is stated that he is a theoretical champion of popular rights but a practical voter in favour of railway monopoly. When I heard the denial of the member for South York, I had a distinct recollection that he was lined up on that occasion in favour of monopoly, and I am bound to say it surprised me very much when he gave that vote.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. I invite the attention of the committee to items 355 and 356, which we had before us several days ago. In regard to German silver and nickel, the question arose as to whether these articles are being made in Canada. We were aware that a factory had been established in Toronto for the manufacture of brass and nickel, but we found on inquiry that it had been suspended for some time. Although negotiations are understood to be in progress with a view to opening it, there is no very definite prospect of it going on. The conclusion we have reached, as respects the principal item of the factory, brass, is that we will adhere to the small duty of 10 per cent proposed, while as respects German silver and nickel, which are practically not made in Canada, we think it well to make them free; so that if the factory goes on, as the parties interested say it will, they will have the benefit of this small duty on brass, while the nickel, which is a secondary matter with them, will be free.

Amendment agreed to, and item as amended agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. In connection with item 71 there was a discussion with regard to certain field and garden seeds, which it was held required special consideration from the fact that they were of high value. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) spoke of them as being so costly that the tariff would bear very heavily upon them. Therefore we have decided to insert a new item to meet that case:

71a. Field and garden seeds, not specified as 'free,' valued at not less than $5 a pound, in packages weighing not less than one ounce, each, British preference, 5 per cent; intermediate, 10 per cent; general, 10 per cent.

The idea is that the ordinary division of a pound package would not apply to these valuable seeds, and so we make a special rule providing for a one ounce package. We think that substantially meets the suggestion of the hon. member for Brantford.

Item agreed to.

411. Malleable sprocket or link-belting chain 15 per cent, 17½ per cent, 20 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. When the committee last reported we had this item under consideration. The view we expressed was that the malleable industry, which at one time had made representations and which it appeared had some just cause of complaint, had been fairly dealt with as respects the greater part of its product; whilst this malleable sprocket was a branch of business which they were preparing to enter into, but had not actually entered upon. We felt, therefore, as respects the principal articles on which they are now engaged, we might fairly give them some measure of the consideration they asked for. But we do not think that they should press for further consideration on this particular item, which they are not actually manufacturing, but in the manufacture of which they are only prepared to enter.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that a letter was read here saying that they have been manufacturing this special kind for some time. The hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Christie) made the statement in the House the other night.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I was given to understand that they were manufacturing link belting and I made that statement from a letter of February 15 last, from the Secretary of the Ontario Malleable Iron Company. He says:

Another very serious blow to us is the removal of the duty from link belting, which we have manufactured for many years. We have recently expended in patterns, machinery and buildings, upwards of $10,000 for the manufacture of this chain, which will be a dead loss to us if chain is allowed to come in from the United States free of duty, as it is utterly impossible for us to compete with the United States without protection.

I read this so as to put myself correct, as some hon. members may have thought that the statement I made the other night was mere guess work.

Mr. FIELDING. Every one who knows the hon. gentleman will know that he made the statement in good faith, but there is not much substantial difference. This is not at present an important branch of their business, and no injustice will be done them if they do not go on with that particular branch. That is not the principal branch in which they are engaged. Their industry is a very large one and they employ a very large number of people, but their business is mainly in other branches which have been well considered in the readjustment of

the tariff, and the promoters ought to feel that we have made every reasonable effort to meet them.

Mr. FOSTER. In whose benefit is that rearrangement of the duty to enure? Who chiefly use these products?

Mr. FIELDING. Largely agricultural implement makers and also the lumber industry.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. I understood the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to say that he had raised the duty on many lines. On what lines has he raised the duty to compensate this taking off the duty?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think that there is any quantity of sprocket chains made in Canada. But if there is, it is affected in that way adversely. The duty on reapers, mowers and binders has been reduced from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent. Parts of those come in at the same rate as the duty on the implement itself. Therefore malleables imported for reapers, mowers and binders will come in at 17½ per cent instead of 20 per cent, as they came in before as part of the machine, when the duty was 20 per cent on the machine. That is the disadvantage I understand they are under. The advantage they have is that all their other productions, which were 25 per cent before, will now under the general item come in at 27½ per cent. Malleable iron of course enters into the construction of many things. If any one industry will feel the advance of 2½ per cent, it will be the railways more than any particular industry that I know.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. I understood the hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) to state that lumbermen would be one of the parties who would benefit by this change in the tariff. But the benefit to the lumbermen seems to be that they will pay 27½ per cent instead of 25 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. No, they use these sprocket chains.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. Very little.

Mr. PATERSON. They will be free.

Mr. CLEMENTS. While we have in Canada an established factory of this kind, as the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Christie) has told us, this government should deal out equal protection to the other manufacturers. I understand that a good deal of malleable iron is used in agricultural implements. I want to say that if a duty of say 15 per cent or 20 per cent were given these people, it would not cost the farmer very much more, as far as the binders are concerned. It would not make 20 cents difference. I would like to ask the hon. minister what in his opinion would be the difference in the cost to the farmer of a binder between the 17½ per cent and the 20 per cent duty.

Mr. PATERSON. It would be about 20 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. Twenty cents of an advantage in the sprocket wheel trade.

Mr. PATERSON. In selecting the articles on which we give a drawback to the manufacturers of these three implements on which we are reducing the duty—in making our computation when we put in malleable iron as part of it, which we are now striking out, there was a duty on sprocket chains. Making sprocket chains free will compensate in a measure for removing the original discription of all malleables that were in the drawback. Malleables will go out of the drawback altogether. The sprocket chain is not called a malleable. Having been dutiable before and being made free, that will go towards compensating the agricultural implement maker for the taking out of malleables that which it was proposed in our original draft—to give them—not that it will balance but it will be part that enters into the competition.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. As I represent a riding in which the lumber interest is largely developed, I want to draw attention to the fact that sprocket chains used by lumbermen are not malleable sprocket chains. They are chains in which there is no malleable whatever. They are partly composed of cast-iron and partly of wrought-iron or steel. There are some chains all malleable, very light chains, but they are used very little by lumbermen. Then there are chains of larger dimensions, part malleable and part wrought-iron. The larger chains have no malleable whatever, so that the benefit to the lumber industry will be very little indeed.

Mr. PATERSON. I speak without absolute knowledge, but I venture the opinion that no lumberman in Canada would say that he had used malleable sprocket chain made in Canada. Any they have used, no doubt, have been imported. The duty on large iron chain is not heavy.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that the minister intends to give the manufacturer of harvesting machinery the opportunity to import his malleables, which are parts of the finished article, at 17½ per cent. But he has added 2½ per cent to the malleable irons imported for other purposes. I understood him to say that the bulk of these are manufactured in Canada for railway purposes. If he will inquire of the Oshawa people he will find that they have five or six hundred men making goods which are not used by the railways at all. Every carriage factory and every wheel factory in the country buys malleable irons from these people. I do not know how much my hon.

friend from East Peterborough (Mr. Findlay) pays them, but I know that our bill runs about $1,500 to $2,000 a month. They will take advantage of this 2½ per cent and the farmer will have to pay it. What will be the good of the reduction of 2½ per cent on harvesters when the farmer will have to pay 2½ per cent more on the malleables in every vehicle he uses on his farm?

Mr. PATERSON. If this 2½ per cent is added, of course the malleable iron manufacturers will take advantage of it. But, of course, my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will not put it on the buggy he sells to the farmer.

Mr. CLEMENTS. No doubt the minister has made a calculation of how much the farmers expect to benefit by this reduction from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent. What will be the saving on a binder?

Mr. PATERSON. It ought to be $2.50.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the minister to say that this change is made for the benefit of the lumber industry as well as for the manufacturers of agricultural implements ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not attach much importance to the effect upon the lumber industry.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the government received, since the bringing down of the tariff, any request from the lumber interests for this change?

Mr. PATERSON. The representatives of the lumber industry appeared before us very seldom. In British Columbia they wanted a duty on lumber and representations were made also that they were burdened with duties on all they had to buy and were afforded no protection. We have not heard so much about it lately, I suppose on account of their brisk trade in lumber.

Mr. CROCKET. Since the tariff was brought down has the government received any requests on the subject in behalf of the lumber trade?

Mr. PATERSON. I think not.

Mr. CROCKET. It is entirely then at the request of the agricultural implement manufacturers that this change is made?

Mr. PATERSON. It must be largely in their interests that it is made. Yet I do not want to mislead the committee; it has just struck me now that, while this will in part compensate the agricultural implement manufacturers for the reduction in duty of their finished goods, any other industry using malleable sprocket chains will benefit also.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it not do to confine this to malleable sprocket chains when imported by harvesting machinery manufacturers?

Mr. PATERSON. The carriage can stand this all right, I think.

434. Lamp springs, 7½ per cent, 10 per cent, 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. We propose to add clock springs to this item as being articles of a similar character.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a representation made by the manufacturers of what are called newspaper feature matrices which, as I take it, will come in under item 433, which reads:

Stereotypes, electrotypes, celluloids and bases for the same, composed wholly or in part of metal or celluloid, n.o.p., and matrices or copper shells for such stereotypes, electrotypes, and celluloids, per square inch, ⅛ cent, ⅛ cent, ⅛ cent.

The facts appear to be these: The protection on these goods, up to the present time, has been 2½ cents per square inch. Under that duty these manufacturers came into this country and established themselves and have been two years in business. They have been paying out about $23,000 a year to their employees and in connection with their work. They have quite a large staff employed and have been supplying matrices to nearly all the great newspapers in Canada.

Mr. D. ROSS. Where is the plant?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is in Montreal. I have here letters from a number of the principal newspapers in Canada, the general tenor of which is that they are satisfied with the service they have been getting from these people. Now, the duty of 1½ cents a square inch is cut down to ⅛ cent a square inch. If this be done, it effectually puts this factory out of business. They affirm that it has been done in some special interest, that their interests have been entirely ignored and that their industry, which employs Canadian labour, will be, as I have said, wiped out. I would like to hear the reasons of the minister for what seems to be a pretty drastic treatment of this industry. I may read a few of the letters on the subject. Take, for instance, the letter from the Manitoba 'Free Press,' which is a large and representative newspaper:

I am happy to say that your matrix service which we have been receiving for the past year has given us good satisfaction and has resulted in our being able to use a much greater quantity of matrices than we were able to do before you began business in Canada.

And the managing director of the Halifax 'Herald' writes:

We are entirely satisfied with the page matrix service which you have rendered. Our only regret is that we cannot use more mats.

The 'Herald' of Hamilton writes :

In reply to your inquiry I have to say that since you began the business the 'Herald' has paid much less for mats that it was obliged to pay before, and I attribute the lower price chiefly to your enterprise.

The Ottawa 'Free Press' writes :

Replying to yours of recent date, the establishment of the Canada Newspaper Syndicate has been of undoubted advantage to Canadian newspapers. The Ottawa 'Free Press' has shared in this advantage to a considerable extent, and is on the whole well satisfied with the service of the syndicate.

The 'Ottawa 'Journal,' an able and independent newspaper, writes in exactly the same strain. The Toronto 'News' says :

I beg to say that the service we have been receiving through your company is eminently satisfactory, and we could not possibly procure the mats direct from American citizens at anything like the same figure.

There is no need of reading more. Without exception, they are all in the same strain. Now, if a satisfactory service has been rendered, if it is a service, for the newspapers mainly, that has been transplanted from the other side, and has, in one or two years business in this country, made prices lower rather than higher, I cannot see why a change should have been made in the duty. Of course if you take the duty down from 1½ cents per square inch to ⅛th of a cent, you might almost as well have no duty at all.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the hon. gentleman referring to ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am referring to the Canada Newspaper Syndicate of Montreal.

Mr. PATERSON. I think that has been in existence since 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. This particular industry I quote from has been in existence two years, and has transferred itself from the United States.

Mr. PATERSON. The making of these matrices is not a new thing that was introduced only a year or two ago, and I am rather surprised to hear what the newspapers have said. My impression was that there was a great clamour against the excessive duty, and my remembrance is that the old duty of one and a half cents, with this ad valorem added, was an extremely heavy duty, and was unfair to those who had to purchase these things. The commissioner does not remember that we have had any representations from these people complaining that the duty was unjust to them. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman has information as to what these combined duties amount to ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not making any calculation as to that, I am just stating the facts as they seem to exist. Now, these gentlemen have been before the commission, and they state that they have the promise that if the newspapers of Canada were satisfied with their service, and it was so indicated, the duty would be kept at the old rate. The newspapers have written these letters in return, and yet they have not been able to get the duty changed, although they have made strenuous efforts in that direction. When the tariff inquiry was being held, the newspapers in Canada did ask the commission for a reduction of the duty on matrices for advertisement purposes, and on plates for newspapers only, but they did not ask for a reduction of the duty on these feature matrices. But that is the one article in which these people deal, and where they are struck by the duty.

Mr. FIELDING. This item has not been reduced as largely as my hon. friends imagine. The item is in two parts. I think there were representations from the newspapers in this and other matters, and we found on examination that the duty appeared to be very high. The item passed some days ago, and I have not my notes on the subject here ; but my remembrance is that we found on examination that the duty was rather high, and we made a reduction on that portion which applied to the newspaper work. The hon. gentlemen will observe that the item is divided between these matrices and the stereotypes and all the other things mentioned in this item for advertisement purposes and other purposes, the other purposes being the newspapers. There was no reduction in that item, although it was a rather high one on the matrices and the various other items that are used for the purpose of advertising, for calendars, circulars and such like. But if it was to be used for news matter, which is now being imported to some extent, the reduction applies only to that portion which is used in the newspaper press, not including advertisements. The reduction is not as broad as the hon. gentleman supposes. The newspapers would include advertisements, because many of the great advertising concerns have these things made for their own use and distribute them, and these will come in under the higher rate. The only thing which has been reduced is the actual news matter, on which we found the duty was rather high. Strong representations were made on behalf of the press, and when we found the duty seemed to be a large one, we made a reduction, which I think will still give the industry a fair chance of success.

Mr. FOSTER. If an industry which was getting one and a half cents per square inch has its protection reduced down to one-eighth of a cent, does the minister think that gives a fair protection ? But after all, these men ought to know their own business

better than I do, and they ought to know what they are making and where they are hit and where their business is being bowled out. They have made their representations to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I find a letter here of January 2nd, in which they write to Mr. Bain, assistant commissioner, and which I will read, as it may have escaped the minister.

Our Mr. Mitchell, representing the Canada Newspaper Syndicate, interviewed you some time ago regarding the reduction of duty that had been made on matrices by the new tariff, and you requested him to place his representations in writing.

Our client pretends that (1st) up to the present time they have been protected by a tariff of 1½ cents per square inch on matrices; (2nd) that by the new tariff a reduction from 1½ cents to ⅛ of a cent per square inch has been made; (3rd) newspapers were getting matrices at present at a much lower price than they were previous to the Canada Newspaper Syndicate, Limited, commencing business;

I think that the letters I read go to carry that out.

(4th) Matrices are sold in the United States from $5 up, and cannot be purchased from the North American or Philadelphia, the Hearst Syndicate, McClure, of Philadelphia, and the International Syndicate at any lower price; (5th) with a duty of a cent and a half per square inch on these matrices these syndicates could not interfere with our Canadian trade; (6th) the International Syndicate could only sell matrices in this country at a lower rate by sending their surplus to Canada, and this surplus would not be sufficient to supply all the newspapers, and consequently, only a few newspapers would benefit to the detriment of the newspapers throughout Canada in general; (7th) the field in Canada is a limited one, and to protect an industry such as our clients stated they require the entire field; (8th) the Canadian Newspaper Syndicate, Limited, have been supplying matrices at prices varying from $1.50 to $5, manufacturing them here, and consequently employing a large number of men.

Then they go on to say that the salary list and wages for the first eleven months ending December 1, 1906, amounted to $24,380. That is a tidy little sum in the way of a small industry amongst a great many, and these small industries are important adjuncts to the manufacturing life of the country.

Since the Canadian Newspaper Syndicate, Limited, has commenced business newspapers thoughout Canada have been able to get their matrices at a cheaper rate than they ever did before, and we are inclosing herewith copies of letters from several newspapers showing their opinion of the service——

I have read these to the minister.

We will be pleased at any time to give you any further information that you may require.

They state also that if this duty is left at one-eighth of a cent they will simply have to move to the United States and that the expenditure of this money in Montreal will therefore go by the board. Then, on January 3 they write again to Mr. Bain and they go over the ground in part sending him also some more letters. I dare say I have read the one from the Halifax 'Herald.' I have a recollection that somewhere in the correspondence they say that although they made this communication through their attorney they have not received any answer and they have not received any amelioration.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will see that we could not give any answer beyond a proper acknowledgment of the letter. I notice that it is stated also that they had received a promise that if certain information were given the duty would be changed. I am quite sure that statement is unwarranted because it would be highly improper to make such a promise and I am certain we did not do it. In reference to this item my impression is that it will be found that we have had fair consideration for the industry. As this item has been passed I have not at the moment all the information we had before us with respect to it but I happen to have under my hand the representation which was made by Mr. L. L. Channel, of the Sherbrooke 'Daily Record,' who writing to us on November 22, stated that 'the duty on plate used by us for newspaper columns and on matrices for the same is prohibitive' and requesting us to put these articles on the free list. We did not go as far as to meet the demand to put them on the free list but we have given what we consider a sufficiently high duty and at the same time we have reduced the duty for the benefit of the press of the country.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister at hand the figures showing the value of the matrices brought in from the United States last year?

Mr. FIELDING. Matrices are not shown separately. They are grouped under 'stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of newspaper columns,' &c., so that this item does not mean matrices only but includes the whole group. The imports of the articles embraced in that item were valued at $15,717. Although the item has already been passed, if it is thought that we should give it further consideration, I should be very happy, before the matter is finally through, to look over the papers again. My own impression is that we did give it fair consideration at the time and that while they suffered a little reduction on the whole they would still have a good chance to do business.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems rather hard treatment.

Mr. FIELDING. If the rate is excessively low it is hard treatment.

Mr. FOSTER. No one took up my challenge to say what feature matrices were.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have here a newspaper containing illustrations printed from stereotypes made from these matrices.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose they are such cuts as those.

Mr. FIELDING. They are not advertising matrices.

Mr. FOSTER. I take it that this is what they deal in and that they are quite content that newspaper, plate and advertising matrices should come in. They are interested in the feature business and I do not know whether I am sorry or glad to see that these 'features' are occupying much more space in the newspapers than formerly.

Mr. FIELDING. All these are cuts of ladies who are good looking.

An hon. MEMBER. Should that be discouraged ?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know. The pictorial method is an attractive one and even for adults and cultivated adults it has a good deal of interest and sometimes conveys a good deal of information. But, the feature business is their business. I would be glad to hand these papers to the Minister of Finance and ask him to consider them.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman will leave the papers, although the item has been passed, before the tariff is finally through we will look into them again and if we find that any injustice has been done we will be quite willing to correct it. I think that the case is a little better than the hon. gentleman imagines but we will look into it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am putting it just as it has been put to me.

Mr. LALOR. Before going to another item, if the hon. Minister of Finance will permit me, I would like to call his attention to item 318 which has already been passed and which deals with common and coloured window glass. I do not know whether the government had their attention called to the fact that in the town of Cayuga in the county of Haldimand there has been established a large window glass factory, that large capitalists from Pittsburg have established that enterprise there and that they have already spent $75,000 in connection with the window glass business. These people are very anxious that the government should give them some encouragement by way of increased duties in order that they may extend that busines. They state that if they received sufficient encouragement from the government in a short time they would be employing a thousand men in Cayuga. It would quadruple the valuation of property in that locality and it would be a very great enterprise for this country to encourage. I believe that the result would be that in a short time they would be selling window glass at a lower price than the people are now required to pay. I believe that probably they would get it for an even less sum than the amount of duty which is now imposed. It would be very beneficial to the country and to the county of Haldimand and I trust that the minister will seriously consider item 318 and see if he cannot assist this great industry which has located in this country in order to encourage them to increase and extend their plant. They are people of great wealth and a rational measure of encouragement would lead to the establishment of a very great enterprise in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. One should not attempt to discredit any industry in Canada, and I speak with great hesitation on such a point; but I am bound to say that our information led us to form the impression that the window glass industry is one which we can hardly hope to make a success of in Canada. It has been tried before without success. I believe it is carried on by only one or two concerns in England. It is an industry which cannot prosper except under special conditions, which we do not think exist here. It is especially a Belgian industry, and the Belgians appear to have taken control almost of the world's market in that line. Of course, I speak with a great deal of deference in the presence of hon. gentlemen who may have invested money in the enterprise, but, as I understand, it is like one or two other industries which have been brought to our notice, and as regards which we think they could not be made a success in this country. Window glass is an article in universal use, and any duty that would be acceptable to the promoters of the industry would be regarded as a burden on the consumers. By increasing the duty, you would be increasing the price of an article that is universally used.

Mr. LALOR. We have special advantages in Cayuga for the manufacture of glass. We have natural gas, and fuel is a large item in the manufacture, and they have found a peculiar quality of limestone which is most suitable for the purpose. It is believed that the industry would develop if it received encouragement in the way of a duty. These people have also patents which cover the manufacture of window glass by machinery, and I am informed by a member of this House,

who is in the business, that window glass can be manufactured in Canada just as cheaply, and even to greater advantage, than common bottle glass. This industry would be a great advantage to Canada if it were encouraged.

Mr. SPROULE. It has been stated that for some years past there is an understanding among the plate glass trade, and I think the window glass trade as well, by which a certain price is fixed. If, by putting a duty on, it would play into the hands of the trade in that respect I would feel that the government were doing wrong. If, on the other hand, the putting on of a duty would help a Canadian industry, and if that industry kept outside the trade agreement, then it would be a good thing to put on a duty. For many years past glass has been much higher in price than it ought to be, according to its intrinsic worth and cost of manufacture. I do not know that this may be fairly called a trade combine, but there is some kind of understanding by which every firm sells at the same figure. If there is any way in which the government can force the trade to bring the price down to a figure which would give the manufacturers a reasonable profit, it is desirable the government should act in that direction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have been asked to inquire why monotypes have been increased from 10 to 20 per cent. I am informed that this machine is not made in Canada, and that it does not compete with any machine made here.

Mr. FIELDING. That particular machine may not be made in Canada, but I think I am correct in saying that machines which serve the same purpose are made here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no personal knowledge, but the statement is made to me by a gentleman who is interested in matters of this kind. There does not seem to be any good reason for doubling the duty, if this machine is not made in Canada.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The monoline is made in Montreal, and it answers the same purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statement has been made to me by a gentleman who has been engaged with newspapers for a very long time, and who should know about matters of this kind.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The linotype and the monoline answer the same purpose as this machine.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The machine to which I have reference is called the monotype.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I know the machine.

445. Mowing machines, harvesters, selfbinders or with binders, binding attachments, reapers, 12½ per cent, 17½ per cent, 17½ per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the present tariff on the articles mentioned in this item?

Mr. PATERSON. It was 20 per cent; it will now be 17½ per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know how the exports of these machines compare with the quantity used in Canada; the actual amount of the exports; and to what countries these machines are exported?

Mr. FIELDING. In 1905 the value of all agricultural implements entered for consumption was $1,593,301; for the year 1906, $1,614,564. That includes agricultural implements of all kinds. In 1905 the mowing machines imported are valued at $71,375, and in 1906 their value is apparently $24,692.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that for the whole year 1906?

Mr. FIELDING. That is the fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. Are mowers included in agricultural implements in the former figures you gave?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. The total exports of agricultural implements, the products of Canada, are $2,497,601. They go to some thirty different countries, the larger ones being: Australia, $523,514; Great Britain, $236,955; Argentina, $256,000; New Zealand, $143,000; France, $293,000; Germany, $443,000; Holland, $100,000; Russia, $180,000; British Africa, $94,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know further if the minister can inform us, from information derived by the Tariff Commission, how the net prices realized abroad compare with those realized at home and what is the actual price at which these machines are sold abroad?

Mr. PATERSON. I would not like to speak positively, but my impression is that it was claimed that they got better prices abroad than they did at home.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister will be prepared, when we get into committee on the Bill, to give us this information in as definite a form as possible.

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, we would have to take the word of the manufacturer for it. I think the representation made to us was that agricultural machinery was sold cheaper in Canada than in any other

country in the world except the United States. I say that from memory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There has been a good deal of discussion on this subject, and I assume that information must have been gathered by the Tariff Commission on these points. Then I would like to know whether or not these articles successfully compete in any and in what foreign countries with similar articles manufactured in the United States.

Mr. PATERSON. We have our official figures of that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Another point on which I think it is desirable to have some information is, as to the actual cost of producing these machines and as to the cost of selling? I mention that because we have had some discussion as to the services of agents in connection with the insurance business, and I would like to know how much the farmer pays in respect of the services of agents, middlemen, &c., in connection with the purchase of these articles. Then I would like to know what average profit the manufacturer makes on them. if we have the cost of manufacturing plus the cost of selling, we would be able to ascertain what the average profit is. Would the minister also tell us what capital is employed in this industry and what dividends are paid on the stock issued and what the amount of stock issue is? Then I would like to know how the cost of these articles when manufactured in Canada compares with the cost of similar articles when manufactured in the United States, also how the cost to the purchaser in Canada compares with the cost to the purchaser in the United States? Then I would like to know whether the American manufacturer dumps these machines in Canada, or whether he pays the duty and sells them at the same price in Canada as the Canadian manufacturer? Another important question is whether or not there is in Canada among the manufacturers of these articles any combine as to prices, modes of selling, or other matters of conducting the business? Then I would like the minister to give me information as to how many alterations have been made either in items in the tariff or by drawbacks or otherwise which would affect the cost of manufacturing these machines in Canada. It would also be desirable for us to know, if possible, the extent, in each case and in the whole, to which these alterations will affect the cost of manufacture in Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. That is a series of questions which my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) had better put to the Minister of Finance. I think there will be some difficulty in getting the information on all these points. The hon. gentlemen is asking for every detail of a man's business, and how far he will be willing to give that——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may tell the Minister of Customs that the information I have asked for is no more than has been obtained by the Royal Commission in Australia which investigated the cost of manufacturing these articles and some others in that country. And it is well known to those who have investigated the subject that the new Australian tariff, so far as these articles were concerned, has been based upon the report of that royal commission. The Tariff Commission we had in this country was fulfilling, to a certain extent, the same purpose as that royal commission which has done such exhaustive work in Australia. The Australian commission did not regard it as outside the sphere of their duty to make inquiries into the cost of manufacture of these machines in Australia in order to be able to report what rate of customs duty should be imposed upon them under the new Australian tariff. I do not think, therefore, that I am going beyond what is right in asking for this information. Of course, it may be possible that the government have not looked into the matter so thoroughly as the Australian commission did and may not be able to furnish the information. All I ask is that whatever information on these points is available should be supplied, in so far as the government thinks that my request for information is a fair one. Of course, I would not make the request unless I thought it fair, and I make it, of course, without the slightest desire to do injustice to these gentlemen; for I am sure that they desire only fair play at the hands of the government and parliament of Canada, and do not ask us to discriminate in their favour beyond the protection which other manufacturers in this country have expected and are receiving. I will hand the memorandum of what I have asked to the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Finance, and I do not ask that this item be delayed for the purpose of completing an answer, because it can be given later on when the House is in Committee on the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. So far as the information asked for is available it will be our duty to get it. Some of it can be obtained by looking at the records of the census returns and others. In the Tariff Commission we did not think it our duty to consider in detail the cost of manufacturing every article in the tariff. That would have been an endless task. Some may have thought that time enough was spent on our work as it was, but we simply could not have accomplished it at all if we had attempted to gain that information concerning all lines of industry. Some of the information which the hon. gentleman asked for was dealt with by some of the wit-

nesses. So far as we can we will get the information before the tariff is finally moved.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to add an inquiry as to the valuation placed on each of the classes of articles coming under this head which are imported into Canada. The Minister of Finance, in his budget speech this session, proposed to offset the reduction in duty on threshing machines by an increase in the valuation. Therefore, I would like to know exactly how the valuation is arrived at in the case of each class of these machines—is it the price charged to the wholesaler or the jobber? In this connection I would point out that the information furnished by the Minister of Customs some little time ago concerning the valuation placed on self binders—I leave out mowers for the moment—in the year 1895 depended on the quantity imported at the time, and that the average valuation at that time amounted to $95. Subsequently that valuation was increased to $102 for two classes of self-binders at any rate, and apparently, they remained at that valuation from 1900 to 1905 when a sudden drop was made to $97, at which figure it remained last year. I would like the House to have definite information as to what the valuation of these machines is. One can readily see, of course, that under the dumping clauses, a decrease of the duty of 2½ per cent could be offset by an increase in the valuation of a little more than $2 on the machine itself.

Mr. FIELDING. We will give the hon. gentleman the information as to the valuation.

Mr. HALL. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs the meaning of the words in section 445, completed parts thereof?' There are certain classes of repairs brought in by the foreign manufacturer, and these, I should suppose, would be 'completed parts' of these machines. On the other hand, there are certain manufacturers in a small way here in Canada who buy certain parts to be used in the making of these machines. As a matter of fact, these parts are not actually complete; they may need to be punched or submitted to some other simple operation. Would this class of goods used by these manufacturers, be counted as complete parts, or would they be subject to the higher duty?

Mr. PATERSON. I fancy that, in this case the words 'completed parts' refer to parts which are intended to be an integral part of the machine and not useable for anything else. What we have to guard against is the importation of parts which are not integral parts of the machine. Even though it may have to be punched or something of that kind, so long as it can be recognized as a part of the machine, I think that would be enough.

Mr. HALL. But work upon these pieces is necessary to make them part of the machine.

Mr. PATERSON. It must be a part that, when it comes in, is in the shape required for use in the machine. It must be some thing that is really a part of the machine, something that could only be used in that machine.

Mr. HALL. A cutting bar might be brought in, that is a piece of bar of iron made into the shape but not properly punched. I would like to see a definition as to the amount of work that would be required upon this particular part in order to bring it within this clause. I fear that the wording of that item might militate against the smaller manufacturer of agricultural implements because if he had to pay a duty of 30 per cent on particular parts of a machine which could not be made in his own factory but could be brought in in quantities, he would be placed in an unfavourable position with regard to the foreign manufacturer.

Mr. PATERSON. The man that is only engaged in assembling the parts we do not consider is doing as much for the country as the man who is making the whole machine in this country. He brings them in here partially manufactured and does not give employment to our own people. It must be distinctly understood that the article must be a part of the machine. You could not bring in a part of the iron and forge that into shape and claim that it was a part of the machine.

Mr. HALL. Here is a point that I would like to have made clear. I can understand that the foreign manufacturer, such as the International Harvesting Company, can bring in their parts from Chicago and the Northwest and put them together in Canada but all the work has been done in the United States. But take a local company, as for example, one in Peterborough, that employs a couple of hundred men, they cannot use the gang-punches and all sorts of drilling machines because their works are not fitted for it, and naturally in order to compete with large manufacturers they require to get in these small parts. The item 'and complete parts,' it struck me, would operate in favour of the large manufacturer who was bringing in repairs made in a foreign country, but would operate unfavourably to the smaller manufacturer who is bringing in certain parts of the machine and paying seventeen and a half per cent duty on them, but which parts require some work in order to complete the machine. Take the cutting bar, for instance, that might come in unpunched, but the knives might re-

quire to be placed on them, certain punching might be required to be done, and certain riveting, and this extra work we require to be done on them in order to put them in the machine. It struck me that the words 'complete parts' might militate against the small manufacturer.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. With regard to the valuation of articles, does the department make any difference whether a machine comes into the province of Ontario or whether the like machine comes into the province of Manitoba? In the western States the question of freight is a very important one in arriving at the value of an article. A binder made in the western states would be worth more money than a binder of the same size and class made in the eastern states.

Mr. PATERSON. The value is alike in all cases, no matter in what part of the Dominion the machine enters.

Amend item 447, so as to read—

447. Portable engines with boilers, in combination, horse powers and traction engines, for farm purposes; windstackers, and threshing machine separators, including baggers, weighers and self-feeders therefor and finished parts thereof for repairs: British preferential tariff rate, 15 per cent; intermediate tariff rate, 17½ per cent; general tariff rate, 20 per cent.

Mr. LAKE. In introducing this item in the budget speech, the minister stated that it was proposed to increase the valuation in order to offset the reduction in duty. Now I would like to know how the reduction in duty is going to work out under these circumstances, how much the valuation is to be, proportionately, in order to make that offset. There are certain well known manufacturers, and a certain number of standard threshing machines brought into the country, and I would like to know exactly how these provisions are going to work out with reference to threshers.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a 5 per cent reduction in duty, from 25 to 20 per cent. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), when he announced that to the public, thought it well to let the public know that while there was that actual reduction in the duty, under a ruling that had just been adopted, or was about to be adopted, as to values, it would not really be a reduction of the cost in threshing machines to the farmer. The question of valuation is one with which the Customs Department are charged, and which it is their duty to review when they consider it necessary to do so. On a review of the valuation placed upon threshing machines just a little before this was being introduced it was determined by the Customs Department that the discounts that had been allowed on threshing machines coming from other countries were larger discounts than the Board of Customs thought they were authorized under the law of the land to admit. The discounts at that time amounted on certain lines to 40 per cent; they are not all equal. The department got the price lists with the discounts that are attached thereto. That is what we have to go by. All the threshing machine makers of the United States have not uniform lists of prices and have not uniform discounts. Each party has to be dealt with according to the prices that he lays down in his price list in reference to the duty. If these threshing machines had not been reduced by 5 per cent at all, if they had remained at 25 per cent, the review of the valuations would necessarily take place by the Customs Department in any case. The law requires that the fair market price attached to the article as sold in the country of production is to be the value for duty in this country. It is a rather intricate question that has to be decided very often by special officers being sent to the manufacturers in the United States who are shipping into the country to get a full and complete understanding of their mode of doing business. If the hon. gentleman asks me: Will a man who buys a threshing machine now under the amended values, and with the duty reduced to 20 per cent, pay more or less?—the judgment of the commissioner is a—and he, of course, is more conversant with it than I am—that the implement will be somewhat cheaper, but not to the extent of 5 per cent on the old valuation.

Mr. LAKE. I have been informed that the increase in valuation will result in this, that they will have to pay duty on a larger value than the goods are actually being sold for in the United States. I do not know whether that is the case or not, or whether the minister has any information in regard to that.

Mr. PATERSON. It would not be right if we were doing that. But the hon. gentleman understands that the peculiar way of doing business in this case makes it very difficult. They have no price. They do not sell to the consumer direct, but they sell through agents.

Mr. LAKE. I understand that the manufacturers have a regular, definite price. What I understand from the minister is that the department allow a certain definite discount off this price in making the valuation of the article?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. Now, I think the minister can tell us, in the case of the few firms which export threshing machines to this country, exactly the amount of the discount that is allowed at the present moment off their published price list. I think that information will be very valuable to

the public, and will enable them to know exactly what duty they are to pay.

Some resolutions reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

DOMINION FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Consideration of amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 53) respecting the Dominion Fire Insurance Company, was first called.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is this amendment ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The head office of the company is at present at Vancouver, and the amendment is to change it to Toronto.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that all ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes.

Amendment concurred in.

CENTRAL CANADA MANUFACTURERS' MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

On the order :

House in committee on Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Mr. MILLER. As Mr. Calvert who has this Bill in charge, is not in the House just now, I would mention that Mr. Heaton, one of the promoters said he would like this Bill to stand as they have some idea of asking permission to withdraw it.

Mr. FIELDING. Let it stand.

Progress reported.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA.

On the order :

House in committee on Bill (No. 82) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Gervais.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask that this Bill should stand until Monday. There was a difference of opinion in the committee between legal gentlemen as to the necessity of a very important suggested amendment. If it is thought wise to press the Bill now, I will have to take up the time of the committee to show why I think it should stand until Monday.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think there is any objection to its standing.

Progress reported.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 72) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I hope the Minister of Railways will be able to assure the House that the Bill has been carefully revised after the many amendments made in committee, and that the Bill as now presented, is as it passed the committee. Perhaps the chairman of the committee can assure us that it has been carefully revised by some officer representing the department or the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it has been pretty well revised.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the chairman of the Railway Committee so assures us, I have no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL. These amendments simply define the branch lines more definitely than they were defined in the original Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There were some other important amendments, as the Minister of Railways knows.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think they were put in pretty clearly.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the minister assures us of that I have no objection.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I have on other occasions drawn the attention of the House to the slipshod way in which these Bills were placed before us after passing the committee. Bills like this which have been extensively amended should be reprinted before they are sent back to the House. At present, all I can do is to rely on an indefinite recollection of what happened in committee in regard to this Bill. The Bill should be reprinted before coming back, I think the Minister of Finance has on a former occasion expressed himself in favour of that view.

Mr. McCOOL. This Bill was considered very thoroughly and revised by the special committee. The changes merely put it beyond any question of doubt as to what lines are intended to be extended.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I know that the gentlemen who had this Bill particularly in hand understand it, but there is no good reason why all the members should not have an opportunity of understanding it.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a good deal in what my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) says : This Bill has been very materially changed in the committee, and the members of the committee as a whole are entitled to have placed before them a reprinted copy of the

Bill as amended. I quite concur in that suggestion.

Mr. FIELDING. Under the new rules, the Bill would have to be reprinted, and therefore the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) must be carried out.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I hope the Minister of Railways will remember that when Bills are seriously altered in committee they have to be reprinted before being sent back to the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the officers of the House should not place such Bills on the order paper until they have been reprinted and are ready for consideration by the Committee of the Whole. The officers of the House have more time to attend to that than I have.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. All you have to do is to comply with the rule.

Mr. LANCASTER. I was chairman of the subcommittee to which this Bill was referred. We gave close attention to it, and I know that the amendments are of considerable importance. I think we made a proper report, but in the meantime there were only six or eight members on that subcommittee, and the other members of the House have a right to know what the amendments are, as has been properly pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson).

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Grand Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Oxford).

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. McIntyre (Strathcona).

Bill (No. 94) to incorporate the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

NATIONAL ACCIDENT AND GUARANTEE COMPANY.

On the Order :

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 29) an Act to incorporate the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—Mr. Pardee.

Mr. LANCASTER. What are these amendments ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It seems to me that whoever is in charge of the Bill ought to be able to make the explanation ?

Mr. MILLER. I think the only change is with regard to the amount of stock a man must hold to entitle him to be a director. The Bill originally provided for ten shares, while the amendment provides for twenty-five.

Mr. LANCASTER. Some one has been kind enough to send me a copy of this Bill, and it seems that the Senate has struck out sections 12 and 13, which are very important :

12. The company may invest any of its funds in accordance with the terms of the Insurance Act and any amendments thereof, and may call in the said investments as occasion requires.

13. The company may invest or deposit such portion of its funds in foreign securities as is necessary for the maintenance of any foreign branch.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the promoter is not here, if there is any objection, the order had better stand.

Order allowed to stand.

QUINZE AND BLANCHE RIVER RAILWAY.

On the Order :

Consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 56) an Act to incorporate the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the amendment ?

Mr. McCOOL. The only change that was made by the Senate was the reinsertion of clause 15 which the Railway Committee of this House struck out. There is no objection to the Bill as it stands. I cannot tell why this clause was struck out in the Railway Committee but some one raised an objection to it. It was reinserted by the Senate, not at the request of the promotors, but because the Senate thought it was necessary to the Bill. It is as follows :

The company and its undertaking shall be subject to such provisions of any general Act now or hereafter passed by the legislatures of the provinces of Ontario or Quebec as provide, in the interest of public health or safety, for the control and regulation of the transmission, distribution or supply of electricity in any form.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not see why that amendment is necessary at all. This was very fully considered by the railway committee, and the clause was purposely eliminated from the Bill. We cannot legislate in any way to affect the powers which the provinces have with respect to public health, and it needs no legislation from this parliament to give effect to any legislation within the jurisdiction of the provinces. It seems to me that this clause is absolutely and entirely unnecessary. It is mere surplusage.

Mr. BERGERON. It cannot do any harm.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a great deal in legislation that cannot do any harm. If

it does no good, there is no use of passing it.

Mr. BERGERON. If we do not pass it, the Bill will have to go back to the Senate.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the clause is properly in the Bill. It deals not only with the public health, but with safety for the control and regulation of the transmission, distribution or supply of electricity in any form.'

Mr. EMMERSON. Within the jurisdiction of the province.

Mr. LANCASTER. Both parliaments might deal with that matter, which is not exclusively within the jurisdiction of the province. If this parliament chose to intervene it could do so; but if we think the province ought to control in these matters, it seems to me proper to have the clause inserted.

Amendments read the first and the second time and agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 104) for the relief of Osprey George Valentine Spain.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada, and to change its name to the Royal Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—Mr. Ames.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the United Baptist Women's Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—Mr. Logan.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Item 447:

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. When the House rose this afternoon we were discussing this question of valuation, which is important, not only because it affects the duty, but because of its relationship to the dumping clause. It has been said that it is very difficult to arrive at a proper valuation under this item on account of the absence of invoices and the peculiar manner in which the goods come into the country. In his budget speech, page 315 of the revised 'Hansard,' the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) referred to the particular article under discussion in the following terms:

Threshing machine outfit, when consisting of traction or portable engine and separator; under the old tariff these articles were dutiable at 25 per cent and we propose to make them 20 per cent. In the case of threshing machines the difficulty has not been so much the duty as the valuation. There has been a difficulty in establishing a proper valuation for that article because it is not sold to the wholesale trade; it passes from the manufacturer through the hands of agents to the consumer. The department has been allowing 40 per cent reduction on the cost price, but the department is rearranging that and increasing the valuation, so that unless there was a reduction in the duty the cost of the article would be increased. That was not desirable because it is a very important item in the northwest so that the change in the valuation will not operate to the disadvantage of the buyer.

There are two prices known to the general public—the wholesale and the retail. There seems to have been no difficulty in arriving at the cost of these articles and after the department arrived at the cost it cut of 40 per cent. What is meant by the cost of the article and why is that cost reduced by 40 per cent?

Mr. PATERSON. It is the cost to the consumer in the United States.

Mr. LAKE. Before the House rose this afternoon, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) made the statement that the net result of the reduction in duty, combined with the increase in valuation, was a slight decrease in the amount of duty which would have to be paid in future by the consumer. I wish to point out that under the dumping clause regulation that is not the net result by any means, but the net result is a large increase in the duty to be paid by the importer. Take a J. I. Case threshing outfit, valued, say $500 for the separator and $1,700 for the engine, or a total of $2,200. I am told that the original valuation by the Customs Department up to within quite recently allowed a discount of 35 per cent on that amount. That is to say, the customs duty had to be paid on a valuation of $1,430 on an outfit which was listed at $2,200. The duty on $1,430 at 25 per cent would be $357.50. The department, as I am informed, has now decreased the amount of discount allowed on a J. I. Case threshing outfit to 20 per cent. That is to say, that same outfit is now valued by the department at $1,760, on which the duty of twenty per cent would amount to $352, or a reduction so far as that goes, of five and a half dollars on the duty. But it must not be forgotten that under the dumping clause the man who, up to the present, has been able to buy that outfit at $1,430 will now have to pay a special duty which in this case will amount to $264. So that whereas formerly on this particular outfit he paid a duty of $357.50, under the new valuation proposed by the Customs Department he will have to pay a duty of $616. I call the attention of the Minister of Customs to this and ask him if it is not a correct statement of the case.

Mr. PATERSON. The dumping duty cannot be applied unless the goods are being

brought in at an under valuation of 5 per cent or more.

Mr. LAKE. But the Customs Department makes the valuation.

Mr. PATERSON. The valuation is based on the prices at which the article is sold in the United States.

Mr. LAKE. But how is that arrived at? Entirely by officers of the department?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, after examination of the facts. For instance, on the J. I. Case machine which the hon. gentleman mentions we do not allow as much discount off the price list as in many others. In some the discount is 20 per cent, in some 30 per cent and in some 35 per cent—this last, I believe, being the highest. We had an examination of their price list, and not only that, but had a conference with the representatives of the manufacturers as well. We had the representative of the J. I. Case Company here. I think the basis arrived at is one which they could not successfully controvert as to valuations in the United States, and that is the basis on which we work.

Mr. LAKE. What is the discount allowed now on the list price of the J. I. Case outfit?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not that information before me at the moment.

Mr. LAKE. I am informed that the J. I. Case people allow a discount of 35 per cent to the American jobber and that the Customs Department have reduced that.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not think they have jobbers, nor can it be said that they have jobbing prices. They have agents, and they consign to themselves, and put in the machines at figures that we cannot accept. If they dealt with the jobbing trade in the ordinary way and we could find out their jobbing prices in the United States, we would take these as a basis. But, under the circumstances, we have to ascertain what is the proper valuation. If we took it the other way it would bear harder on the farmers of the Northwest. Suppose we were to take the price at which they sell the implement to the customers in the United States and take 20 per cent off that and make that figure the basis for customs taxation—twenty per cent is more than they allow, and for that we have the testimony of the member of the House who acts as agent for them.

Mr. LAKE. I understand the minister admits that the department are not able to ascertain with certainty the actual price at which the manufacturers sell to their customers in the United States? That leaves the matter in the hands of his officers to bring it out as nearly as they can. If the officer puts the valuation a little higher, it means that the consumer has to pay a much higher duty than he would otherwise pay. I think that the example that I stated just now, shows an enormous increase in the customs valuation, which, I consider, would result in an excessively high duty to be paid by the consumers in this country.

Mr. PATERSON. That is assuming that the Customs Department would act arbitrarily and advance the value without reason. That would be improper, and we could not do it.

Mr. LAKE. I do not suggest that the officer would deliberately act in an arbitrary manner. But I think they are likely to err on the safe side and in favour of the revenues of the department.

Mr. PATERSON. No, our way is to interpret the law as liberally to the importer as we can. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) will understand that these are difficult questions to deal with owing to the different discounts on the various makes of these implements and the variation from time to time in the process. Since the tariff was introduced representatives of these firms have been in Ottawa, and the discounts allowed by the board of customs, I consider, about right in each case as between themselves. The question of under-valuation is not confined to this class of goods. It is our duty to raise the valuation if the goods are sold in this country at lower rates than in the country from which they come. Now, with reference to reapers and binders these prices vary, I think, about once a year. My hon. friend (Mr. Lake) mentioned a case in which the answer brought down showed that the valuation for duty of binders varied from year to year. It was $95 and went up to $102. But the hon. gentleman may remember that there was a wonderful advance in steel and a new valuation had to be made. Another change took place in prices of steel, and our officers went to the headquarters of these firms and reached a determination of the proper valuation for customs purposes on entering Canada. Of course, we cannot ascertain the discount and allow it to remain for all time, because the changes in conditions bring changes in the price-lists and we have to review the situation, and, to that end, we have to make inquiries. I think there is no danger that anything unfair will be done. I have thought that perhaps the better way would be to take the price-lists of these firms showing prices at which they sell to the farmer in the United States. Take that actual price-list and take 20 per cent off for commission, and when he sells that article it means 25 per cent added, that would be 25 per cent profit for the man who sold it. If we did that I think our farmers would pay more than they pay now. We have the testi-

mony of a member of this House who acts as their agent and he says they got only 10 per cent. But if we were to take 20 per cent as a commission, I think the present arrangement is better for our importer than that would be.

Mr. LAKE. When the hon. gentleman is bringing down the information asked for by the leader of the opposition, would he be kind enough to give us a statement of the amount of discount allowed previous to this last arrangement, and the amount of discount allowed under this new arrangement, on all classes of threshing outfits which are brought into this country?

Mr. FIELDING. I did state that that information would be brought down, and I hope we shall be able to bring it down. But how far we are able to bring down information given in fixing the values of invoices is a question. It may be that we will find that the information came to us in a way that we might not be free to use it. I merely put myself on guard there.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. I think the minister could arrive at the values a great deal nearer than by taking the price at which the goods are sold to the farmer. In every instance these companies sign a contract with their agent, in which he is allowed a net cash price. That is equivalent to the wholesale price on any other class of goods. The hon. gentleman can arrive at the actual value of the goods turned out by these manufacturing concerns by sending over to their wholesale houses in Ottawa, and he can get the contract they sign with their agents, and settle the matter in ten minutes with regard to the great bulk of the goods of this class coming into Canada. The same practice prevails in the United States. I have in my hand a contract made by a wholesale manufacturing concern there with their agent, and the same conditions are found in it. There might be a question of freight to determine between the United States manufacturer and the point where the goods are laid down to the agent here. But there is a net cash price to the agent in every contract that is made. Once that price is determined for any given year, the contract stands for twelve months. I do not think the question of arriving at a valuation is a very serious one if it is gone about in a business-like way.

Mr. LAKE. I would like some information in regard to the wording of this clause. I see it states 'portable engines, with boilers in combination, horse-powers and traction engines, for farm purposes.' What is the exact meaning of that language? I would like also to ask the minister whether it is proposed to allow gasoline engines to come in when portable and used for threshing purposes? A number of them are used in the Northwest now.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no distinction between steam and gasoline. I think, under the words used there, the gasoline engines forming part of a threshing outfit would be all right.

Mr. LAKE. I want to know what the words 'in combination' mean?

Mr. PATERSON. Has the gasoline engine a boiler connected with it?

Mr. LAKE. No. I think they should come in under this heading, specifying gasoline engines when used for threshing purposes.

Mr. PATERSON. Gasoline engines are used for many other purposes, but we confine it to portable engines with boilers for farming purposes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In two years all the grain in the west will be cut with gasoline engines attached to the mowers and reapers.

Mr. LAKE. Where do gasoline engines come in under this tariff?

Mr. PATERSON. Under the general item, 27½.

Mr. LAKE. Then when a man imports a threshing outfit, if the engine is a gasoline engine, he would have to pay 27½ per cent?

Mr. PATERSON. On that part, yes.

448. Hay loaders, potato diggers, horse powers, separators, n.o.p., windstackers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm, road or field rollers, post hole diggers, snaths and other agricultural implements, n.o.p., 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

Insert a 'semicolon' after the words 'horse powers' and after the word 'snaths.' Strike out the words 'horse powers, separators, n.o.p., windstackers.'

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs, with regard to item 449, whether the Canadian market is entirely supplied by the Canadian manufacturers with axes, scythes, sickles and goods of that kind, or whether there is much importation of those articles?

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a large exportation of them.

Mr. FIELDING. Strike out the words 'separators and windstackers'.

Mr. LAKE. In the first notice of motion it says 'horse-powers, separators n. o. p., windstackers,' &c.

Mr. FIELDING. In the printed copy I have it says:

Strike out the words 'horse powers, separators, n.o.p., windstackers.'

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). The item will read in this way:

Hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm, road or field rollers, post hole diggers, snaths and other agricultural implements, n.o.p.

Mr. LAKE. It seems to me that horse-powers have been inserted in 447; have they not? They appear in two separate items now under different rates of duty.

Mr. FIELDING. Item 447 includes 'horse-powers and traction engines for farm purposes'. It is limited to a particular purpose there.

Mr. PATERSON. They will not come in at as low a rate for other purposes.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman asks about axes, scythes, &c.

Mr. PATERSON. $8,000 worth of axes came in and about $2,000 worth of scythes.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many went out?

Mr. PATERSON. Of spades, shovels and forks, $13,000 worth came in. I do not suppose the exports are very large. The trade is very largely with ourselves.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice that the minister has reduced the duty one half per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. And that the American duty is 45 per cent on the same articles.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, but the manufacturers get their steel free and it was considered that it was time to bring this duty down a little. They are stronger and we thought that they were able to bear it.

Mr. DANIEL. Of course, if the Canadian manufacturer holds the market or more than holds it that might be a fair reason for reducing the duty.

Mr. PATERSON. He does; $8,000 is nothing comparatively.

451a. Stove urns of metal; and dovetails, chaplets and hinge tubes of tin for use in the manufacture of stoves, 5 per cent, 7½ per cent, 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a new item. These articles are not made in Canada. They are given a low rate of duty to assist the stove maker.

460. Sundry articles of metal as follows, when for use exclusively in mining or metallurgical operations, viz.:—Diamond drills, not including the motor power; coal cutting machines, except percussion coal cutters; coal heading machines; coal augers; rotary coal drills; core drills; miners' safety lamps and parts thereof, also accessories for cleaning, filling and testing such lamps; electric or magnetic machines for separating or concentrating iron ores; blast furnaces for the smelting of copper and nickel; converting apparatus for metallurgical processes in iron or copper; copper plates, plated or not; machinery for extraction of precious metals by the chlorination or cyanide processes; amalgam safes; automatic ore samplers; automatic feeders; retorts; mercury pumps; pyrometers; bullion furnaces; amalgam cleaners; blast furnace blowing engines; wrought iron tubing, butt or lap welded, threaded or coupled or not, over four inches in diameter; and integral parts of all machinery mentioned in this item, free.

Amended item.—After the words 'processes in' strike out the words 'iron or copper' and insert the word 'metals.'

Mr. FIELDING. In item 460, instead of the words 'blast furnaces for the smelting of copper and nickel' I propose to substitute the words 'furnaces for the smelting of copper, zinc and nickel ores.' There are furnaces now which are not blast furnaces. There is the modern electric furnace and we want to adapt the wording of the tariff in that respect, and to include the smelting of zinc ores as well as copper and nickel.

461a. Iron or steel pipe not butt or lap welded, and wire bound wooden pipe, not less than 30 inches internal diameter, when for use exclusively in alluvial gold mining, 5 per cent, 7½ per cent, 10 per cent.

This is a new item given to assist alluvial mining in the Yukon.

Mr. THOMPSON. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to item 461.

Machinery and appliances of iron or steel, of a class or kind not made in Canada, and elevators and machinery of floating dredges, when for use exclusively in alluvial gold mining, free.

Dredging for gold has become an important industry in the Yukon and these machines are not made in Canada. In order to place a requisition for them with the manufacturers in the United States where they all come from, the people who want them find that they have to place an order for the whole machine in order to get delivery at a given time. If they have to get a portion of the machinery in Canada and a portion in the United States the people who can supply the greater portion will not take the order.

Mr. PATERSON. This would let in every thing except the power.

Mr. THOMPSON. Possibly; but in some cases the power is placed upon the hull of the dredge. In other cases it is placed upon the shore of the pit in which the dredge works and power is transmitted by wire from the power plant to the dredge. This is one of the best industries in the territory that I have the honour to represent, parliament has that industry in the hollow of its hand and I would like to have that restriction removed for at least a few years. The government have met my request to a

very large degree by opening the gate so that this machinery can come in. If they could further remove that restriction it would be a great assistance to that industry. I will leave it to the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you mean to confine it to the floating dredge or do you mean the power to be established on the land ?

Mr. THOMPSON. According to the construction I put upon it at the present time it does cover the power if the power is placed upon the dredge.

Mr. PATERSON. It will not cover plants upon the land producing electricity to work the dredge but if they were part of the dredge they would come in free.

Mr. THOMPSON. Could it be considered to mean a power plant if the plant were placed upon the shore and the plant was for alluvial mining ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. FIELDING. I ask the committee to return to item 79 for reconsideration. We made an amendment in that item, but I find we have put the newly added words in the wrong place. I move that the words 'rose stock and other stock for grafting' be inserted after the word 'lilac' and that the words 'rose stock' be struck out where they were added, making the item read :

Florist stock, viz.: azaleas, rhododendrons, pot grown lilacs, rose stock and other stock for grafting, araucarias, bulbs, corms, tubers, rhizomes and dormant roots, n.o.p.; seedling stock for grafting, viz.: plum, pear, peach and other fruit trees, free, free, free.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. How about item 407 ? This item reads :

Wire, single or several, covered with cotton, linen, silk, rubber or other material, including cable so covered, n.o.p., 20 per cent, 27½ per cent, 30 per cent.

I have here representations from the manufacturers of these goods. This wire is used in making hats and bonnets. They say that, owing to the higher wages paid here and the customs duty on raw material, it is impossible to compete with the old country prices under the preference. The duty on the wire is 20 per cent. The duty on the cotton yarn 20 to 25 per cent and on silk floss 25 per cent and on boxes 35 per cent, on which, of course, the importers get the benefit of the preference. The changes that these people asked for and that they thought would be granted have not been granted. They say that this is a new industry in Canada that in this department they employed twenty-five hands, but will have to close down indefinitely if they do not get more encouragement from the tariff. The preferential duty on the silk floss and cotton yarn will be 17½ per cent, and as the duty on the finished product is only 20 per cent they have a margin of protection of 2½ per cent, and they say that under the tariff as it was they had a margin of 5 per cent. They have a letter from the secretary of the Tariff Commissioners, that their case would be looked into, but the change that they asked for has not been made.

Mr. PATERSON. We went fully into the hat and cap business, and these people will be in a better position than before.

Mr. FOSTER. But this is not a hat or cap manufacture but a manufacture of wire used in making hats or bonnets.

Mr. FIELDING. Their rate has not been reduced. There must be some misapprehension.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been any increase on the duty of the silk floss which they use to cover this millinery wire ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The general rate is all right ; it is the preferential that hurts them.

Mr. PATERSON. This would affect a good many engaged in other lines. Where are these goods made ?

Mr. FOSTER. These makers are in Toronto.

Mr. FIELDING. I see we have increased the duty on materials. They are in no worse position than they were before.

Mr. FOSTER. Look at 579, which includes silk floss at 17½ per cent for the preferential. The protection they have on the wires when finished is 20 per cent. Now, have you not raised that preferential duty 2½ per cent on silk floss?

Mr. FIELDING. It is possible some portions of these were unenumerated.

Mr. FOSTER. You have not given them any advance on the finished article, but you have added to the duty upon the raw material.

Mr. FIELDING. It is only on one of their raw materials; it is only a small percentage of their goods.

Mr. FOSTER. The direct result of the change has been that on the floss they will use there has already been notified to them an advance in the price consequent upon the duty. Now, you allow Canadian yarns in free for the manufacture of shoe laces and they raise the question very pertinently why you should not allow floss in free for the manufacture of these millinery wires.

Mr. PATERSON. It is a difficult matter to get a perfectly straight edge on the tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. Before the matter is finally through with, we will look over it again.

Mr. PATERSON. In reference to item 135a of the Act regarding beet sugar, it has occurred to the commissioner whether, under the conditions that sugar may be brought in from Belguim or France, the dumping duty would not apply. Beet sugar is produced in Canada, and if it was sold lower coming into this country it might be subject to the dumping duty, which would nullify altogether the article. He suggests for safety to add to that clause:

Provided that sugar imported under this item shall not be subject to special duty.

That is the dumping duty. It seems to me it is a proviso that only secures that the sugar should come at such prices as will exempt it from the special duty.

Schedule 'B'—Goods subject to drawback for home consumption.

1001. Oil, fuel and other articles not machinery when entering into the cost of binder twine manufactured in Canada, drawback, 99 per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to have the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) explain what the regulations are going to be in reference to these items in schedule B. You have changed the amount of the drawback from 95 to 99 per cent. I know some large manufacturing industries which, if they have to pay the full duty and get the drawback when the goods are manufactured, will be obliged to lock up large amounts of capital. Take, for instance, the spring and axle works at Gananoque; they import very largely their year's supply in the fall and get it delivered by barge. It comes to a very large sum of money. They pay the duty, but do not get the drawback until the goods are manufactured. The goods they import cannot be used for any other purpose than for springs and axles; unless some satisfactory arrangement can be made by which they can make an entry, pay the duty, put in a declaration that the goods will not be used for any other purpose and then get their money back they will be locking up thousands and thousands of dollars. I would like to have the minister explain how he purposes giving these drawbacks.

Mr. FIELDING. The principle governing the matter and the line we try to draw is this. If we desired to make an article free for a certain purpose, and it could only be used for that purpose, then we would put it straight on the free list; but if it could be used for the purpose as to which we did wish to make it free and it could be used for other purposes for which we did not wish to make it free, we would deal with it by way of a drawback, practically giving back all the duty upon evidence being furnished that it had been used for the particular purpose for which we wished to give it free. I think that will be regarded by the committee as a reasonable arrangement, and that it is necessary to guard against the abuse of the privilege, because if an article is admitted free for one purpose and it is afterwards used for another purpose, the intention of parliament will be defeated. In regard to steel for springs and axles, my hon. friend says that it cannot be used for any other purpose. If we were free to agree with him upon that, I would say at once that it should be put on the free list, but we were advised that it could be used for other purposes, and that there was danger of the privilege being abused. It is for that reason that we made this subject to drawback and did not make it free.

Mr. TAYLOR. In so far as steel for making springs is concerned, of course it might be put into bars to make pins for fastening logs together, or something of that kind, and so could axle steel, but it is not done. It could be used for another purpose, but I think an arrangement might be made whereby the importers would make an affidavit stating that it would not be used for any other purpose.

Mr. PATERSON. They do that now; they have always done that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know it is going to be a great hardship for these people, because it cannot be used for any other purpose to any advantage. Rather than use it for any other purpose, they would use iron in place of steel. Any manufacturer who knows the purpose that spring steel is used for knows that it would be used for no other purpose than for making springs for carriages, and the same would apply to axle steel. It is made up especially as to sizes, and it is used for that purpose only. It means thousands and thousands of dollars of their capital being locked up until the goods are manufactured, and it would be a great hardship to them unless some arrangement can be made by which it can be allowed to remain in bond until they are ready to use it.

Mr. PATERSON. We will allow it to remain in bond.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no place to bond it except in their shed.

Mr. PATERSON. It will have to go into a bonded warehouse.

Mr. TAYLOR. They have no bonded warehouse to put it in.

Mr. DANIEL. I have the same complaint to make on behalf of the manufacturers of edge tools, cutlery, files, augers, etc., in regard to the steel that is imported for that purpose. These people have to import in large quantities, and the consequence is that before they get their drawback they lose a large amount in interest

on the money which they are obliged to pay to customs duties. It is a very great hardship for them. I am informed that the steel which is used for this purpose is unsuitable for almost everything else. The exact words I have here are these:

On account of the fact that material used for edge tools is suitable for almost nothing else and as almost all of these are included in the drawback clause, the government will suffer no loss in working it out in that way.

That is in allowing the importer to pay 5 per cent on the steel imported, instead of paying the whole duty and then getting a drawback many months afterwards, perhaps of 99 per cent. It appears to me that the government, under these circumstances, will be likely to suffer no loss, and if they could arrange it in that way, or, as the Minister of Finance said, make it free altogether, it would relieve these people of a very considerable loss and allow them to transact their business with the government very much more satisfactorily, and the government would suffer no loss of revenue. I think that perhaps the minister might give some other reason for continuing the burdensome arrangement than that already given.

Mr. TAYLOR. I might just add, before the minister replies, that if an arrangement could be made by the Customs Department with manufacturers who are manufacturers exclusively of the goods to bond these goods in their own warehouses, it might be a relief. I am satisfied, and perhaps the minister is too, that the revenue has been defrauded by some persons who are both manufacturers and hardware merchants, and who can import these goods for the purpose of manufacturing them and then sell them out to the trade. But where a manufacturer is exclusively a manufacturer, if an arrangement could be made that a bonded warehouse could be made of his yard, and not force him to put up the duty that the tariff calls for, it would be a relief. Some satisfactory arrangement ought to be made in a case of this kind.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sure the Department of Customs would be only too happy to facilitate any arrangement that was reasonably possible in regard to the bonding of goods. This is so much a matter of administration that I would not care to offer any opinion of my own. The question is as to whether or not these goods can be used for other purposes. The hon. gentleman will see that the Customs Department have no earthly interest in creating this drawback system. It is a great bother to them. It would simplify their work very much if we would put these goods on the free list and be done with it.

Mr. BERGERON. And a great bother to the trade also.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Was not this item on the free list before?

Mr. FIELDING. It was claimed that in regard to a number of these items which were free for certain limited purposes, the privilege was abused and they were used for other purposes and would come into illegitimate competition in that way. To guard against these abuses, the drawback system was adopted. In cases where the article imported can only be used for the purpose for which it is admitted free, it is not put on the drawback schedule. The drawback system is a great trouble to the department, and it is only introduced in cases where the experience of the department has shown it to be necessary to guard against abuse. I am sure the Minister of Customs and his commissioner would be only too happy to make any reasonable arrangement to carry out the suggestion of the hon. gentleman with regard to bonding goods, always provided we can have the safeguards which are necessary for the protection of the public.

Machinery imported after the first of July, 1906, and prior to first of July, 1908, and other articles not machinery. When entering into the cost of tinplate, &c., manufactured in Canada, 99 per cent drawback.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you mean by the word 'prior?'

Mr. PATERSON. The tinplate industry which is being started at Morrisburg had some machinery imported before the tariff was brought down on which they paid duty. This will make that machinery free, and if the duty was paid, of course they will get a refund.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the minister does not care to give the history of the negotiations.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes. We did not see our way clear to give them a duty on tin, but we think no industry is injured by doing what we now propose.

Mr. BRODER. This industry is in the town I live in and I know considerable about its inception and progress. The outlay up to the present is about $250,000 and they are only proposing to manufacture things that are not now manufactured at all in this country. Their intention is to manufacture terneplate, tinplate, Canada plate, and steel sheets, plain and galvanized. What will be the effect of the 14 gauge limitation in the item?

Mr. PATERSON. Stouter than stovepipe.

Mr. BRODER. They are proposing to make steel sheets that would enter into the manufacture of steel ranges; would this 14 gauge preclude them?

Mr. PATERSON. We cannot give them a drawback on an article which is made by others.

Mr. BRODER. I have been informed by the president of the company that none of the things which they propose manufacturing are now made in Canada at all.

Mr. PATERSON. We think we have covered this in the wording of the item. If we make it as broad as the hon. gentleman suggests they would be getting free what others have to pay duty on.

Mr. BRODER. They would only be getting their material free, out of which they would manufacture these different articles. The steel plates can be made into tinplate in the United States and England and come in free, whereas if these gentlemen had to buy the steel plates they would pay a duty of $7 from the United States and $4.25 from England.

Mr. FIELDING. We are relieving them on that score.

Mr. BRODER. Very well.

Malleable iron castings, and pig iron. When used in the manufacture of mowing machines, reapers, harvesters, binders and attachments for binders, 99 per cent drawback.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister tell me how much pig iron will be used under this clause? It is important we should know that.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you mean on each machine?

Mr. FOSTER. How much pig iron do they use in each machine and how much will this be in the aggregate? I want to know the total amount that will probably be deducted from the production of the country by letting this in free.

Mr. FIELDING. The drawback on a six-foot binder is estimated as follows: 300 pounds of pig iron, 37 cents; 500 pounds of rolled steel, $1.73; total, $2.10. Then we put in a saving of 225 pounds malleable at ¾ of a cent per pound, and the reduction of duty from 20 to 17½, 21 cents; making $2.31, which is the estimated concession in this respect to the makers of binders. The reduction of duty from 20 to 17½ per cent on a six-foot binder valued at $97 would be $2.42, so that the concession is estimated to be if anything a little less than the difference.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the farmer get his binder for $2.42 less?

Mr. FIELDING. The farmer who imports an American binder will pay the American price plus the lesser duty.

Mr. BERGERON. The Canadian manufacturer will sell at the same price as the American.

Mr. BRODER.

Mr. FIELDING. I presume so; that is what the manufacturer generally does.

Mr. BERGERON. And it won't make much difference to the farmer.

Mr. FIELDING. Just to the extent of the difference in duty, no more.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister imagine that the farmer will get his binder 50 cents cheaper on account of this?

Mr. FIELDING. Surely.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the Minister of Finance that he will not get it one cent cheaper.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has a curious method of arguing; if any duty is increased which to him does not seem agreeable, he immediately tells us of the dreadful effects of this increased taxation, but when the duty is reduced my hon. friend thinks that no one gets the benefit of it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister of Finance is entirely astray, because I have not undertaken to make such an argument before this House for a long time. Where the duty is reduced to a trifling extent, it does not make much difference in the price one way or the other. The farmer will not get the machine any cheaper. If there were a large reduction in the duty, he would get it somewhat cheaper; but a small reduction is usually taken up by the trade.

Mr. FIELDING. A reduction of $2.50 on one item is not small.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. I am in a position to say that the manufacturers have not reduced the price of binders, or other machines to the trade to the extent of five cents, in consequence of the reduction of duty.

Mr. FIELDING. Then they are foolish to pay the price if they can bring them from the United States that much cheaper.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. The price is the same, because there is a combine, and it is the same thing whether they buy them in Canada or in the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. This is no longer an infant industry that should be fed. I think it is time that it stood by itself.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has given the amount of pig iron and steel used in a six-foot binder. What I want is the total amount of pig iron and steel approximately that will come under this heading in one year.

Mr. PATERSON. We cannot tell the tonnage.

Mr. FOSTER. You ought to know just about the number of machines manufactured last year, and the number that will probably

be manufactured this year, and then it is simply a piece of multiplication. The House does not know what it is conceding when you simply say that in the machine there will be used 500 pounds of the one and 300 pounds of the other. What we want to get at is the total number of tons of these materials that will come under the drawback in virtue of this clause.

Mr. FIELDING. If it is reasonably accessible, we would like to get it.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the amount of malleable iron castings that would go into a six foot binder ?

Mr. FIELDING. 225 pounds.

Item 1007. Flat spring steel, steel billets and steel axle bars, when used in the manufacture of springs and axles for vehicles other than railway or tramway vehicles, drawback, 95 per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR. Am I to understand that the minister will make an arrangement with the manufacturers at Gananoque to allow them to store these materials in bond ?

Mr. PATERSON. We shall be glad to make any arrangement that will not affect the revenue. The goods will be under customs lock and key, and they will have access to them only under the supervision of one of our officers.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is impossible, because they will have to haul them into a yard and pile them there. It only means locking up a large amount of money.

Mr. FIELDING. You will have to trust the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman must remember that these people are protected to the extent of 35 per cent, and they ought to be willing to bear the interest on the amount of the duty from the time the goods come in until they get the drawback. But we will try to meet them without any loss to the revenue or damage in any other way.

Mr. TAYLOR. They will give you any amount of bond, if you require it.

Mr. PATERSON. If the goods are in bond, they will only take out a certain amount at a time. If they take out a month's axles, they will get their money back on that amount.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say is that the minister is storing up an immense amount of trouble and complication for himself. Whenever an article can be put on the free list, I would think it would be better to put it there.

Mr. PATERSON. As far as the minister and the department are concerned, the hon. genteman is perfectly right.

Mr. FOSTER. The expenses will be large also.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, we shall require more officers and have more work altogether. Would the hon. gentleman say we should not do this ? We have had of course complaints, but I do not want to make any allusions to the particulars of these complaints. The trade however complain that these free items for special purposes have been abused, and the only way we can keep track of them is to collect the duty. When a free entry was made, the proprietors would declare that these articles were to be used for that purpose, and no doubt they would make that declaration honestly, but people in other lines had the impression that the thing was abused. You may be sure that we are not doing this with the view of easing the work of the department, because this will entail a good deal of labour and expenditure.

Steel, when used in the manufacture of cutlery, files, augers, auger bits, hammers, axes, hatchets, scythes, reaping hooks, hoes, hay or straw knives, agricultural forks, hand rakes, skates, stove trimmings, bicycle chain and windmills, 95 per cent.

Mr. CROCKET. We have in St. Mary's, N.B., a very important manufactory of cant dogs and peevies. Perhaps the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will remember that I waited on him before the revision of the tariff, when this item was on the free list, and called his attention to the request made by this concern that cant dogs and peevies be included in the items here enumerated. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was not able to state any reason why they should be excluded. I think also the matter was brought to his attention when he was in Fredericton with the Tariff Commission, by an officer of this company. I would ask him whether these cant dogs and peevies could not be included among the articles specified in this item? I presume that the reason for giving this drawback is to encourage the manufacture of these goods in Canada, and I cannot see why the same encouragement should not be given to an industry such as we have at St. Mary's. It is a very important establishment, one, I think but two or three similar factories in the Dominion.

Mr. FIELDING. The duty on this finished article is higher than in some of these others, and therefore that industry is, in that respect, in a better position. Axes are charged 22½ per cent and peevies 30 per cent, so that there is a substantial advantage to the manufacturer of the latter. That in itself is a reason for this distinction.

Mr. DANIEL. The manufacturer of axes and the importer of this steel is put to rather greater disadvantage in this new tariff than some of the other gentlemen

with whom we have been dealing. The duty on their products has been reduced and their raw material has been taken out of the free list and put in schedule B under this drawback. I presume that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), from the fact of his putting this steel into schedule B and giving it a drawback, must have received some information to the effect that this steel, while imported for the purpose of making edged tools, has been used for other purposes. I have not heard him say that he has received such information.

Mr. PATERSON. It could be; I only said it could be.

Mr. DANIEL. What would be more to the point would be information as to whether it has been or not, more especially as these gentlemen have to make affidavits to the fact. The information I have is that it is almost impossible to use this kind of material for other purposes, except for the purpose of making these cutting instruments. Perhaps the minister would reconsider this item and put it, where it was before, on the free-list, especially as the drawback amounts to 99 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. That would be to go back to the old tariff and wipe out schedule B altogether. But this was done after consideration and representation from the trade generally. It would be invidious for me to mention any names or make any particular charges. I can only say that there were complaints—I am not saying that they were well-founded, but no doubt they were made in good faith—that this free entry was being abused. That was no doubt due to errors and mistakes, but there were cases in which we had to impose penalties. Suspicion was aroused that the abuse had gone to a far greater extent than we discovered; and I thought it was only reasonable, if people were getting the concession of free material—chargeable with a rate of duty of 22½ per cent—which gave them that amount of protection over all the material they bought, they ought to be willing to be out of the sum of money paid to customs, from the time of making their entry until they got their drawback. We shall try and give them their drawback as early as we can, and will not make them wait a year. As they turn out their product, and send us a statement which can be checked, we propose to give them their drawbacks. From the departmental standpoint, it is true, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said, that this will entail a lot of work on the Customs Department, and, from that point of view, I would rather have the old system.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) can have given the true reason for the exclusion of peevies and cant dogs from this item. He suggested that it was because these articles were more highly protected than the articles mentioned in the list.

Mr. FIELDING. I gave axes as an illustration.

Mr. CROCKET. I would call attention to the fact that skates, the steel for the manufacture of which is mentioned in this item, bears a duty of 35 per cent, or 5 per cent higher than the duty on cant dogs and peevies. So that the reason he has suggested does not appear to be the true or a good reason to assign for the exclusion of cant dogs and peevies from this item.

Mr. FIELDING. Skates are a very much more advanced product of the steel industry than peevies and cant dogs.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister is not prepared——

Mr. FIELDING. I am not persuaded.

1010. Cloths, of wool, cotton, silk, ramie or unions, fifty inches or over in width and weighing not more than seven ounces per square yard, rubbered, not rubbered or made waterproof—When used in the manufacture of mackintosh clothing, 50 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that on the free list?

Mr. FIELDING. The duty is 15 per cent and we propose to give them one half off, which leaves them about where they were.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these cloths made in this country?

Mr. FIELDING. Some of the cottons probably are, but not the silks. Substantially, this is no change—they get the old concession in another form.

1013. Fabrics of silk and satin, embroidered or embossed chiffon, casket gimps and fringe—When used in the manufacture of burial caskets and burial robes, 65 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. Under an order in council passed in January 7, 1905, the duty was reduced on the following articles when imported by the manufacturers of burial caskets and burial robes for use in their own factories:

Casket gimps and fringes, and embroidered or embossed chiffon—the rate to be reduced from 35 per cent to 10 per cent; silk cloth, including satin, the rate to be reduced from 30 per cent to 10 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the government power to refuse a duty?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew it had power to put an article on the free list.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, we called attention in a previous session to the fact that the power to make free seemed to involve the power to reduce the duty. There might be cases in which we would not want to

give up the whole duty, but might wish to reduce it. That is allowed under the present law.

Mr. FOSTER. How long is it since that was done ?

Mr. FIELDING. This order in council to which I have just referred was passed in 1905. The change was some time before that.

Mr. FOSTER. My recollection is that the principle upon which governments have acted is that they had a right by order in council to repeal a duty, but they had no right to vary. What the minister says is all news to me—that the government, sitting in council, has the power to vary duties. It is quite true that the power to take off a duty altogether argues the power to reduce it. But I do not think that was ever contemplated in the law.

Mr. FIELDING. I feel sure we got the authority of parliament for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the minister to tell me where it is.

Mr. FIELDING. I remember distinctly bringing the matter before the House. It seems to me that if we had the power to give a man a dollar we ought to have the power to give him fifty cents. I do not think the matter admits of any doubt. There might be cases in which manufacturers would show that they would be able to advance their industry if we would reduce the duty. This we might be willing to grant and yet not be willing to grant the abolition of the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the power ?

Mr. FIELDING. As I say, I have a distinct recollection of having brought the matter before parliament and having carried it. I find that it was in 1903—section 13 of the amendment of the Customs Act of that year. By it the government received power to make regulations to reduce the duties on all articles, whether natural products or products of manufacture, used as materials in Canadian manufactures.

Mr. FOSTER. You have not made a law to enable you to raise a duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be the next step.

Mr. FIELDING. That will have to come under a government not so mindful of constitutional safeguards as the present one.

Mr. CROCKET. You are taking that power under the present tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket), by a forced construction of the law, made it so appear.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister said that this was equivalent to a duty of 10 per cent on these articles ?

Mr. FIELDING. We aim to leave them in the same condition as before.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be simpler, and easier and better to put on a duty of 10 per cent, instead of compelling them to pay it and then applying for a drawback.

Mr. FIELDING. We have been discussing that for some time. But that way of doing it is apt to lead to an abuse of the law by the importation of the articles under the low rate of duty for another purpose.

1015. Rolled angles of iron or steel, nine and ten gauge, not over one and one-half inches wide—when used in the manufacture of bedsteads, 99 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. That was free before.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these articles made in this country ?

Mr. FIELDING. A small quantity is made in Canada.

1019. Bituminous coal, subject to drawback when imported by proprietors of smelting works and converted at the works into coke for the smelting of metals from ores, portion of duty payable at drawback, 99 per cent.

Mr. BOYCE. Does that meet the request of the steel companies?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. The principle is that as coke is free it would seem only reasonable that the material out of which coke is made should be free. Any thing touching the coal duties naturally arouses suspicion on the part of the coal mining community. If we take the concrete case of the Sault Ste. Marie operations, we can see the reason for this item. Coke is brought in from the United States for smelting operations at the large Sault Ste. Marie works because coal would have to pay a duty, they could not bring in coal to make their own coke. We thought it only reasonable that as coke was brought in free, if they saw fit to bring coal in and establish a coking plant on the Canadian side, there would be no injury to the coal mining interest anywhere, and there would be that much additional labour established on the Canadian side rather than on the American side.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister made any calculation as to what duty he is going to lose?

Mr. FIELDING. We do not lose any. At present coal does not come in free, but the coke comes in free. They bring in coke from the American side because they say that while the duty on coal remains it won't pay them to make coke in Canada, and they bring it in. In Nova Scotia they make the coke, also in the west.

Mr. BOYCE. They use 500 tons of coke a day at Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. FIELDING. When this thing was first proposed the coal interests looked upon it with suspicion, and I have sufficient appreciation of the value of the coal mining industry to be mindful of it, but I am satisfied that in this instance we simply transfer the making of coke from the United States to the Canadian side of the Soo, and that is a very desirable object.

Mr. FOSTER. How would it do to make coke dutiable now?

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman had set us an example like that we might have attempted to follow it.

Mr. PATERSON. 480,000 tons of it came in. We should get the making of a large part of that in our own country.

1014. Nickel, nickel silver and German silver, in bars, rods, strips, sheets and plates, subject to drawback when used in the manufacture of spoons and cutlery, portion of duty payable, 65 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. This is the item on which the member for North Toronto (Mr Foster) asked for some information in regard to glass. We are going to give them a lower rate, give them back a part of the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what you call the raw plate glass.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, a half manufactured article which is partly finished in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to ask the minister if, when they were going around the country getting information in regard to the question of duty on these various lines, they made any inquiry to ascertain whether parties engaged in this line were in combination with the understanding that they should all sell alike?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, that was very often a subject of inquiry.

Mr. SPROULE. What information did you get in regard to glass?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not recollect that it was alleged before us that there was any combination in glass. There were some complaints as to the British glass manufacturers not being willing to sell generally in Canada, but only through certain specified agents, which some persons objected to. But I do not think there was any complaint of a combination.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that a traveller would only sell for certain houses; the glass must be purchased through certain houses, and it was all one price. The information was given to me that a travelling agent stated that the trade do their business only through certain channels; that no matter where you purchased plate glass you have to pay the same price. Some time ago I know that statement was made by a travelling agent who was selling, I think, for the Pilkington house in England. There is no other conclusion than that there was an understanding in the trade somewhere or other, that either certain houses would handle the trade in that line, or that there was an understanding in regard to the wholesale price, no matter who sold it.

Mr. PATERSON. We do not make that in Canada. That question did come up; it was charged that an English firm would not sell except through its own agents, and there was quite an argument in our presence that lasted until after midnight, one affirming one thing and another affirming another thing, and finally the Pilkington agent, to prove that he would sell agreed to take any order right there and then from this man who was complaining that he could not buy from them.

Mr. SPROULE. It was contended that the glass all came in from one company but was manufactured in different countries, and no matter what country it came from you paid the same price for it. That led to the inference that there must be some understanding among the people who handled it here as to what price it should be sold at. The traveller would have no hesitancy in the world in telling you that it does not make any difference; that you might as well take it from him because you cannot do any better. If you send to Toronto or Montreal you have to pay the same price. The traveller will say: You might as well place your order now, because it will go up 15 cents a foot inside a certain time. Fifteen cents a foot is a big jump on plate glass. It is apparently going up all the time if you listen to what the trade tell you. They seem to know beforehand and that suggests that there is an understanding come to amongst those engaged in the trade that they will stand by a certain price.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. In regard to the question of glass I handle a considerable quantity of it and I agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that in so far as plate glass is concerned there is a combination ordinarily speaking. The Consolidated Plate Glass Company of Canada handles nearly all the plate glass which comes into Canada except that which comes from the Pilkington concern in England. They have an agent now in Montreal. When we can get quotations from the Toronto Plate Glass Company or from any of the three glass concerns in Montreal asking for plate glass to be delivered at any given point, for instance Ottawa, or even nearer to Montreal or at Whitby we find that there are practically but two concerns in Canada

dealing in plate glass. These are the Consolidated Plate Gass Company and the Pilkingtons, and if you get a quotation you we find that they will be practically the same, freight paid and delivered to any point in Canada. It makes no difference, as the hon. gentleman from East Grey says, which concern you order from, the price will be the same delivered. Any person in the trade always buys the plate glass delivered. I think the hon. gentleman is a little off in speaking about quotations for other glass.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not speaking in regard to any knowledge I have during the last year, but I do know that before that this condition existed because I was obliged several times to buy glass and I know the fluctations.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The fluctuations in plate glass have not been one quarter what they have been in ordinary glass. A few years ago we were buying ordinary glass for ninety cents a box when we were buying plate glass for ten cents a foot, whereas we are now paying $4 a box. Plate glass has remained at very nearly the same price. A combination exists in reference to plate glass but in reference to the other glass there is no combination.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not so sure about the other glass.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I know there is no combination in that. I do not buy any glass except what I import from Germany or England.

Mr. PATERSON. Can you buy plate glass direct from Belgium or English houses?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I think not. They handle it through the Consolidated Plate Glass Company of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Consolidated Plate Glass Company of Canada is composed of the various firms which were handling it before and which have come together as a combine and that is where I consider the combine is. The Consolidated Plate Glass Company is made up of the individual concerns that were acting separately before.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. No, the Pilkingtons are not in that. Invariably when I get quotations all of the others, on a $150 order, will be within a dollar or two, but the Pilkintons will vary their quotations probably by $10 or $15. I have had them as much as $22 below the others on a $180 order. Of course I have had them as much as $5 or $6 above the others. I do not know just on what line they figure their prices but I have found that they are not in the combination to the same extent as the others. I have had quotations from Hamilton and Toronto firms, from Montreal and the Consolidated people and they would come within 25 or 30 cents of each other, never varying more than $2, but I have found the Pilkingtons varying as much as $24 or $25 on an order of the size I have mentioned. I do not think they are in the combine.

Schedule 'C.'

1208. Metallic trading checks.

Mr. FIELDING. We place metallic trading checks in the list of prohibited goods because they may be regarded as coins. It has been represented to us that there could never be danger in circulating metallic checks where they are not circular. If we allowed circular checks to be imported they might be mistaken for our coins.

Mr. SPROULE. Are circular checks used in trade? My information is that they are not. We have frequent inquiries from parties as to whether they can be used or not. Is it illegal to use a platinum check?

Mr. FIELDING. There may be a doubt about it. I am half inclined to think that the Criminal Code would prohibit them now. However, we should not encourage their importation. We may require legislation to prevent their use in Canada, but certainly hon. gentlemen will agree that we should not allow them to be imported.

Mr. PATERSON. We have just these two items, leather and boots and shoes; can we go on with them to-night?

Mr. FOSTER. I think you had better allow these to stand.

Mr. PATERSON. How long?

Mr. FOSTER. Till the next sitting.

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, this question of drawbacks is a pretty heavy item with some people and they are now anxious to know how they can get their drawbacks. We cannot make any regulations until this becomes law.

Mr. FOSTER. Friday night is a night when there are very few here.

Mr. PATERSON. Will you take it up on Monday?

Mr. FOSTER. On Monday then; our people will be back.

Mr. FIELDING. I would like to draw attention to the amendments to the resolutions one of which was very fully considered before. That is in regard to the exemption of binder twine from the dumping clause. It was represented, hon. gentlemen will remember, that we are making a certain class of binder twine in Canada and sending it to the United States, and the danger was that if we subjected binder twine from the United States to the dumping duty it would be taken to be within the meaning of the American tariff, and the effect would be to shut us out from the

privilege we now enjoy of exporting that special class of binder twine to the United States. There was something in the criticism, and we have concluded to amend the wording of the resolution by taking the exact words of the American tariff which admits certain classes of binder twine free; we say that as respects that particular class of binder twine, using the very words of the American tariff, the dumping duty shall not apply. In that way we prevent the giving of any justification to our American friends for imposing a duty on this twine, which is made by a number of factories in Canada and which is exported to the United States. I have reason to believe that in this form, the amendment is in no manner open to any objection.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

On resolution No. 4,

That it is expedient to provide that the provisions of the foregoing resolutions shall be deemed to have come into operation on the 30th day of November, 1906, and to apply and to have applied to all goods imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on or after that day, and to have also applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that day except as otherwise provided in the resolutions: provided that goods which were imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption and on which duty was paid on or after the 30th day of November, 1906, and prior to the 12th day of February, 1907, in accordance with the rate of duty set forth as payable on such goods in the resolutions respecting the duties of customs introduced in the House of Commons on the 29th day of November, 1906, shall not be subject to further payment of duty by reason of such rate of duty having been increased by any resolution or amendment introduced subsequently to that in accordance with which such duty was paid.

Mr. FIELDING. I mentioned to the House the other day that we desire to interpret this tariff as liberally as possible towards the importer and we propose to adopt this rule: That where, since the presentation of the tariff some weeks ago, we have in any case increased the duty, we do not propose to go back and collect it. We say to the importer that he has made his entry, and his business has been based on that, and we will not disturb it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right.

Mr. FIELDING. On the other hand, if as a result of further discussion we have come to the conclusion that the duty was too high and we have reduced it, we will give him the benefit and in that case we will not reopen the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Even though he sold on the duty as it was?

Mr. FIELDING. Even so.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Take a case where the old tariff of 20 per cent was raised to 30 per cent, and which in the interval has been placed upon the free list. Would all of the duty be given back, or would the old rate of duty be charged?

Mr. PATERSON. If they were made free, he would be entitled to his duty back since the date of the budget.

Mr. FIELDING. We have done a fair days work, and I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What business for Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. We would like, if it were convenient, to wind up the tariff; if there is any delay or difficulty in doing that, the Postmaster General will bring on his Labour Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be no difficulty in taking the tariff in the afternoon or may be in the evening.

Mr. FIELDING. Failing that, it will be the Labour Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 11, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to move:

That the Hon. Jacques Bureau be appointed to the following committees: Privileges and Elections; Debates; Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines; Private Bills; Banking and Commerce, and Agriculture.

These are the committees on which Mr. Bureau was.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to move that Mr. Pius Michaud be appointed to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON ACT, AMENDMENTS.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 109) to amend the Yukon Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is this Bill about?

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of the Bill is to provide for the appointment of an acting Commissioner of the Yukon, and to legalize the action already taken by the acting commissioner.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROPRIETARY AND PATENT MEDICINES.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue if it is intended to proceed this session with Bill (No. 99) respecting proprietary and patent medicines? It is stated in the newspapers that the Bill may be postponed, and, as it is an important measure, I would like to get information on that point now.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). There is no determination to postpone the Bill. We have been receiving the views of those interested in the trade, and we will meet several delegations this week. The postponement of the consideration of the Bill has been due to that fact; we may reach it next week.

Mr. BERGERON. Does that mean that it will go on this session?

REPORT OF THE INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I wish to ask the Minister of Finance if he knows where these exhibits are in connection with the Insurance Commission report? I cannot find them in the record office, and I am afraid they are dumped somewhere outside.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). If they were not sent to the House with the report, I suppose they are in the hands of the commission; but they can be found.

Mr. FOSTER. They ought to be in the custody of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I know of no reason to the contrary.

Mr. FOSTER. They are an integral part of the evidence.

Mr. FIELDING. I will see the secretary of the commission about it. I presume the commission would be quite willing to turn them over to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the commission has anything to say about that. They are part and parcel of the report and they are incorporated in the report, and should have been laid on the table of the House along with the evidence.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not expect there is any trouble over the matter, but I think the commission as a body can determine, subject to the ultimate view of the House, what shall be done. If the commission has not sent them in, they are under the control of the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not belong to the commission at all.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Speaking of that insurance report, would the Minister of Finance say if the government intend to deal with it by legislation this session?

Mr. FIELDING. It would depend on the condition of business. I think the probability is that the question is too large to be taken up at the present stage of the session. But I would not like to give any definite answer.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There will have to be a debate on it.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CENTRAL CANADA MANUFACTURERS' FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Mr. CALVERT. I wish that this Bill should stand. I am awaiting instructions from the promoters of the Bill, and I would ask that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 82) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Gervais.

On section 8,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I want to ask the Minister of Railways why the Grand Trunk have withdrawn clause 9 of this Bill, and if by its withdrawal they confess that they propose to give effect to the penny-a-mile clause in their original charters? Is this withdrawal a confession by the Grand Trunk that that which they wished to have repealed is, as a matter of fact, in force and is to be enforced in this country? The public of this country voted £3,000 per mile for the original construction of the Grand Trunk, and with that great franchise went the condition that a certain kind of service was to be given to the public. The Grand Trunk have never performed that service, and, as far as I can understand now, the government have refused to entertain a proposal of the Grand Trunk that that condition in the original

charter should be repealed. If that is so, the people of Canada are entitled to an explanation from the government. One of the main organs of the government said not long ago that this was a very important issue, that it would have to be dealt with, and that the Grand Trunk would be held to account for the performance of what it had undertaken to do in its original charter. We are entitled to an explanation in regard to this great question; and it is a great question, because the Grand Trunk charter occupies exactly the same position that the Canadian Pacific Railway charter and the Grand Trunk Pacific charter occupy with reference to the parliament and people of this country. If it comes to be recognized in this country that the provisions of these charters—and every one of them carry great subventions and the credit of the country—are put in simply for the railway companies to break and ignore them, and to be free, in the face of their very defiance of the law, to enter into new negotiations with the state, then things have reached a pretty pass in this country. The government are bound to make an explanation to the public as to whether the Grand Trunk Railway Company is to be required to give that penny-a-mile service, and whether the government, especially the Minister of Railways, intends to enforce the performance of that duty.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no particular explanation to make with respect to this Bill. I, in common with the other members of the Railway Committee took into consideration Bill (No. 82), and when it was announced by the solicitors representing the promoters that clause 9 would be withdrawn, we passed the Bill without that clause. My hon. friend was present at the committee, and heard the statement in common with myself, and no further action was taken with respect to it. I am not the father confessor of that Railway Company nor of any other railway company, and I am very thankful that I am not in such a position. The promoters having withdrawn that section, there was no occasion for any further action on it to be taken by the Railway Committee. We assume that every railway in Canada is bound to respect the law, and whatever the provisions of the Act of 1852, incorporating the Grand Trunk Railway Company may be, I certainly, in common with all the other members of this committee, would not for a moment question that the Grand Trunk would be bound by those provisions.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the hon. gentleman is not the father confessor of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, he is the Minister of Railways of this country, is paid a large salary, and has a large department under him. He has his own legal department, who will advise him that there has been a breach of the law in this case.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend mean in withdrawing that section? It was entirely eliminated from the Bill?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I know it was, but in that way the minister's attention has been called to this grievance of the public, for which I am demanding some kind of cure. The Minister of Railways says he hopes the Grand Trunk will obey the law. He ought to do more: he ought to compel the Grand Trunk to obey the law when it has been found to be a defaulter. They have confessed their default by their conduct of last week. They found that public opinion would not stand for the repeal of that charter, and public opinion looks to the government of the day for its enforcement. Does the Prime Minister remember how he used to thunder——

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise the point of order; how can a clause which has been dropped be discussed by an hon. member of this committee? It does not appear in the Bill.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. He wants to talk all the time; let him talk.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Here is the same old sidetracking of the argument I am making. I think I am quite in order. In the old days the Prime Minister used to storm against the Canadian Pacific Railway charter, and he and his friends used to hold debates in this House to show how the provisions in that charter were not carried out; and he has claimed credit that on one occasion he rectified a grievance of the people in the west by reason of certain negotiations of his in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Therefore he upheld the doctrine of the sanctity of these contracts, and the duty of the government of the day to see that they are observed. Here is the charter of the Grand Trunk Railway, and in it this provision is set out:

3. And be it enacted, that the gauge of the said railway shall be five feet six inches; and the fare or charge for each first-class passenger by any train on the said railway, shall not exceed two pence currency for each mile travelled, the fare or charge for each second-class passenger by any train on the said railway, shall not exceed one penny and one-half penny currency for each mile travelled, and the fare or charge for each third-class passenger by any train on the said railway, shall not exceed one penny currency for each mile travelled; and that at least one train having in it third-class carriages shall run every day throughout the length of the line.

These very words in the charters of all British railroads gave the people of Great Britain that excellent penny-a-mile service which they have to-day; and if the same provision were enforced in Canada, it would give the people of Canada the same thing. Why has this clause been struck

out of this Bill ? Is it because the ministry insisted on it going out ? It was told in the committee that the reason this clause was withdrawn was that the government would not stand for it ; they wanted it out. If they did, they should go further and insist on this provision of the charter being lived up to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Who said that the government wanted it out ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I was told in the committee by a gentleman responsible for what he said with reference to that Bill that the Minister of Railways wished it out.

An hon. MEMBER. Who was it ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I was told by the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway, Mr. Biggar ; and on behalf of the people of this country, I ask now, the solicitor of the Grand Trunk, having withdrawn the clause, as he informed me at the request of the Minister of Railways, do the government intend to make any move for the enforcement of that law ? Or does it come down to the question which I raised last year, and which I am going to raise again at the first opportunity, whether the federal law is to be enforced or is to be a farce, or whether we are to go to the provinces for its enforcement ? I do not raise this question to annoy any one, but I think I am entitled to an answer.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to say that I made no statement in the committee to the effect that the government were opposed to the Bill in any way, and I made no request personally or on behalf of the government to Mr. Biggar or any one else with respect to the Bill. Mr. Biggar made the announcement as to what he proposed to do. Mr. Biggar probably has some knowledge of my own personal views in the matter, but they are not relevant to the discussion of the Bill here now. But so far as the government is concerned, there was no announcement made to the committee nor was there an announcement made to Mr. Biggar. Mr. Biggar stated to me that it was his purpose to withdraw the clause. That was a matter for him to determine.

Mr. LENNOX. The section I want to call attention to has been passed but the Bill was mentioned as No. 81 and it was not until just recently that it was noticed that it is Bill No. 82. What I wish to speak of is in reference to section 7. I proposed an amendment to section 7 and it will serve my purpose quite as well, I think, to propose that amendment on the motion to read the Bill the third time. I would ask that the Bill should not have its third reading to-day and if that is understood I do not propose to move the amendment now because I want to draft it carefully. It is on the lines I mentioned the other day and I will move it on the third reading if the minister will allow it to stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no reason why the Bill should be pressed to a third reading and while I have not charge of it, it being a private Bill and I being in no way responsible for it, I certainly would concur in the desire of my hon. friend.

Mr. LENNOX. The promoter of the Bill is not in the House at the present time.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has spoken of the provisions of the original charter of the Grand Trunk which was a copy of the English charters of that day making provision for first, second and third-class accommodation. I think it is considered in Canada that the third class is entirely obsolete and that we have no desire on this continent to have such a class. I think there is on all Canadian railways a second-class fare of two cents per mile. I know that is true with respect to the Intercolonial Railway and it is certainly true with respect to some portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway and I think as well with respect to the Grand Trunk on certain sections. My hon. friend, of course, seems to be particularly the champion of a two-cent first-class passenger rate. In speaking of the matter in this House the other night he cited the state of Nebraska and I read only to-day in one of the newspapers the result of the movement there for a two-cent rate. This is an item taken from the papers published on March 8th :

> The two cent per mile passenger fare Bill recently passed by the Nebraska legislature became a law yesterday. Simultaneously with the Bill coming into effect the railroads in Nebraska, including the Union Pacific, the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, the Chicago and Northwestern, the Missouri Pacific and the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific issued circulars absolutely abolishing all classes of reduced fares.

That is the effect of the two cent rate Bill in Nebraska. It is followed by the Nebraska railways cancelling all classes of reduced fares. That would be a matter for consideration by hon. gentlemen in considering the question as to whether we should impose upon the railways at this stage in Canada a uniform rate of two cents per mile for first-class passenger accommodation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Now, the minister once more has shown his incompetency for the position which he holds. He says on the floor of this House, as he has said repeatedly, that there is provision in Canada for second-class accommodation and for a rate of two cents a mile on nearly all the railways. It is not so. It is not so on the

Grand Trunk and it is not so on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said on portions of them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then tell me the portions. The hon. minister talks about portions; he may show that the two cent rate is in force on one tenth of these roads when it should be in force on ten tenths.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am speaking of the eastern section where my experience has been had.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then, the Minister of Railways should not talk of his experience. He should speak of his knowledge because he should know the fare on every mile of railway in this country and he should speak by the book. I challenge him that if he will show me one instance where you can get it I will show him twenty instances where he cannot get it. He spoke of the Canadian Pacific Railway and I will give him an instance that came under my notice recently. A doctor in Lindsay asked for a second class ticket on the Canadian Pacific Railway and he could not get it because that is a branch line there. When he went to Myrtle he got it You cannot get a two cent a mile ticket every where in Canada. There is no two cent a mile or second-class rate on the western division of the Grand Trunk. There is no second-class ticket sold from Toronto for Niagara Falls, Hamilton, London or Detroit. There is no second-class ticket sold at two cents a mile between Toronto and Montreal excepting between the two cities themselves and in that way the Grand Trunk pretend to obey the law. Now, the hon. Minister speaks about Nebraska and here is where he shows his profundity; he says that in Nebraska the people are getting a two cent a mile rate but that the moment they got that all their other privileges were withdrawn. At least there is a square deal and every man will be treated alike. I tell him that fifteen states have passed two cent a mile laws without any of the privileges theretofore existing having been withdrawn. In Ohio I proved in this House that not only had a two cent a mile rate been adopted but I also gave the proof on the authority of the Railway Commissioners that not a single privilege theretofore existing had been withdrawn and I also gave the authority of the Railway Commissioners for the statement that the railways have earned over a million dollars more within the three months during which this law has been in force than they did previously. So that, before the Minister of Railways gets up on the floor of this House and begins to tell us what he knows about the two cent a mile proposition and about the way it is spreading over the country he should make himself acquainted with the subject. He is trying to make the people believe that the two cent a mile proposition is a dangerous one. and he inferred that it was still more dangerous because it involved a third class penny a mile service. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) said the other day that the people wanted no penny a mile service if they had to stand up in open cars and travel like cattle. They do not need to do that. If in England the third class penny a mile service means so and so it means the same thing in Canada and if there is progression in England in regard to what that service is there must be the same progression in this country and I think a little more. Although the hon. member for Glengarry derided that service the other day they have secured in England a splendid penny a mile service and we would secure the same thing in Canada. All that would be necessary would be that the government should enforce the federal law as it is the duty of the government to do. Evidently the government do not believe in enforcing the law. They only believe in making laws and in humbugging the people. The government make laws, spread them before the people and ask to be praised for making these laws although they had no intention of enforcing them. They say: Look what we have done; read these statutes, but when you come to the application of them the Minister of Railways says that he does not know whether the two cent a mile law is in force or not. He is not even going to concern himself to find out.

Mr. EMMERSON. What law is that?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The penny a mile third-class service under the Grand Trunk charter. It is on the statute-book. I read it to the hon. gentleman. Does he intend to enforce it?

Mr. EMMERSON. Did I question whether it was there or not?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will tell the hon. gentleman what happened. I put the question in this House three times whether this was the law. The Minister of Justice dodged the question on two occasions. But on the third occasion, the Minister of Finance, who, by the way, is not in his place at the moment—said that this was a lawyer's question, and a great deal could be said on both sides, and he must leave it there—and there it was left. And up to this day, this government, with its expensive legal department and its expensive railway department, does not know whether this is the law of the land or not, and, if it is the law of the land, the government does not know whether it is going to enforce the law or not. I think that this is a question worthy the attention of the government for a great many people are interested in it. Here is the significance of it: If the government can secure this penny-a-mile

service on the Grand Trunk, it means that there will be a similar service all over the country. If the Grand Trunk give the penny-a-mile rate on a portion of its system, it must extend it to all, and, in that case the Canadian Pacific must follow. That is proven by the experience of Manitoba, which, of course, the Minister of Railways has not forgotten. Some years ago the Canadian Northern made an agreement with the province of Manitoba to give a three-cent-a-mile rate in that province. That was all there was to it, so far as any agreement was concerned; but the moment that agreement went into force, the Canadian Pacific came down to the same rate. So the whole future of this reduced passenger service rests on the vindication of this law. As I told the Prime Minister, if he wishes to avoid the responsibility of interfering with his friends the Grand Trunk directly, all he has to do is to put the law in motion and say that he was forced to do so. The effect would be that there would be a penny-a-mile service all over the country. And it would be a good service, just as it is a good service in England—good cars, fast trains, and penny-a-mile cars on every train. It is true that, according to the original charter the Grand Trunk were not obliged to run more than one train a day, each way, that is all the law they have in England. But in enforcing it, they have a splendid service. And if we should enforce it here to-day, the result would be a splendid service to Canada. I cannot see that the Minister of Railways has made a very advantageous exhibition of himself in discussing this question, because he has shown that he has no knowledge whatsoever, no actual and accurate knowledge, of what the railways are doing in regard to the two-cent-a-mile service, whether second or third class. The railways refused it when asked for it, as they did in the case of the gentleman from Lindsay whom I quoted. This happens to-day because the Minister of Justice will not enforce the law and the railways feel that they can defy the law for that reason. The Minister of Justice takes the position that, outside of any special duty imposed upon him, the administration of the law rests with the attorney generals of the provinces. And, now, as I have that question up, I wish to direct the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to something he said here the other day with regard to the enforcement of the law. The Minister of Justice said that, if any special duty in the enforcement of the law were imposed upon him or if any department of the government gave him a case, he would see that their rights were maintained. And he was endorsed by the Prime Minister. This shows that it does not do for even a Prime Minister to undertake the interpretation of the British North America Act unless he has recently perused it. The right hon. gentleman had failed to read section 101——

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Johnston). Order. I would direct the attention of the hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to the fact that the question before the committee is: Shall Bill (No. 82) be adopted?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will abide by your ruling on that score, Mr. Chairman. I shall be able to discuss the matter a little later on. But I would remind you that it was the Minister of Railways who raised this whole discussion. I had sat down, having finished what I had to say; but the hon. gentleman wanted to show what lore he had in regard to railway tariffs. He lost his bearings, and I was simply trying to help him out. I will return to the question before the day is over.

Mr. SPROULE. This Bill was hurried through before we had time to get it. There is another question on which I would like an opinion. Clause 3 empowers the company to acquire 'lands, water lots, wharfs, docks, and so on.' I desire to know if this has anything to do with the land sold or granted to this company or one of its allies on Kaien island or adjoining territory. And I would like to know if the government have looked into this matter and intend to ratify the sale of that land without safeguarding the reversionary right of the province of British Columbia in the land. As the members of the government know, the claim is put forth on behalf of the province of British Columbia that, when that land is given up by the Indians the reversionary right is in the Crown and the Crown is represented by the province. Is it the intention to assist the company to take this land in violation of the rights of the province?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is straining the matter a little far, when he takes occasion, on the discussion of a Grand Trunk Railway Bill to refer to the operations of a different company in an entirely different section of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. This is part of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, my hon. friend knows that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is an entirely different corporation.

Mr. SPROULE. In name they are different but in reality they are one.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, they are entirely different. My hon. friend knows that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is simply the guarantor for the Grand Trunk Pacific. But, however, that is neither here nor there——

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that we gave them power to take over the Grand Trunk Pacific and that we gave the Grand

Trunk Pacific power to amalgamate with the Grand Trunk ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend was before the Railway Committee I presume, and heard the explanations that I heard. The question was asked of the solicitor of the company what lands these powers referred to——

Mr. SPROULE. I did not happen to be there when any explanation of that kind was given.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then, I will repeat the explanation to my hon. friend. A question has arisen as to whether the Grand Trunk Company has power to take action in Canada with regard to real estate in Great Britain. It appears that they propose to have offices there, and they want to remove doubts on that subject. This clause has special relation to that point so that they may take necessary action with regard to certain office buildings in Great Britain.

Mr. SPROULE. 'Canada or elsewhere,' that means Great Britain. I take it that we could not grant any powers to them to acquire and hold land in Great Britain; all we can do is to deal with the Dominion of Canada. It seems to me that is quite superfluous.

Mr. EMMERSON. We could give them power to hold lands abroad, but of course they would have to hold them subject to the laws of Great Britain. Last year we gave power to a company to acquire lands in Mexico, and on another occasion to a company to acquire lands in Cuba and Brazil. But of course these powers are always subject to the laws of the land in which they are to be exercised.

QUESTIONS.

WHARF AT BAY OF SEVEN ISLANDS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. What is the total cost to date of the wharf or wharfs erected by the government at the bay of Seven Islands, P.Q. ?
2. Were said works done by tender publicly called ?
3. Is the work finished ?
4. What is the population of the locality where said works have been located ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. $90,304.70.
2. No.
3. Last fall. Public tenders were asked for for the completion of the work, due October 27, 1906, as a result of which a contract was entered into and the work is at present progressing towards completion under such contract.
4. Large works are established there and the population is variable according to the number of hands employed. The department has no knowledge of any census ever having been taken.

BREWERIES AND DISTILLERIES IN LOCAL OPTION MUNICIPALITIES.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Have any petitions or other communications been received by the government asking that in local option municipalities breweries and distilleries in such municipalities be prohibited from selling their products for consumption therein ?
2. If so is it the intention of the government to prohibit them ?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1 and 2. One communication has been received from the Department of Inland Revenue asking that in local option municipalities breweries and distilleries in such municipalities be prohibited from selling their products for consumption therein. This was from Mr. John McQuaker, of Owen Sound, who wrote to ascertain if the department could cancel licenses of brewers to sell in local option municipalities. The reply made by the department was that the license to sell having been obtained under the authority of provincial legislation the proper source of redress was that under which these sales were being made and it was suggested that Mr. McQuaker should make his appeal to these authorities.

LEE-ENFIELD AND ROSS RIFLES.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. In what year were Lee-Enfield rifles first issued to members of the Canadian militia ?
2. Since then, how many Lee-Enfield rifles have been issued to members of Canadian militia and Northwest Mounted Police, giving numbers to each force separately ?
3. In what year were Ross rifles first issued to members of Canadian militia ?
4. How many Ross rifles have been issued to members of Canadian militia and Northwest Mounted Police, respectively ?
5. How many Ross rifles have been used on active service or at target practice by members of Canadian militia and Northwest Mounted Police ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence.)

1. 1896.
2. (a) to militia forces and rifle associations, 39,550 ; (b) To Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 450.
3. 1905.

4. (a) To militia forces and rifle associations, 5,019; (b) To Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 1,000.

5. The information in possession of the Department of Militia and Defence and the Royal Northwest Mounted Police does not enable a specific answer to be given to this question. The numbers stated above were issued to the militia and rifle associations and the Royal Northwest Mounted Police respectively, but it is impossible to say how many of that number were actually used at target practice.

IRRIGATION IN WESTERN PROVINCES.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY—by Mr. Blain—asked:

To what extent, if any, is the government, or any department thereof, carrying on investigations in the western provinces, bearing upon the measurement of streams and the conservation of the water supply for irrigation and other purposes by the location and withdrawal from sale and settlement of natural reservoir sites?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Investigations have been carried on by the staff of the office of the Commissioner of Irrigation since the year 1894 in Southern Alberta and Southwestern Saskatchewan, and by order in council of the 27th September, 1897, a large number of reserves were made for reservoir sites. Last season three parties were in the field. One party was occupied in gauging the rivers and large streams to determine the flow of water therein and in obtaining general information for the hydrographic branch. The two other parties were employed in gauging the smaller creeks in addition and in inspecting works in connection with irrigation schemes.

SALVATION ARMY IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. RALPH SMITH—by Mr. Duncan Ross—asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to the following circular being issued in Canada by the Salvation Army, and to the comments thereon, by the Hamilton 'Herald,' as follows: 'Two documents have reached the 'Herald' which show that the Salvation Army has undertaken to bring out to Canada British mechanics and labourers and supply them to employers who may apply for this class of help. The Salvation Army officials are not publicly exploiting this phase of immigration work. The documents printed below are not promiscuously distributed. They are carefully placed only where it is thought that advantage will be taken of the means afforded by the army project of obtaining a supply of cheap labour.'

The first of the documents is a circular letter sent to manufacturers. It is as follows:

Dear Sir,—I have the pleasure to inform you that during the past three years the Salvation Army has been successful in selecting and bringing to this country nearly twenty thousand very desirable immigrants from all parts of Great Britain. Next season we hope to still further develop this important branch of our work, and among those emigrating through the agency of the Salvation Army there will doubtless be some very good mechanics and labourers of all kinds, for whom we desire to secure suitable positions.

Seeing that your firm is interested in the employment of labour, we have reason to hope that you will co-operate with us in this matter, and if you can possibly assist in placing some worthy and desirable people in positions, we are confident that you will do so.

If you have any vacancies at present, or are likely to require men during the coming season, I shall be obliged if you will kindly set forth your requirements on the attached application form, and return at your earliest convenience, when we shall be pleased to give same our careful attention.

Yours very truly,
THOMAS HOWELL,
Secretary for Immigration.

The other document is the application form mentioned in the letter. At the top it displays the names of Thos. B. Coombs, commissioner, and Brigadier Thos. Howell, with the lettering: 'The Salvation Army Immigration Department and Bureau of Labour. Manufacturers' Application Form.' There are ten blanks which the manufacturer is requested to fill, the information desired being as follows: 1. Number of mechanics required. 2. Nature of employment. 3. Wages per hour or day. 4. Number of men required for labouring work. 5. Wages per hour or day. 6. Will your firm furnish permanent employment for satisfactory men? 7. Can houses be procured suitable for workingmen? 8. Probable rent per month. 9. Date men will be required. 10. Please state whether open or union shop.

The 'Herald' has inquired of several trades unionists whether they knew of this phase of the Salvation Army's immigration work, but they all expressed ignorance of it. The public significance of the project is referred to on the editorial page.

2. Does the Salvation Army receive any assistance from the government in this connection?

3. Does the government have any guarantee that money paid to the Salvation Army for immigrants of the domestic class will not be applied in importing mechanics and artisans?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes, to the circular which is alluded to in the following letter:

THE SALVATION ARMY.

Transportation and Immigration Offices
James and Albert streets,
Toronto, Ont., March 1, 1907.

W. D. Scott, Esq.,
Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Scott,—I noticed in the 'Toronto Evening News' last night an article on the Salvation Army and Mechanics, and that the matter had been referred to the Labour Solicitor with instructions to bring the matter before the government. I think it is fitting that you should know our position in the mat-

ter. It is quite understood that among those who are coming to Canada there is a small percentage of mechanics. Many of those people are not prepared to sacrifice their trades to go on farms. The result is that they make for such cities as Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and the larger cities of Ontario and the west. It has been, and is yet, the policy of the army to distribute those people where there is a demand for the various kinds of labour. We send a circular around to all the firms we can get in touch with, and find out from them as far as possible the needs. We then send our representative to interview them, and also to interview some of the workmen to find out if the shop is an open shop or union shop, and if there is any trouble there. If we find there is any labour difficulties we advise the people to keep away and thus protect the labour interest. If we find that the firms are anxious to get men in order to reduce wages we avoid sending the people to such firms. We have the workingman's interest at heart, and if the labour unions would only confer with us instead of publishing all kinds of stories in the press, they would find that the Salvation Army is doing more in the best interests of labour than some of the unions are doing themselves. I may also say that in our first year's business, our people made a mistake in one or two instances in sending people to firms where there had been some difficulty, but as soon as I was advised of this I acted promptly.

I may say that we have been approached with some very tempting offers to bring skilled mechanics to this country on various occasions, but we have absolutely refused to open any such negotiations with any firms where there is any labour difficulties.

I thought it best to give you this information so that if the matter comes up you will know our attitude.

Very truly, yours,
(Sgd.) T. HOWELL.
Brigadier.

2. No.

3. Money is paid to the Salvation Army on the same terms and conditions as to other booking agents and on the undertanding that such terms and conditions will not be departed from. In addition thereto there is paid $5,000 a year in connection with their London office, which payment is made in consideration of the fact that the army assumes all responsibility for the care of the immigrants it sends to Canada.

SUGAR IMPORTS.

Mr. LAKE asked :

What was the total amount of raw sugar imported into Canada from the Fiji islands, at Vancouver or any other ports, for the years ending 30th June, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906 ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The total imports of raw sugar from Fiji Islands during the fiscal years 1902 to 1906 inclusive, amounted to 41,480,109 pounds. Of this amount the quantity imported at Vancouver was in 1903, 11,051,000 pounds ; 1905, 6,114,559 pounds ; and in 1906, to 13,095,152 pounds ; and during 1905 there were imported at the port of Montreal, 11,218,798 pounds.

ST. LAWRENCE PILOTS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. What is the total number of qualified pilots doing the ocean steamship service between Montreal and Quebec ?

2. What is the limit of age for pilots in active service ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to reduce the number of qualified pilots between Montreal and Quebec ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Forty-eight.

2. Sixty-five ; but a pilot may continue in active service up to seventy providing he passes successfully two examinations each season for eyesight and hearing.

3. No.

DOLSEN'S BURYING GROUND.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What was the report of the engineer recently sent to Chatham to investigate Dolsen's burying ground, lying along the banks of the River Thames, owing to representations having been made to have said bank protected to keep it from being washed away ?

2. Is it the intention of the department to proceed with the work ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. Estimated cost of protection works, $2,550.

2. Matter under consideration.

CLAIM OF ED. PRAUGHT.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals received an application on behalf of Edward Praught, of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, formerly a car inspector for the Prince Edward Island Railway, for compensation for injuries sustained in the performance of his duties ?

2. If so, what action does the department intend to take in regard to it ?

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

1. Yes, for alleged injuries received while in the employ of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

2. Mr. Praught was paid the amount of insurance due him in that connection, and the department does not see that anything further can be done in the matter.

HALF-BREED SCRIP.

Mr. McCRANEY—by Mr. Johnston—asked :

1. Was there any issue of half-breed scrip in 1906 ? If so, under what treaty ?

2. Who was the commissioner appointed by the government for that purpose, and who composed the government party ?
3. For what time was the commissioner engaged in the issue of scrip ?
4. How many scrips were issued, and in what settlements ?
5. Is it the intention of the government to make such scrip locatable by bearer ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes, treaty 10.
2. James A. J. McKenna was the commissioner ; the government party consisted of Commissioner McKenna, Charles Fisher and Charles Mair, clerks ; Dr. Lebreque, medical officer, and Major Begin, in command of escort.
3. The party left Prince Albert on the 16th of August and returned there on the 9th of October, but did the work incident to the Indian Treaty as well as that in connection with the half-breed claims.
4. 271 money and 227 land scrip were issued at the following points : Portage la Loche, La Loche Mission, La Loche river, and Isle à la Crosse.
5. No.

Mr. McCRANEY—by Mr. Johnston—asked :

1. Has the government any intention of issuing half-breed scrip during the present year?
2. If so, who will be the government's commissioner ?
3. What settlements will he visit, and when?
4. Can the government give any information as to the number of scrips likely to be issued?
5. Will the scrip to be issued be locatable by bearer ?
6. Has the government considered any method of extinguishing half-breed claims by other means than the usual issue of scrip?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The commissioner, owing to the lateness of the season was unable to reach that part of the territory covered by treaty 10, which lies between the Isle à la Crosse country and the northern and eastern boundaries of Saskatchewan ; and it is the intention to provide for taking next season the adhesion to the treaty of the Indians therein, and for hearing the claims of any half-breeds therein who have not yet had an opportunity of presenting their claims ; but it is not proposed to issue scrip on the spot. The evidence will be taken and submitted to the department with a report, as was done under somewhat similar circumstances in treaty 8, and then scrip will issue from the department in allowed claims.
2. No one has yet been selected.
3. Isle à la Crosse, Stanley and a point on Reindeer lake, which has not yet been fixed upon. The time will be in June, July and August, but dates have not yet been definitely fixed for the different points.
4. The government has no information as to the number likely to be issued.
5. No.
6. No.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all papers, affidavits and correspondence between the government, or any official thereof, with the Prince Edward Island Railway, or any official thereof, or any other persons in reference to the burning of the properties of Widow James Wiggins and Charles Malley, at Alberton, Prince Edward Island.—Mr. Lefurgey.

For a copy of all papers, reports and correspondence, in connection with the Doukhobor colonies in Saskatchewan from October 1, 1906, to date.—Mr. Cash.

For a return showing : The timber lands sold or leased by the Department of the Interior subsequent to the date of those included in sessional paper No. 90, brought down to the House on the 9th of April, 1906 ; the description and area of such lands, the applications made therefor, the notice of advertisement for sale or tender, the tenders received, the amount of each tender, the tenders accepted, the name of the person or company to whom each lot was sold or leased, and the name and address of each person or company to whom any of such leases have been transferred.—Mr. Ames.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, complaints, and all other documents, letters, telegrams and memoranda, relating to Copper Cliff post office, Ontario, together with a copy of all instructions given to post office inspectors, or other officers of the department, and of all reports and memoranda in respect thereto or in connection therewith.—Mr. Boyce.

For a return showing the total amount of money in banks, to the credit of this government, at the end of each month during the year, 1906, and the name of each bank.—Mr. Armstrong.

PREVENTION AND SETTLEMENT OF STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 36), to aid in the Prevention and Settlement of Strikes and Lockouts in Mines, and Industries connected with Public Utilities.—Mr. Lemieux.

On section 2, interpretation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I beg to move as subclause (b) :

(b) Trade union or union means any organization of employees formed for the purpose of regulating relations between employers and employees.

During the discussion in committee we dropped the words 'incorporated or registered,' and for the better understanding of the Bill, it is well to insert this definition which is taken from the statute of 1872.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The word 'organization' requires definition almost as much

as the word 'union.' Would it mean a temporary organiaztion for a few days? What would constitute an organization?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the word would be understood in the application of the Bill. Labour organizations are sometimes constituted when the trouble arises, and we have provided that when such an organization elects a secretary and a president, through them the machinery of the Bill will be put in motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The word organization has no legal meaning and we have simply to guess at it.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,—appointment of boards of arbitration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When this clause was under discussion the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) suggested that there should be a permanent board, instead of temporary boards for each dispute. Since then, the hon. gentleman has discussed the question with the deputy minister and he thinks that for the present he should not propose the establishment of a permanent board. I think the appointment of such a board would be unwise. Labour organizations and industrial concerns are very sensitive, and if once a decision were rendered by a permanent board the parties might feel that the board would be bound by its decision, even though like conditions did not apply in a different case. It may be said that we have permanent courts in civil and criminal cases, but the leader of the opposition who is an eminent jurist, knows, that sometimes exception is taken to this. When the Hon. T. Chase Casgrain was Attorney General of Quebec, there were complaints as to civil and criminal jurisdiction being exercised in the same district by the same judge, and he introduced a Bill providing that there should be a sort of tour de role for the judges, If there are complaints of the administration of civil or criminal justice, there may be more criticism and perhaps more trouble if we select for the application of this law a permanent board. Therefore I think we should keep the clause as it was originally drafted, and later on, when public opinion is accustomed to the decisions rendered by these boards and educated to this legislation, it may perhaps be convenient to have a permanent board, as we have with regard to railways. Another objection, I think, may fairly be pointed out. This country is very large, and the settlement of these disputes should be had as soon as possible. If we had one permanent board, and that board were engaged at Halifax or Pictou or Fredericton or somewhere else in the eastern provinces in the settlement of a great strike or a great lockout, and its services were required in British Columbia or the Northwest Territories, would it not then be found advisable to have several boards instead of one permanent board? I think the objections are obvious, and we should leave this clause as originally drafted.

Mr. CONMEE. When subsection (f) was under discussion, I suggested an amendment. The minister stated that he would take it into consideration and would apply the amendment suggested to clause 58, and I believe that has been done. But I still think this amendment should be amended.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the amendment?

Mr. CONMEE. I would suggest inserting after the word 'work' in the third line these words: 'or a lowering of wages or an increase in the hours of labour.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. The amendment made in clause 58 covers that point entirely.

Mr. CONMEE. I am aware that there was an amendment to section 58. If that is sufficient, I am content, but it seems to me that the two sections conflict, and the different sections of the Bill should be consistent with each other.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The amendment to section 58 adopted the other day was the insertion after the words 'in every case' in the first line of the following words: 'employers and employees shall give at least thirty days' notice of an intended change affecting the conditions of employment in respect of wages and hours.' So that before the appointment of the board and pending the investigation before the board no changes can take place as regards hours or wages on either side.

Mr. CONMEE. It was contended that after the notice was given, there might be a lowering of wages or a change in the hours, because the parties had not come together. No strike had been ordered and no investigation had taken place under the Act, and in that case such an occurrence might take place. That is a matter of legal construction on which I do not attempt to set up an opinion, but I call the attention of the House to it to see if there is anything in it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Section 58 has been amended, but does not section 2 have a different office to fulfil?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is only a definition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But that definition applies to other clauses than clause 58. For example, the word 'lockout' is defined in clause 2. The same word is used in clause 15, and their is no special provision as in clause 58 to which the hon. minister has just referred. The amendment in clause 58 would have no effect in governing the definition of 'lockout' in clause 2 as applied to clause 15. Clause 58 deals with a case of a lockout in a particular instance. It does

not deal with clause 15, which says that you must make a declaration that a lockout shall be declared before any reference shall be made under the terms of that section. Section 58 deals with what takes place afterwards, not with the initial difficulty. That is what the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) has in mind, as far as I can understand it.

Mr. CONMEE. That is the point I am trying to make clear.

Mr. PARDEE. The definition of 'lockout' applies to all clauses. Section 58 does not apply to the other clauses, and, therefore, does not meet the point raised.

Mr. CONMEE. I cannot see the objection if that is the intention and it seems to meet with the approval not only of the minister but of all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. If that is so why not put it in the clause? It will make it absolutely clear and do no harm. It will satisfy me, at all events, and I believe it will do some good.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister, I think, sees the difficulty.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, but I am not quite ready to go as far as my hon. friend from Rainy River. Section 2 defines a lockout and section 58 declares that the moment a reference has taken place no change on account of a lockout or strike can take place in the wages or the hours or the work of the employees pending that investigation. What does my hon. friend wish to add to the definition of the word 'lockout'?

Mr. CONMEE. I fear that section 15 intervenes.

Mr. PARDEE. The interpretation says that the word 'lockout' should mean a certain thing, just what the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has pointed out. Then section 58 goes on to define what shall take place after a lockout. Then what are you doing by the proposed amendment? All you are doing by the amendment which my hon. friend from Rainy River proposes is to say what a lockout is so that the Act may come into operation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So that there can be a reference.

Mr. PARDEE. So that there can be a reference. Section 58 then goes on to say what you shall do after that takes place. The interpretation must be there to show what the lockout is before this takes place.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Section 2 defines what a lockout is. Section 58 says in plain language that the reference must take place in view of the lock-out, not after it has happened. The investigation is ordered before the lockout or before the strike and section 58 enacts that pending that investigation and before the lock-out or strike no change in the condition, wages or hours of the employee shall take place.

Mr. CONMEE. This is not a question of a lockout or a strike but the enployer says: I am going to reduce wages after a certain date.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Act has nothing to do with it except in cases of lockouts and strikes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is just the reason why the hon. member for Rainy River desires to have it amended. He takes the ground, and I think he is right, that if, instead of closing the place of employment or suspending work the employer should say that a reduction in wages was necessary or that it was necessary to work longer hours, the employee should have the right, under section 15 to have that referred under the Act. I think that under the clause as it is drafted at present he could not do that. You should make it plain. After you have had a reference under section 15, then of course, the amendment to section 58 which the minister has proposed puts the matter right according to the view of the hon. member for Rainy River, but before that it does not seem to put it right. I entirely agree with the view which has been put forward by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee).

Mr. LENNOX. I think it is very clear. I understand the minister to say that he agrees with the view that in the definition of 'lockout' in section 2 are included what the hon. member for Rainy River suggests—

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. LENNOX. That is that there included the lowering of wages and any change in condition of employment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. LENNOX. If the minister does not mean that and if the minister does not think they should be embraced in the term 'lockout,' then we have nothing to argue about. As I understand the minister, by section 58—

Mr. LEMIEUX. As amended.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand what the minister has said; I want the minister to understand me if he will. I understood the minister to point out to the hon. member for Rainy River that what he wants to have accomplished is accomplished by section 58. I understand that to mean that the minister concurs with the object that the hon. member for Rainy River has in view and then he says that the object is accomplished by section 58. I submit that it is not. If you turn to section 15 you will find there a provision made for a sworn declaration setting forth that failing adjustment a lockout will be declared. Then you have to find when you come to work the Act out what a lockout is. According to the definition as it is in the statute at the present time it would not embrace a lowering of wages or a change of conditions. According to the

hon. member for Rainy River it should embrace a change of conditions or a lowering of wages. If the minister concurs in the view that a lock-out should embrace a lowering of wages or a change of conditions then he must put it in the definition ; otherwise when you come to deal with the declaration you cannot make the declaration and you cannot get the assistance of the Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will my hon. friend please follow me now ? I have followed him with pleasure. The definition of the word lockout is as follows :

'Lockout' (without limiting the nature of its meaning) means a closing of a place of employment, or a suspension of work, or a refusal by an employer to continue to employ any number of his employees in consequence of a dispute.

What is a dispute ? According to subsection (e) :

'Dispute' or 'industrial dispute' means any dispute or difference between an employer and one or more of his employees, as to matters or things affecting or relating to work done or to be done by him or them, or as to privileges, rights and duties of employers or employees, &c.

And without limiting the general nature of the above definition includes all matters relating to (1) the wages allowance or other remuneration of employees, or the price paid or to be paid in respect of employment.

I think that covers the point.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not meet it at all.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Will the minister state what objection he has to adding the amendment of the hon. member for Rainy River ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. member for Rainy River state the amendment that he proposes ?

Mr. CONMEE. I am referring now to subsection 7 of section 2 (f) in regard to lockouts and after the word 'work' in the third line I would insert these or other words to the same effect : 'Or a lowering of wages or increase in the hours of labour.' It may or may not be a dispute. It seems that these are the principal things about which there might be a difference. They should be covered in the definition.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. member for Rainy River might also add the words 'or any other change in the condition of the employment.'

Mr. CONMEE. I have considered that but I think it would be going too far. An employer might want to ask a man to work at a certain employment to-day and he might want to shift him to-morrow to something else which he could do. There is no necessity for tieing their hands in that way. The main point in the interest of the employee is that his wages may not be reduced or his hours of services increased. I think that with these two safeguards he will be satisfied.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not think I can accept that amendment, because as I have pointed out, we know what is, under this Act, a 'dispute.' We are not going to declare the fact of a notice being given by an employer that he intends to reduce the wages or increase the hours constitutes a lockout no matter whether it is acceptable to the employees or not. We know what a 'lockout' is under the Bill. We know that a 'lockout' results from a 'dispute' and we have a 'dispute' clearly defined. I think my hon. friend should be satisfied with the amendment of section 58.

Mr. CONMEE. But if these words are not added there is no reference in subsection (f) to rates of wages or hours of service.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Subsection (e).

Mr. CONMEE. But I am speaking of subsection (f).

Mr. LEMIEUX. The addition of these words, it seems to me will be merely redundant. Under the definition of the word 'lockout' we say that it means 'a closing of a place of employment, or a suspension of work, or a refusal by an employer to continue to employ any number of his employees in consequence of a dispute.' Now, what is a 'dispute.' We turn to subsection (e), and there we find that it is 'any dispute or difference between an employer and one or more of his employees, as to matters or things affecting or relating to work done or to be done by him or them, or as to the privileges, rights and duties, of employers or employees, and so on. These things are included in the definition of 'dispute.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the minister does not see the point. Suppose the men make a demand for an increase of wages and the employer grants it and does not close his shop. He does not do anything enumerated in subsection (f) at that time, but, immediately after, he increases the hours of labour by one or two hours. That is not a lockout——

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is a dispute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may not even be a dispute. It is an act of the employer which obliges the men to strike. It is the adoption of tactics by the employer which are essentially a lockout, though not a lockout, within the meaning of subsection (f).

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman will read the amendment to subsection (f) he will see that it applies to hours of labour as well as to wages. In the case

that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) cites, the employees would have recourse to the tribunal, and, pending that investigation, there could be a change made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, but it would put the men in the position of striking, whereas it is virtually a lockout by the employer.

Mr. CONMEE. And there is this further consideration: Section 15 provides, under subsection (b) that there must be a sworn declaration in order to bring the matter before this tribunal. If the employer lowers the wages, he will not make the declaration; and the men cannot make it, because there is no lockout, as the employer is not closing his doors. I shall not argue that the men could not strike, but what I do say is that that is the only course open to them, the Act ought to give them the reference without a strike.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He must give thirty days' notice.

Mr. CONMEE. But that does not hurt him, if he lowers the wages.

Mr. BOYCE. Take the definition of lockout under subsection (f) and a strike under subsection (e). These are correlative terms throughout the Bill. If the meaning of 'strike' is compared with the meaning of 'lockout' the minister will see the necessity for a change. A 'strike' is declared to be 'the cessation of work by a body of employees acting in combination, or a concerted refusal, or refusal under a common understanding of any number of employees to continue to work for an employer, in consequence of a dispute—' and so on. Unless this is amended, the employer may lower the wages and so render operative section 58, but it would be through a refusal of the workmen to accept the lowering of wages, and thus would be a strike and not a lockout. Thus, the terms would be no longer correlative.

Mr. VERVILLE. The question of lockouts and strikes is easily understood. it only arises through a misunderstanding. Suppose that the employer reduced the wages of the men, and at the same time told them: You are going to work two hours more for the same money—you will understand that no men who are men will consent to that, they have the privilege of coming under this law, for the very reason that they can refuse to accept the conditions offered to them by their employer, and vice versa. When the Bill was first in committee I offered an amendment to that very section, and the minister offered another amendment to section 58. I was entirely satisfied with his amendment because I knew that section 2 and the amended section 58 covered the same ground. I think we have too many technical words here with regard to strikes and lockouts. If the two sides cannot agree there is going to be a fight, and that is all there is about it.

Mr. BOYCE. Does not the hon. member for Maisonneuve, as the alleged representative of labour in this House, see some difficulty in not including these words suggested by the member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee)?

Mr. VERVILLE. I am satisfied that the change in clause 58, taken together with clause 2, cover the same ground. The plainer the better, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. BOYCE. The clause absolutely contains the declaration that a lockout includes a lowering of wages or an increase of the hours of labour. Now does the member for Maisonneuve object to that?

Mr. VERVILLE. I do not object to anything in any clause as to the lowering of wages and the increase of hours. But as I remarked a moment ago, if an employer at any time chose to increase the hours of labour or lower the wages, the men are at perfect liberty to refuse to accept his conditions.

Mr. BOYCE. Would it be a portection to the men?

Mr. VERVILLE. It would be a protection to the men to come under the law. I am entirely satisfied with this. If I were to come under that law I would use that clause, because I would not accept a diminition of wages and longer hours, and nobody else would.

On section 11,—members of board not to have pecuniary interest in dispute.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The committee may remember that when this clause was under consideration, some one, I think it was the member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross), suggested that perhaps the secretary-treasurer of a union could not be selected as a member of board because he was receiving a salary both from the government, as acting on the board, and from the union. In order to remove any doubt on that question, I move that this section be amended to read as follows:

No person should act as a member of a board who has any direct pecuniary interest in the issue of a dispute referred to such board.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The secretary of a miner's union might also be a man who was working for $4 a day in the mine, and in fact any one connected with the union might be a working man not interested in the outcome of the dispute.

Mr. VERVILLE. Do I understand that the amendment would prevent anybody directly interested in that trade from being appointed on the board?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. It means, as I understand, that no striker shall be a member of the board.

Mr. VERVILLE. There might be in a city a trades council, with which all the trades were affiliated; then where are you going to find a labouring man to represent them on that board? They are directly interested.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are indirectly, but not directly interested.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 16,

16. The application and the declaration accompanying it :

1. If made by an employer, an incorporated company or corporation, shall be signed by some one of its duly authorized managers or other principal executive officers ;

2. If made by an employer other than an incorporated company or corporation, shall be signed by the employer himself in case he is an individual, or a majority of the partners or members in case of a partnership firm or association ;

3. If made by employees, members of an incorporated or registered trade union, shall be signed by any two of its duly authorized officers ;

4. If made by employees not members of an incorporated or registered trade union, shall be signed by not less than ten of their number.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Subsections 1 and 2 passed, and 3 and 4 were allowed to stand, after some suggestions made on both sides. I have drafted these amendments which I think will meet all the suggestions :

3. If made by employees, members of a trades union, should be signed by two of its officers duly authorized by a majority vote of the members of the union, or by a vote taken by ballot of the members of the union present at a meeting called on not less than three days notice for the purpose of discussing the question.

4. If made by employees, some or all of whom are not members of a trades union, should be signed by two of their number duly authorized by a majority vote taken by ballot of the employees present at a meeting called on not less than three days notice for the purpose of discussing the question.

Mr. CONMEE. Under section 4, where some employees are members of a union and some are not, how are you to distinguish? Suppose the union men call a meeting and send in a notice, independent entirely of those who are not union men? I think the amendment assumes that both bodies will act together.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They must act together under this—it contemplates joint action.

Mr. CONMEE. Difficulty might arise under this. I do not see why the union men should not be dealt with through their regular union officers, and why the non-union men should not be recognized through a chairman and secretary elected by them. That is the usual practice.

Mr. D. ROSS.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Both are included in the amendment. By the first, if it is made by employees who are members of the trade union, we have the procedure ; and if it is made by employees who are not members of the union, we have also the procedure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is accepted in either case?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Those who belong to a union have their secretary, and those who do not, elect a president and secretary.

Mr. D. ROSS. If, under section 4, the union men make an application and the non-union men do not, would that application be acted upon?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. D. ROSS. If the non-union men made an application and the union men did not, would that application be acted on?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

On section 20,

20. Copies of applications or statements in reply thereto, to be transmitted to the other party under any of the preceding sections where the other party is, &c., &c.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Here I would suggest the following amendment, as the result of the debate which took place on this clause : In subsection 3 strike out the words 'an incorporated or registered' and substitute the word 'A.'

For subsection 4 substitute :

Composed of employees some or all of whom are not members of a trade union.

(a) Where some of the employees are members of a trade union shall be sent to the president and secretary of the union as representing the employees belonging to the union; also

(b) Where some of the employees are not members of a trade union and there are no persons authorized to represent such employees, shall be sent to ten of their number.

(c) Where under section 16, subsection 4, two persons have been authorized to make an application shall be sent to such two persons.

This is to meet all cases.

Mr. CONMEE. I assume that the amendment means that in the case of men who are not members of a union, but who had met and elected a chairman and secretary, that chairman and secretary would be recognized.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly ; they are recognized formally in the Bill.

On section 34—scale of witness fees.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce) the other day made an objection as regards the scale of fees to be paid to the witnesses duly attending the meetings of the board. He stated that in

Ontario in some civil courts the fees were different from those before a superior court. I suppose they are higher in a superior court. We might perhaps amend it by substituting the words 'criminal cases' for 'civil suits,' which would give you the same scale of fees all over the Dominion.

Mr. LENNOX. That will not improve it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What fees are paid to witnesses in Ontario ?

Mr. BOYCE. $1.25 a day, outside of the three mile limit; the division court fee is seventy-five cents.

Mr. PARDEE. Make this $1.50 a day, with the additional mileage.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That suggestion might be adopted.

Mr. BOYCE. I suggested the other day that this clause should be amended by providing that the witnesses fees shall be governed by the scale for the time being in force with respect to witnesses in civil suits in the Supreme court.

Mr. PARDEE. That would be all right.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 39, how parties may be represented before the court.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I move to strike out section 39 and replace it by the following :

Any party to a reference may be represented before the board by three or less than three persons designated for the purpose, and by counsel or solicitor where allowed, as hereinafter provided.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How are they to be designated in the case of a number of employees, not members of a trade union ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, they will find out themselves I suppose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They certainly would not find out from the Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We must trust them.

New section 39 agreed to.

On section 57, prohibition of strikes or lockouts ; agreement between parties.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. After the award has been given it holds good for one year. Now, immediately after an award has been given a dispute may arise as to whether either of the parties is keeping the award. The men may say that the employer is deliberately violating the agreement, and they may go on strike, maintaining that the finding of the board is not being lived up to. I would suggest an amendment along these lines ; I have not drafted it in legal language.

If after the award has been accepted by both sides a dispute arises as to whether the terms of such award are being violated by either party, then the board shall immediately adjudicate upon the question in dispute.

That would mean, the same board should immediately inquire whether the finding they made is being lived up to by the parties.

Mr. SPROULE. The same board may not be in existence.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am not wedded to it being the same board, but I point this out as being a case not covered by the Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no objection to the amendment provided these words are added :

The board may be reconvened by the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. How can you regulate the board after it has performed its functions, and made its report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Duncan Ross) mean that if one of the parties has violated the agreement, the board should be reconvened to decide on that ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. There is this point, that the finding of the commission has been agreed to by the men and the company, and the day after it goes into effect the men raise the question that the company is not keeping it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. member mean the recommendation of the board or does he mean what becomes an award by agreement?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do not care whether it becomes an award by agreement or not. In either case the men raise the point that the company is violating it. There is no machinery in this Act that I can see for finding out whether the men are right or wrong.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the board makes a report or recommendation no one is obliged to observe it.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. But they agree to observe it, and the men claim that the company are not observing it. The Act only provides for the penalties imposed by sections 60 and 61.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see where the hon. gentleman would get to anyway. Here you have the men and the employers before this commission. The case is heard; the commission make their report and recommendation. Up to the time that it is made there is a prohibition of a strike or a lockout, but the moment the report and recommendation is made that provision no longer applies. The next minute the men may walk out and there is no penalty.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am only dealing with the case in which the report of the commission is accepted by the company.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way? If it is by a formal written contract, that is enforceable by law. If it is not by a formal or written contract, it is not enforceable. and if you call your commission together for a second time in order to tell the employer or the men that they are not living up to the agreement, what happens then? The men may still go on strike or the employer may lock out, and there is no provision for a penalty in either case. There is simply the power of sweet persuasion filtering through the lips of the three commissioners, while either of the parties may be obdurate, and, with the fear of neither God or man before their eyes, may go on and do just as they like.

Mr. CONMEE. The two parties may agree, before the board has convened, that the finding of the board shall be a rule of court. My hon. friend (Mr. Duncan Ross) wants to provide that in the case of difference of opinion between the employer and the employees as to the meaning of the finding, the board may be reconvened to determine what its meaning is. I think that point was discussed the other day, and the minister agreed to bring in a section to cover it.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister cannot do it, because he sets out with the idea that this is not to be a compulsory finding.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Except when the parties agree that it shall be so.

Mr. FOSTER. If they do that, and it becomes enforceable by law, the hon. member for British Columbia has what he wants.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. No. The point I am making is that after it is enforceable by law there may be an honest difference of opinion as to whether the award is being kept or not. All you can do under this law is to mulct the employees in the penalties provided in the Act, because they believe that the company are not living up to the agreement and consequently go on strike. That would be the worst kind of compulsion. All I ask is that if there is a dispute as to whether the award of the finding being kept or not, the minister should immediately reconvene the commission for the purpose of deciding that point and not enforce the penalties of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member has only in mind those cases in which agreements have been made and acquire the force of law. If the agreement is in the opinion of one or other of the parties being violated who shall decide the matter and enforce the decision? What power will this commission have to enforce it? It may give an opinion, but its opinion would not be worth anything more than it was before. What the hon. member for British Columbia wishes is enforcement; he comes back to the idea of compulsion. But this commission, being jelly-like in its formation, has no power to enforce things. It is the attitude of sweet persuasion that it holds towards all parties.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You cannot call on the law to punish a man because he has an honest opinion that the other party is not keeping the agreement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You can have another tribunal and show them up to public opinion.

Mr. BOYCE. The only clause in which the matter is dealt with is section 65, which provides that:

Either party to a dispute which may be referred under this Act to a board may agree in writing, at any time before or after the board has made its report and recommendation, to be bound by the recommendation of the board in the same manner as parties are bound upon an award made pursuant to a reference to arbitration on the order of a court of record; every agreement so to be bound made by one party shall be forwarded to the registrar who shall communicate it to the other party, and if the other party agrees in like manner to be bound by the recommendation of the board, then the recommendation shall be made a rule of the said court on the application of either party and shall be enforceable in like manner.

My hon. friend will see that if there has been a finding and if there be a consent by both parties then the function of the board ceases, the award becomes a rule of court and is enforceable to the same extent as an award would be in an arbitration.

Mr. FOSTER. That must be an agreement in writing.

Mr. BOYCE. It must be an agreement in writing.

Mr. PARDEE. The effect of the amendment which the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo proposes would be to absolutely negative some portions of this Bill because how would it be possible that an award should be a rule of court if you were not going to act upon it? It would simply mean that in many cases men, in order to escape the penalties, would invoke a dispute. I think that is wrong.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. All I have to say in reference to the matter is that if you expect that men are going to agree to any award and make it a rule of court enforceable by the court, I am afraid you will never get them to agree to it.

Mr. LENNOX. That is the intention.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I guess that drops; does it not?

On section 67,—Governor in Council may specify certain industries as coming within the provisions of this Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Section 67 stood. That section provides:

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, by notice in the 'Gazette,' declare any specified industry to be an agency of transportation or communication or a public service utility, and such industry shall thereafter be deemed to be included in the provisions of this Act.

This clause has been regarded as rather dangerous from what I hear coming from outside of the House and from inside the House too. Some hon. gentlemen are of the opinion that this might lead to the tyrannical abuse of the power of the Governor in Council with respect to private industry and private business. Therefore I will not press this clause before the committee. I will only say in explanation of its having been drafted and inserted in this Bill that it was drafted to meet certain strikes and lockouts which would be strikes and lockouts within the meaning of this Bill. Suppose that there should exist in the city or district of Ottawa a bread trust as we have had in the city of New York an ice trust; the question might arise whether it would be the duty of the Governor in Council to declare then that it was a public utility and that we must proceed as we do under this Act in order to prevent any strike or lockout. However, in view of the fear that has been expressed on several occasions during the discussion of this Bill, we must give time to public opinion to be educated on the general provisions and features of this new legislation and consequently I will drop this clause for the present. But, I want to impress the committee with the idea that it was not inserted there with the view of giving the Governor in Council any tyrannical power of investigating the private business of any private concerns but just to carry out the intention of the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 67 is expunged.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister intend to drop section 68 also?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Section 68 is passed.

Mr. LENNOX. I mean now that the minister has dropped section 67, should he not drop section 68? It seems to me it is more arbitrary. What is it for? What does it mean? It follows out section 67. It empowers the minister to determine what industries are included in a public service utility. These words are also used in section 67. I do not know what the object of this is. It is more arbitrary and more dangerous than the other.

Mr. CONMEE. There must be finality somewhere.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think this clause is very important and very useful. My hon. friend is wrong when he thinks it is very arbitrary.

Mr. LENNOX. There is no doubt about it being arbitrary; it may be necessary.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is necessary to determine what is included in this class of industry, but the moment we declare that we will not interfere with private industries, as mentioned in the preceding clause, there should be no fear as to the application of this clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is to refer it and how is it to be referred? I do not quite understand how it will be worked out in actual practice.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Minister of Labour, of course, will administer the present Bill and he will communicate with the Governor in Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The clause does not say anything about the Governor in Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Communication will be had between the parties and the minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The clause is certainly unnecessary for that purpose, because when the parties under the Act shall make application through the minister he will not act if he thinks it does not concern a trade within the meaning of the statute. If he thinks it is a trade within the meaning of the statute then he will take the necessary proceedings to have the board appointed. The section certainly is not necessary for that purpose and I do not understand yet what purpose it would answer or how it would be worked out. Who is to refer it to the minister? By what procedure is it to be referred to the minister? Are the parties to be heard before him, and if so, what parties and upon what notice? All these are matters for consideration when you come to consider the practical application of the clause.

Mr. CONMEE. That I think would be provided for by the rules. The Act provides that the Minister of Labour may provide rules and forms and I suppose that the machinery would be set out in the rules.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not agree with that view.

Mr. LENNOX. In the interpretation clause it is stated that the provisions of the Act shall apply to a certain class of employment, but I do not know of any clause where there is any provision for the particular employment that appertains to one of the industries as distinguishing it from the industry itself? Now, the word here used is not that the minister shall determine the particular class of industry as coming within the Act; but other industries which are not exactly of that class, but which pertain to it he may declare to come within the provisions of the Act. I do not see anything in the general scope of the Act which justifies this clause. It is not necessary in con-

junction with the interpretation clauses, so far as I can see, and I do not remember any other provision bringing in other and ancillary occupations.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Take the case of the longshoremen, for instance: The question may arise whether they belong to the shipping industry, which is a public utility, or are to be regarded as ordinary labourers. The minister may be called upon, after a reference has been made to him, to decide upon this point. And—answering the question raised a moment ago—the minister will decide at the time the reference is made to him whether the law applies or does not apply to the particular industry in which these parties are engaged. I think it well to keep this clause in order to give some discretion to the minister under the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under section 6 the minister has all the discretion that is necessary. That section provides:

> Whenever, under this Act, an application is made in due form for the appointment of a board of conciliation and investigation, the minister, within thirty days from the date at which the application is received, shall establish such board under his hand and seal of office.

If the industry in respect of which the application is made does not come within the terms of the Act, the minister would have no power to constitute the board. But what I do not understand is the 'reference' to the minister—by whom is it to be made, under what notice, and how is to be done?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The application is made to the minister, and on that application he may declare that the law does not apply, on the ground that the employment involved is not a public utility.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the time for him to decide.

Mr. LEMIEUX. True. But, during the investigation, the question may arise before the commissioners, and then the minister will declare whether it is a public utility or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But, the minister will have already decided that question by constituting the board, because under the terms of the Act, he can constitute the board only in such cases.

Mr. LENNOX. The interpretation clause shows exactly what is to come within the scope of the Act, when application is made, the minister must determine whether the employment involved comes under the Act or not. But the Bill goes even further and gives the minister power to determine even contrary to the fact—he may decide that an employment is of the class provided for under the Act when, in fact, it is not of that class. If the Bill means anything, it means that. It gives the minister even a wider latitude than is given by the interpretation clause. What we should have is the interpretation clause alone. Anything that comes within the scope of that should be dealt with and every thing else rejected.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it might be desirable to provide that, if the minister having decided to constitute the board in respect of a certain matter, should, upon reconsideration conclude that the matter did not come within the terms of the Act, he would be free to disestablish the board. But this seems to go further and to give the minister the arbitrary power referred to by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox.)

Mr. LEMIEUX. After the case is referred to the board, a question might arise whether the certain class of employees, for instance, the shipwrights come under the Act. It might be contended that they were a building trade and did not belong to transportation, and so were free to act regardless of this law. Under the Bill as now proposed, the minister would have power to decide that question and say whether this employment was a public utility or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It gives a great deal of power to the minister if its terms are read literally. Suppose, for instance, that the men in a particular industry wish to strike. They are advised by counsel that their industry does not come within the terms of this statute, and they strike. If they are charged with violation of this statute, is the decision of the minister to be invoked in the courts, and used, possibly as a means of punishing these men, even though under the construction of the statute by the courts they would not be guilty of any offence? I do not think that that power should be vested in any man in the minister's position.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The powers may appear to be wide, but my hon. friend must not forget that the minister, being responsible to parliament, will take good care not to override the law and not to act arbitrarily. He will have to render an account of his stewardship at the next session of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. At the next caucus.

Mr. LEMIEUX. At the next great caucus of the nation. It seems to me that the minister should be clothed with large powers seeing that he can be held to responsibility for the operation of the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I mean is that the men should have their case adjudged according to the law of the land as determined by the court, and not according to the law of the land as determined by the minister. I do not know

whether the clause goes so far as I have suggested, but apparently its terms are intended to go that far.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am ready to yield to the judgment of my hon. friend. What would he suggest in order the better to define any 'specified industry to be an agency of transportation or communication or a public service utility'? Would it not be better to leave it to the minister to determine?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am willing to leave it to the minister so far as parliamentary responsibility is concerned. So far as the constitution of the board is concerned, the minister might conceivably make a mistake, and his action would be a subject of criticism in parliament if he constituted a board in an industry which, by the judgment of some court afterwards, was found not to be included within the terms of this statute. But in respect of the responsibility of the men for any penalty or punishment, the statute should be made perfectly plain that the determination of the minister should in no wise affect that. That is not a matter upon which the minister can invoke his parliamentary responsibility. Men always have been governed by the law of the land in this country, and I hope always will be governed by the law as construed by the courts, and not as construed by a minister of the Crown.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the point of my hon. friend is well taken, and after recess I will have some further amendment.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Before recess we were discussing section 69 and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was suggesting an amendment to section 68. Has he framed his amendment?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I have not had an opportunity.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As this is a quasi-judicial matter what would my hon. friend think of referring it to the Minister of Justice instead of to the Minister of Labour?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would not improve it from my standpoint. I would like to leave everything to the minister absolutely as far as he is responsible for the administration of the Act. When an application is made some one must decide whether or not the industry is of the class specified, and I make not the slightest objection to the minister doing so; but I do not like to have the Act go further and to use any language which might be construed as taking away from the courts of the country the determination of whether these men had or had not been guilty of an offence by going on strike under certain circumstances. These are matters which ought not to be left to the determination of the minister in any way. I would say the same thing if it were a Conservative Minister of Labour. I would be inclined to think the minister has all necessary powers under section 6 because under that he can do what he sees fit.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Although I think that the Minister of Labour, whether a Conservative or a Liberal, would, in any case, pronounce judiciously and judicially on the question of whether or not a particular employment comes under the definition of a public utility. I see the point of my hon. friend's objection. In view of the fact that very heavy penalties are imposed under the Act, I can see that this might in some cases give rise to a very serious conflict and therefore I would not object to dropping this clause and leaving it to the courts. I therefore move that the clause be dropped.

Mr. VERVILLE. Does that mean that sections 67 and 68 will be dropped?

Mr. LEMIEUX. 68, yes.

Mr. VERVILLE. Both of them?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. VERVILLE. I do not like to see that. When I first read the Bill I thought that section 67 was the best protection we could get. It is all very well if the government is in session; they might decide by resolution that such and such an occupation is a public utility but what would happen between sessions? There are many things that would come under the head of public utilities which in fact would be more really public utilities than those specified in the Bill. We have had cases cited and there are others that would be more public utilities than a strike on a street railway. If the government cannot decide who will?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The courts.

Mr. VERVILLE. The courts? How long will that take. Criticism has been made of the length of time that will be required to make an award. I was sorry to see section 67 dropped, and dropping 68 makes it still worse. There is no one to decide what is a public utility. Take the longshoremen's strike in Montreal years ago, when you had to call out the militia; was that not a strike on a public utility? We must take into consideration the damage caused to all classes of society by a strike. If you drop section 67 I hope you will leave section 68. Give us something that we can go to, some one responsible to the people at large. If you drop that we have nothing at all.

Mr. BOYCE. Clause 6 of the Bill gives the minister the right to establish a board and the argument of the leader of the opposition as against section 68 as well as

against 67 was that before the establishment of the board under clause 6 it would be the duty of the minister to ascertain the applicability of the Act to the particular industry under consideration and that the minister would not establish a board under section 6 unless he was satisfied that the Act applied to that particular form of industry as a public utility and therefore that the matter, although taken out of section 68, is still absolutely in the discretion of the minister who is charged with the administration of the Act and he would have the same power of interpretation under section 6 as under section 68. The reason 68 is dropped is that the power is vested in the minister under section 6, and he would decide under 6 before the board is constituted instead of at a later stage with possible delay under 68.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not concur in the proposition to strike out section 68. It is true that the minister under 6 would have power to decide whether he should constitute a board, if he thinks the application is made by those who are not intended to come under this Act.

Mr. BOYCE. Take section 3 with section 6.

Mr. CONMEE. Suppose the minister does constitute a board would there not be an opening to take the ground that there was no jurisdiction under the Act in reference to that particular employment and thus hold the matter up for a long time? I think that under the Act the government or some minister should be held responsible to the people of the country for the simple working of this Act. If this Act is going to require the best legal talent of the county to determine its meaning, it will not secure the confidence of the labour organizations as we all hope it should. There is force in the objection that too much arbitrary power should not be put in the hands of the minister, but, nevertheless, I favour the clause because I see no other means of affording simple and practicable machinery to enable those who desire to take advantage of the Act to do so without difficulty. So long as we have a good Minister of Labour, such as we have now, I have no fear, but the time might come when the man in charge of the portfolio might not be so admirable and so just as the present minister. However, we must risk even that possibility. He would be responsible to public opinion and I see no other simple recourse. The propositioin is in the public interest; it is certainly in the interest of the labouring men.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) to advocate that some minister should be made responsible for the administration of this law?

Mr. CONMEE. I thought my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) had a better understanding than that. What I was trying to convey was that if this section is expunged, section 6 does not give the jurisdiction which I think it ought to give. I want to see some minister of the Crown responsible for deciding the questions which may arise under this section.

Mr. BOYCE. When the minister receives an application he decides whether it is in reference to a public utility. When he constitutes a board he decides all questions relating to the applicability of the Act, and there is a finality so far as his jurisdiction is concerned.

Mr. CONMEE. There is no provision in the statute giving the minister power to decide. He may establish a board under section 6, but its legality may be attacked in the courts and all kinds of delay may occur.

Mr. PARDEE. As to bringing the Act into force, might we not amend section 6 by such a provision as this:

> Whenever, under this Act, an application is made in due form for the appointment of a board of conciliation and investigation, the minister, on being satisfied that the provisions of this Act should apply, shall within thirty days from the date on which the application is received, establish such board under his hand and seal, &c.

True, that brings us back to where we were before, but if the Act is to be of use at all, there ought to be a provision giving some person the right to say whether the dispute or contemplated strike is in connection with a public utility.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should have no objection to that; I think section 6 means that now.

Mr. PARDEE. There seems to be ambiguity.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree that so far as the board is concerned the minister must be responsible.

Mr. PARDEE. Do you not think the striking out of sections 67 and 68 would leave an ambiguity, so far as the power of the minister is concerned?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think so, but I have no objection to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CONMEE. I agree with that suggestion so far as it goes, but I think there should be some words in the clause declaring that the decision of the minister shall be final. What I want is that the decision of the minister shall stand, and that the employees shall not be dragged from one court to another. If the door is open for that sort of thing, well, the Act may be of advantage to the employers but it will be of no use to the poor workingman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no objection that the decision of the minister as to the formation of the board shall be final, but I do object to the decision of the minister controlling proceedings against these men in a criminal court. The men ought not to be controlled in the criminal courts by the decision of any minister of the Crown whether Conservative or Liberal. My suggestion has been spoken of as being against the men. It is not. It is in favour of the men, so that they may be judged by the law of the land, as is their right, and not by a minister of the Crown.

Mr. CONMEE. I did not intend to insinuate in the slightest degree that the proposal made by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was against the men; on the contrary, I quite agree with him.

Mr. PARDEE. I move that section 6 be amended so as to read :

Whenever, under this Act, an application is made in due form for the appointment of a board of conciliation and investigation, the minister, whose decision for such purpose shall be binding, shall, within fifteen days from the date at which the application is received, establish such board under his hand and seal of office, if satisfied that the provisions of this Act apply.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 68 and 69 struck out.

On section 35,

Mr. LEMIEUX. Now comes the question of including the railway men within the provisions of this Act. As I have stated before, we met some delegations from certain brotherhoods when the Bill was introduced. The railway men represented by Mr. Harvey Hall claimed that the provisions of this Act were cumbersome and expensive as regarded their organizations, and represented to the minister that they would rather remain under the operation of the Railway Labour Disputes Act of 1903. I have had several communications with Mr. Hall, and I am sorry to say that this gentleman persists in the position which he took at the beginning, and will not yield to the invitation to come under the operation of the present Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister says that Mr. Harvey Hall objects to come under the operation of this Bill. Is that as the representative of the trainmen, or is it a personal matter on his part?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I mean as representing the railway men—not all of them, I may say, but some of the brotherhoods. The hon. gentleman must not assume that when I speak of Mr. Hall I speak of him personally. I speak of him as acting for several brotherhoods with which he is connected.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the minister kindly name some of the brotherhoods?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not the list here, but he represents many. I regret to say that Mr. Hall persists in the position he has taken on behalf of some of the railway brotherhoods. We claim that this Bill is less expensive and less cumbersome to the railway organizations than the Labour Disputes Act of 1903. I made a proposition to Mr. Hall which I thought he would accept. I have asked Mr. Hall to let his brotherhood, and the railway men in general, come under the provisions of the Railway Labour Disputes Act, provided the Railway Labour Disputes Act were amended so as to, at all events, prevent a strike before any investigation should have taken place. I have received a letter from him, in which he declines to accept the proposition which has been made to him. Under these circumstances, and in view of the position occupied in the country by the railway men, in view of the importance of the present legislation, and in order to protect the public against any strike or lock-out on the part of railway employees or railway companies, I have decided, after consultation with my colleagues and many members of this House, that the Act should not apply to any railway company or to the employees of any such company with respect to any dispute which has been referred and dealt with under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and labour. That is to say, railway employees and railway companies will come under the operation of this Act if they do not accept the operation of the Railway Labour Disputes Act. If they prefer to accept the Railway Labour Disputes Act they are at liberty to do so. Under that Act an investigation can take place before a strike has been ordered, or during the strike, or after. The Railway Labour Disputes Act will remain on the statute-book. They can invoke the provisions of that Act, or if they refuse, then this Act applies. I have drafted an amendment which will form a new section by itself. It reads as follows :

This Act shall apply to any railway company or the employees of any such company in respect of any dispute which has been referred and dealt with under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and labour.

I speak here of the Act respecting conciliation and labour because it is so defined under the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. LENNOX. While my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is looking over this proposed amendment, I desire to call the minister's attention to the fact that I have received a number of communications in regard to this subject. I

propose to quote to the minister these two telegrams. They are both from Barrie. One is :

The Order of Railway Conductors, representing the northern division of the Grand Trunk Railway, respectfully request exemption from the Lemieux Bill, or that Bill be withdrawn this session.

(Sgd.) K. McLENNAN,
Chief Conductor.

The other is:

The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, representing the northern division of the Grand Trunk at Allandale, respectfully request exemption from Lemieux Bill ; failing exemption that Bill be withdrawn.

(Sgd.) J. LITTLE.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have also received several telegrams of the same nature, but the answer is very plain and it is that they need not be afraid of the provisions of the present legislation because they are at liberty to remain under the old legislation. If they are satisfied with the Act of 1903, and if they wish to avail themselves of the provisions of that Act they are at liberty to do so.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is the minister in a position to tell the House whether the railway brotherhoods accept this new proposal? What they asked was to be relieved from the scope of the Act altogether and to show that, I want to read a message I have here :

The joint general committee of the Order of Railroad Conductors and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, in session assembled at Toronto, beg to advise you that the proposed measure known as Bill No. 36 is inimical to the interests of the men in train service. We, therefore, respectfully ask that you use your influence to have the same amended by eliminating steam railways from the Bill.

Mr. PARDEE. Who is it signed by ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is signed by Mr. W. J. Rath, secretary of the joint committee. The views of the men are very admirably set out in a resolution passed by the Cigar Makers' International Union. While they are not concerned in this Bill they have a very clear appreciation of the situation and their resolution runs in this way.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Are they a public utility?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No, but they have their view in regard to organized labour.

Whereas the Hon. the Minister of Labour has introduced a Bill providing for compulsory investigation of industrial disputes ;

And whereas the said Bill enjoins such unions as may come under its provisions from striking under any circumstances pending the conclusions of the sittings and report of the findings of the arbitrators which may take thirty or sixty days or be prolonged for an indefinite period of time, denying workmen the right to strike until after the publication of the report of the arbitrators ;

And whereas the said Bill does not similarly enjoin the employer who may inaugurate a strike by a summary reduction of wages or other rupture of existing agreement causing cessation of work ;

And whereas the said Bill is, in our opinion, a long step in the direction of compulsory arbitration, which same we believe would be an unlimited curse to the workingmen of this country, and which the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, the legislative mouthpiece of the workers of Canada, have denounced and pronounced against ;

And whereas the ostensible object stated as sought for by said Bill, viz., the avoidance or settlement of industrial disputes, particularly in mining and transportation, and such as are generally described as public utilities, would be better obtained, and the general public who are so dependent upon these things would be far better satisfied if these utilities were brought, as they ought to be, under public ownership ;

Therefore, be it resolved that we, the Cigarmakers' International Union No. 27, of Toronto, denounce the said Bill as opposed to the best interests of labour in this country and against the interests of labour generally; and be it further resolved that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the Hon. Minister of Labour, Toronto parliamentary representatives, Alphonse Verville, M.P., W. F. Maclean, M.P., editor 'Industrial Banner,' and the press, Toronto.

I would like the minister to say, since he has decided on a compromise policy and since he says he has been in long consultation with Mr. Hall, the legislative agent of these brotherhoods, whether he has submitted this compromise to him. I would ask that he should go no further in regard to this proposal to-night, but give them an opportunity of being heard again. For these railroad brotherhoods are a very extensive organization and embrace a very fine class of men. I know no better men in Canada than are the men who run our railroads. They have the lives of the public in their hands, and they are worthy of the trust. They are law abiding citizens. I know hundreds of them personally and meet them year after year; and if there are any citizens of Canada who are entitled to be heard in this parliament and to have their representations most carefully considered, they are the men making up the railroad brotherhoods in Canada.

Mr. TALBOT. Are they in favour of the two-cent fare?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes. And they are in favour of public ownership. And they are in favour of a good many other things—and will be in favour of a new government if their views are not listened to. So I put it to the minister as a reasonable suggestion that, as he has said he has negotiated with the brotherhoods, he should go one step further and have some further conference with regard to the proposal he has submitted.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As I said a moment ago, during the last four or five weeks I have had several communications from Mr. Hall, but, as I have already informed the House, he would not accept any compromise, but simply stated: 'There is a law in the statute-book governing the relations of the railway employees to the railway companies and we do not want any change in that law.' Well, under this section, the brotherhoods he represents, are at liberty to remain under the Railway Labour Disputes Act. But there are other railway employees who are ready to accept the provisions of this Bill. Mr. Hall says—and, of course, it is his right to hold and to express his opinion—your Bill is too expensive and cumbersome and we prefer the existing law. Very well; let him remain under the operation of the existing law. But one thing is certain, they must remain under the operation of one law or the other, just as the railway companies must remain under a legislation which protects the public. My hon. friend cites the opinion of the cigarmakers. I have a very high regard for the cigarmakers; they are earnest labourers. But the cigarmakers are not concerned in any public utility or engaged in the production of a necessary of life. I prefer the opinion of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress which has represented for years the healthy and honest opinion of organized labour in Canada. The Dominion Trades and Labour Congress has signified its endorsation of the present legislation in no uncertain terms. I have stated already that in September or October last that great representative body passed a resolution in favour of a legislation such as this, and after the Bill was introduced, they sent a delegation to Ottawa to meet the Prime Minister and Minister of Labour to express strongly their approval of this Bill. The street railway men of Toronto held a public meeting and unanimously endorsed this legislation. And so did the Toronto Trades and Labour Council. In fact, nearly all the labour organizations in Canada support this measure. We have the opposition of Mr. Hall because he says, speaking always on behalf of the railway brotherhoods, that he prefers to remain under the provisions of the law of 1903. Now, he has stated in his letter criticising this Bill that this is the second step taken by this government in favour of compulsory arbitration. Well, if he contends that this is the second step towards compulsory arbitration, he was himself a party to the first step taken in 1903, because he gave his unqualified endorsation to the Bill introduced in this House is 1903 by Sir William Mulock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And he endorses it still.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly, and, under this section he is at liberty, and the brotherhoods he represent are at liberty, to remain under the provisions of the Act of 1903, or, if they prefer, to come under the operation of the present law. But, Sir it would not be fair, it would not be honest, to exclude all railway employees when other organizations come under the provisions of this Bill, for the railways are the greatest of our public utilities. Now, in 1903, Mr. Hall, on behalf of the brotherhood, wrote the following letter:

Hon. Sir,—After the great amount of consideration that I have given to your Bill for the settlement of railway labour disputes and your desire to put a Bill such as it is on the statutes of the country, for the purpose for which it is aimed, I feel that considering those motives, it is one that should be endorsed by the members of parliament. The fact that the Bill has the power of appointing a conciliation committee, whose duty it will be to endeavour by all possible means to bring about settlements of disputes that may arise, I have no doubt will have good effect. Although in the train service we have had no serious difficulties between the train hands and the company for over ten years, and I don't see that there is a possibility in the near future of anything of the kind occurring, still, the fact of a measure such as this being under the statutes of Canada will place the Minister of Labour in a position to use his good offices to bring about a settlement of those differences, should they arise, possibly without going so far as arbitration. If, after the committee have failed to settle the difference, then the privilege of course, of referring the matter to arbitration, or of what is more a fact—investigation of the difference between the company and their men. They making their report to the Minister of Labour, who will, according to the provisions of the Act, make report of the findings of that committee through the public press of the country; this being for the purpose of influence by public opinion. Something, I believe, that will have that force behind it, that no matter which side of the controversy refuses to be fair, will compel them to accept reasonable conditions and to make a settlement. As I said before, the matter has had a great deal of consideration from myself, and also from other representative railway men of the country, and while admitting that there are a number of those interested who opposed the Bill, I think merely from the fact that they believe that the existing circumstances are all that are required, claiming that they have been able, up to the present, to settle their differences without interference from anybody, and believe that they can still continue to do so, and argue that there is no occasion for the Bill. But I am confident that a large majority of those interested are satisfied to accept your Bill, with the guarantee that it is intended to accomplish the one object—the bringing about of settlements of disputes that may arise.

As the legislative representative of the Brothrerhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and the Order of Railway Telegraphers, I have consented to the Bill as it is now introduced, and hope that all concerned will make the necessary use of the

Bill, if the occasion ever arises, and also that it will be interpreted according to the ideas and intentions of the minister, and as I believe the Bill is intended to operate, and serve, my only wish is that it will be the dove of peace to bring about conditions where sometimes we have war and enmity to each other.

Respectfully yours,
(Sgd.) J. H. HALL.

So, Mr. Chairman, in 1903 Mr. Hall was in favour of a Bill which gives power to the minister to order a public investigation before a strike takes place or while a strike is going on, or after it has taken place; while in 1907, Mr. Hall says that he does not wish to come under the operation of the Bill which I have introduced, and which is about to pass this House, but that he still wishes to remain under the operation of the Act of 1903. Very well, he will remain under the operation of that Act if he chooses to do so, and if he does not, then he must come under the operation of this Act. Is that not fair? But he has himself declared that the Act of 1903 is a dove of peace, inasmuch as it provides for an investigation and decision, and brings peace where there were disputes, and settlement where there was war. I think that the railway employees, at least those who are behind Mr. Hall, should not persist in opposing this legislation, especially the present section, which has in view only the protection of the public and their own interests. What objection does Mr. Hall raise? From the beginning his objection has been this: This legislation will entail unnecessary expense on our railway organizations, it is a cumbersome Bill, and we prefer the first one. Well, we now give Mr. Hall and the railway brotherhood which he represents the option of remaining under the Railway Disputes Act, which he accepted, or of coming under the operation of the present Bill. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the committee should pronounce finally and say that in order to protect the public against the effect of any strike or lockout in the railway world, the employees should come under the operation of this law as well as the employers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has on at least two occasions, in my presence, quoted the letter of Mr. Harvey Hall as a reason why this Act should be made to apply to the railway employees. If I understood the letter aright, it contains every reason why they do not desire to be brought under this Act. The minister says that they declare the Act of 1903 to be a good Act, they hail it as the dove of peace and what he says is quite true; but it is precisely for this reason that the men want to remain under it. The minister says he does leave them under it, but I do not think he does so very satisfactorily, and I will explain why. His proposed amendment is as follows:

Mr. LEMIEUX.

This Act shall not apply to any railway company or employees of any such company in respect of any dispute which has been referred to and dealt with under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation of labour.

To advert for a moment to the wording of the section, there is no such a thing as a reference in the Conciliation and Labour Act at all. The language is badly chosen. All that the Conciliation and Labour Act provides is that the minister, in case of a dispute, may, upon application of either of the parties, or of any municipal body, cause an inquiry to be made into the same and into the cause thereof. There is nothing in the first instance about a reference in the Act so far as I am aware; certainly not in the main section of the Act. So this is not very happily worded, in the first place. The amendment provides that this Act shall not apply in respect of any dispute which has been referred and dealt with under the Conciliation and Labour Act. So until you have had the dispute referred under that Act—and there is no provision in that Act for referring it in the first instance—and until you have had the dispute dealt with under that Act, then the application of this Act is not eliminated. If you desire to do what the minister says is in his mind, you will have to adopt a different wording, and make a provision something like this:

This Act shall not apply to any railway company or the employees of any such company in respect of any dispute, if either party thereto applies to the minister to cause inquiry to be made into the same and the cause thereof, under the provisions of the Conciliation and Labour Act.

I have followed the wording of the Conciliation and Labor Act, and possibly the expressions I have used might be improved, because I have written them out hurriedly. The operative words of section 13, which was section 3 of the original Act of 1903, are as follows:

The minister may either on the application of any party to the difference, or on the application of the corporation of any municipality directly affected by the difference, or of his own motion, cause inquiry to be made into the same and the cause thereof, and for that purpose may, under his hand and seal of office, establish a committee of conciliation.

I have not made the section even so broad as it might be made under the operation of section 13 because it would not perhaps be unfair that this Act should apply unless either one or other of the parties invoked the operation of the Act of 1903. That I understand to be the minister's intention. Perhaps I am not correct in that. Would he say whether he proposes to make his present Act absolutely applicable unless either one or other of the parties to the difference shall apply to the minister to

cause an inquiry to be made under the Act of 1903?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, and after the reference has taken place.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty then is that at any time before that inquiry has been concluded you can still bring the men or the employer under this Act if you follow the literal reading of your section. I propose to eliminate this Act as soon as either one of the parties applies under the Act of 1903. The minister's section does not eliminate the application of this Act until after the matter has been referred and dealt with under the Act of 1903. I say that if what the minister proposes is carried out, either of the parties can absolutely bring this Act into operation just as soon as the other invokes the Act of 1903. That is the difference between the two proposals and it is a very important one.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend states that either party may apply to the Minister of Labour under the Act of 1903, and the Minister of Labour may of his own motion cause an inquiry to be made—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On such application or of his own motion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The inquiry may or may not take place; it is optional; it is discretionary on the part of the minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is my hon. friend of the opinion that the railway employees or the railway companies as the case may be can strike or lockout without any investigation taking place? The object of the new section which I propose is that under no circumstances shall a strike or lockout occur on a railway without an investigation having taken place. The railway employees claim that the present Bill is too cumbersome and entails too vast an expenditure for them and they prefer to remain under the Act of 1903. They do not say that they object to the investigation taking place before the strike. If my hon. friend will read the letters which were published by Mr. Harvey Hall he will find that they do not object to the investigation taking place before the strike is declared; the objection is that the procedure under this Act is too cumbersome and expensive. Well and good, you shall come under the operation of the Act of 1903, and when the matter referred under the provisions of the Act of 1903 has been dealt with and decided then this Act shall not apply to the dispute in question. That is the object of the new section. I shall read the objections of Mr. Hall to the present Bill. I have here a letter addressed to myself, January 17, 1907:

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of yours of January 15, in which you say there is a possibility of your being unable to hold over the second reading of your Bill for compulsory investigation in industrial disputes until after February 5. I sincerely hope, however that you will be able to do so as I feel that an understanding prior to the second reading might shorten the discussion and also give you a better understanding of the position of the railway men in respect of this legislation.

In the last paragraph of your letter you asked me to give my reasons for claming that your Bill is not in the interests of the railway organizations or in the interest of peace between them and the companies. At this date I am not at liberty to go into any extended argument on the question for the reason I have not had time to consult with any great number of my clients. However, I think I can claim that the railway men of Canada should have been exempt from the Act. I do so from the fact that our organizations have always been very conservative in their actions.

I am glad to find the word 'conservative,' because some hon. gentlemen the other day thought I had invented the word.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is a good word.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is a good word.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do not apologize.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (reading):

I do so from the fact that our organizations have always been very conservative in their actions and dealings with their companies and have on many occasions spent thousands of dollars negotiating their grievances rather than take extreme measures. In a few days I expect to have information showing the amounts which are positively astonishing spent in this way. Months have also been spent in negotiating, and when I said in my letter that I did not think it was in the interests of our organizations I referred to sections in the Act that will encourage further delays and expense which must be borne by the employees, and an opportunity will be given the railway companies to further harass their employees without any advantage in so far as the public is concerned other than that which is now in the Railway Disputes Act, 1903. When I mention the fees I do so owing to the reason that the railway organizations will have to change their policy from that of extended negotiation and attempt without spending money and time in efforts to make a settlement when they know this Act is liable to be used to create delay and expense on their membership, and I am quite satisfied it will not tend to continue the harmonious relations which now exist.

The letter then discusses sections of the Bill and is signed by Mr. J. Harvey Hall. Thus my hon. friend will see that the only objection raised against this Bill by Mr. Hall is that it makes the procedure too expensive and cumbersome for the railway men's organization.

Here is another letter dated January 28, addressed to the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Minister of Labour:

Referring to my letter of January 17, in which I said I was not in a position to make an ex-

tended argument on the reasons why the railway men of Canada were liable not to agree with the conditions in your Bill I am now in a position to say to you that the organizations which I represent, being the conductors, locomotive engineers, trainmen and telegraphers, are going to ask to be exempted from the operation of your Act for the reasons of increased expenses in their deliberations and negotiations with their companies. The following will give you an idea of what is spent by the railroad organizations of Canada in negotiating with the companies by reference to the schedules which were agreed on during the year 1906. On the Grand Trunk system the conductors and trainmen acting jointly spent $5,572 on commission expenses. The same organizations on the Canadian Pacific Railway on lines east Fort William $12,043, commission expenses in negotiating their schedules.

He goes on quoting the expenses and continues :

We claim that your Act will create a condition that will bring about further delay and expenses upon the men. We also claim that the Railway Disputes Settlement Act, 1903, is as far as is necessary for the government to go in so far as the steam railway men are concerned, and I again ask you to withhold the second reading of the Bill until after February 5, when we will have representations from the men when these questions can be discussed.

Thanking you in advance, &.,

(Sgd.) J. HARVEY HALL.

So that according to Mr. Hall himself they are quite willing to come under the operation of the Act of 1903 and they are at liberty to be under the operation of that Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg the minister's pardon.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But if he does not choose to come under the operation of the Act of 1903 surely the public must be protected, surely a strike must not be allowed on any railway system without an investigation taking place. The objection of Mr. Hall is that the machinery in this Bill is too cumbersome and too expensive. But under the Act of 1903, the minister has power to order an investigation before the strike takes place, and the action of the minister is described in section 15 as a reference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand perfectly what you mean now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a provision in the Act of 1903 for the formation of a board of conciliation, and if that board is not successful, a board of arbitration may be appointed, so that, contrary to Mr. Hall's idea, the machinery in the Act of 1903 is not less cumbersome and less expensive than the machinery in the present Bill. But I yield to the request of Mr. Hall and the brotherhoods which he represents. I say to them : You will continue to be under the operation of the Act of 1903, but if you choose not to apply, and if your dispute is not referred before the strike or lockout takes place, then surely no one will say that no investigation shall take place as provided in this Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difference between the brotherhoods of railway men and the minister was this. They did not want sections 57 and 58 to be made applicable to them, because, they said, there is a careful, and patient, and thorough investigation, so far as they are concerned, not only in the various grades of their order, but through all the railway departments from the lowest to the highest, before they decide on a strike. They said : You have practically all the investigation which is necessary or desirable, and you should not subject us to the operation of sections 57 and 58 of this Act ; you have the Act of 1903, which, as the present Minister of Labour and his predecessor have declared, has operated successfully and perfectly in the prevention of strikes ; and therefore there is no occasion to impose on us the restrictions of this statute. The minister first told us he proposed to get over this difficulty by allowing the railway men to remain under the Act of 1903, but to so amend it that sections 57 and 58 of this Bill should be added to the terms of that statute. He does not do that. But he does the same thing in another way ; he proposes to add to this statute the following clause :

This Act shall not apply to any railway company or to employees of any such company in respect to any dispute which has been referred and dealt with under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and mediation.

The minister says he is providing for simplicity of procedure, but let us see. You can proceed under the Act of 1903 on the application of either one party or the other, and the minister upon that application establishes a board of conciliation, which has the duty of endeavouring, by conciliation and mediation, to bring about an amicable settlement of the difficulties, and to report the proceedings to the minister. The conciliation committee may for months be endeavouring to effect a settlement; and in case it fails the minister may refer the differences to arbitration. First, you have the conciliation committee, then you have a board of arbitration appointed by the minister, and, so far as I understand the proposed amendment, at any time before the board of arbitration completes its work, one party or the other can invoke the provisions of the Bill which we are now considering, and thus you will have a third tribunal. I do not see any simplicity of procedure in that. It seems to me a perfect mockery. The minister speaks as if the railway men

would have their choice; they will have no choice. The minister may begin by appointing a committee of conciliation, which may work for weeks or months; he may then refer the dispute to a board of arbitrators, and these arbitrators may work for weeks or months; and then, at the very last moment, if the employer thinks the board of arbitration is likely to decide against him, he can undo all the work that has been done and he can proceed under the provisions of the statute now before us. Almost anything is better than a scheme of that kind. And yet that is the scheme which is seriously proposed to us by the minister, if I understood him correctly; if not, I should like him to correct me.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend seems to forget that I was simply yielding to the requests made by Mr. Hall.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Am I correct in my interpretation of what may take place under the proposal which the minister now makes?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend seems to forget that I am yielding to the demand of Mr. Hall and the brotherhoods he represents, in giving them the option of remaining under the Act of 1903. I agree with my hon. friend that the Act of 1903 is not simplicity itself in the way of procedure. It is more cumbersome and more expensive than the present Bill; but the railway men, as represented by Mr. Hall, do not wish to come under the operation of the present Bill, they wish to remain under the operation of the other. We say: Very well, remain under the operation of the other; but if you do not invoke the Act of 1903, you will come under the Act of 1907.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The amendment does not say that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, the amendment says that this Act shall not apply to railway companies or railway employees with respect to any dispute that may have been referred and dealt with under the provisions of the Railway Labour Disputes Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do you mean by the expression 'dealt with'?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will give an example. Suppose that I am a railway employee, and with my fellow workers decide that a strike shall be declared. Before declaring the strike, I consult with the committee, and we decide to invoke the provisions of the Act of 1903. We make our application to the Minister of Labour, and he orders an investigation to take place before the strike is declared. A board of conciliation is constituted, and if it does not succeed in settling the dispute, a board of arbitration is appointed, its findings are published, and then the parties are at liberty to strike or not to strike. On the other hand, the committee decide not to come under the operation of the Act of 1903, but to come under what I consider the more expeditious procedure of the Act of 1907. They follow the procedure which is indicated in the Bill which we are now considering. They have the option of the two Acts. The point I wish to make clear is that the strike will not take place before the investigation has taken place, whether it is under the operation of the Act of 1903 or the Act of 1907.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose the men under the Act of 1903 make an application on February 1, for the intervention of the minister under the terms of that Act. Is it not perfectly possible for the employer on February 2, to make his application under the terms of the Act of 1907, and to bring that Act into instant operation, and in that way to nullify the action of the men under the Act of 1903? That is one question. Is it not possible for the employer to do that very same thing on every day that intervenes between the day of the application by the employees under the Act of 1903 and the day on which there has been a final award by a board of arbitration constituted by the minister under the same Act?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend, I am sure, wishes to be fair; but is he really fair when he supposes the first case? Does my hon. friend believe that the Minister of Labour will be satisfied—in accordance with the terms of the amendment adopted a few minutes ago—that the second application is well founded in view of the one made on February 1? Surely my hon. friend sees that the Minister of Labour will not grant the second application if there is one pending since February 1 with regard to the same dispute?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why, the Act of 1907 supersedes the other, unless the matter has been referred and dealt with under the Act of 1903. I am pointing out that it has not been referred and dealt with up to the time the final award is made. Therefore the minister has no option. He will be bound to grant the second application.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That point can easily be covered. What I wanted to establish first before the House was the compromise at which I had arrived. When that compromise is accepted by the House, as I assume it will be, we can easily provide for the case mentioned by my hon. friend. Surely nothing should intervene between the application and the finding by the first board.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not accepting or rejecting anything. I have no authority to accept or reject anything; but as these men have not had an opportunity to appear before a committee of the House, as I think they should have had, I would not be disposed to impose upon them any provisions which they are not willing to ac-

cept. I think the conditions might have been very different if the minister had brought representatives of the men face to face with representatives of the employers before a committee of the House. As the matter stands, we are proceeding largely in the dark. If they had been given that opportunity, I believe these people would have got together. It is idle for the minister to boast that everything is known about this subject in the Department of Labour. Only some aspects of it are known in the Department of Labour; and I am not saying this with any disrespect to that department, because it is perfectly idle to suppose that any department could, with the utmost possible diligence, learn everything about the labour question in this country in three or four years; and it is idle for the minister to think that he could get along with this Bill as well without that information which could have been acquired by a committee of the House, as he could have done if he had taken advantage of the suggestion that was made. If the minister desires to carry out what he says he proposes, he should put his amendment in this way: This Act shall not apply to any railway company or to the employees of any railway company with respect to any dispute if either party thereto applies to the minister to cause an inquiry into the same and the causes thereof under the provisions of the Conciliation and Labour Act. If he does that he gives the men an option.

If he does not do that he gives the men no option because he imports, by the terms of such an amendment as this, the provisions of section 57 and 58 into the Railway Disputes Act of 1903, and I do not think it is fair to these men to import these provisions into that Act without first giving them an opportunity of appealing before a committee of this House. No such legislation has been passed in any country that I know of in the civilized world, whether New Zealand or elsewhere, without giving workingmen an opportunity to be heard before a committee of the House and of expressing their views fully and freely; and when you attempt to proceed with this Bill without that, you have to be extremely careful as to the character of the legislation which you impose, because the worst possible service which you could do the cause of conciliation between capital and labour is to impose upon the railway or any other class of men legislation which will leave them with a sense of injustice and lack of fair play. If the minister does propose to give the men the option, as he says he does, I think he should adopt the clause as I have hurriedly drafted it and not the clause which he has drafted the effect of which simply is to impose upon these men that against which they are most earnestly protesting.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. FOSTER. After the lawyers have had their round of it I want to see if a layman can understand what the minister means.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Did I not make it clear?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there was a little fog about the thing. The atmosphere was not quite clear.

This Act——

That means the Act we are now discussing?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER (reading):

—shall not apply to any railway company or the employees of any such company.

When shall it not apply?

In respect of any dispute which has been referred and dealt with.

It shall not apply to any dispute which has been referred. That is one step.

—and dealt with.

That is finished.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No 'dealt with' means commenced, I should think.

Mr. FOSTER. 'Dealt with' means commenced. Have I dealt with my breakfast when I have commenced with the porridge? Evidently not. The whole concern must be negotiated. I must eat the porridge, the eggs, the bacon and all before I have dealt with it. Has the insurance question been dealt with when the first witness is heard or when the report even is made? When it is dealt with it is finished, it is all gone through with from A to Z and laid up on the shelf. As I understand it as a layman the only exception is with respect to a dispute under the 1903 Act which has been begun and ended.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Dealt with under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. And therefore to every dispute not begun and finished this present Act applies? That is my reading of it.

This Act shall not apply to any railway company or the employees of any such company with respect of any dispute which has been referred and dealt with under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and labour.

The minister expressed his wish to give the railway men an absolute option and not to trammel it in any way. That is one thing. But when he gives them only an option with respect to disputes which have been referred and dealt with and which are ended it leaves this Act to come in on every dispute which has not been begun and dealt with and ended. May be I am

wrong but that is the impression the English of the section conveys to my mind.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will try and make myself a little clearer. I will take an example again. I am the employee, my hon. friend is the employer and I have a dispute with him. We are in the railway business and we have two courses to follow. I can either, as a railway employee, come under the provisions of the Act of 1903 or under the provisions of the Act of 1907. I choose to come under the Act of 1903. I apply, to the minister and the minister orders an investigation as per section 3 of the Railway Labour Disputes Act. The board is constituted, the award is rendered, or the finding is made and the case there is dealt with. The dispute may not be ended, the parties may strike or lockout but the investigation will have taken place before the strike or the lockout, and therefore that dispute has been dealt with under the provisions of the Railway Labour Disputes Act of 1903. Is that clear ?

Mr. FOSTER. Well ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Suppose I do not choose to come under the operation of the Act of 1903 ; the Act of 1907 applies. One of two things must happen ; the strike or lockout will not take place unless the investigation has been ordered and has taken place. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that the section should be drafted to read as follows :

This Act shall not apply to any railway company or the employees of any such company in respect of any dispute if either party thereto applies to the minister to cause inquiry to be made into the same and the cause thereof under the provisions of the Conciliation and Labour Act.

The objection I find to this draft is this : Under the Act of 1903 the parties may apply to the minister, the minister may grant the investigation or he may refuse it. He has a discretionary power, it is optional with him to grant an investigation and if he does not choose to grant the investigation, if, for instance, application is made by the railway employees and the minister happens to be a friend—a near friend—of a railway corporation and he refuses an investigation—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Justice answered my hon. friend during this session by explaining that when the word 'may' is used in that sense it means that the minister may do that and may not do any thing else.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But my hon. friend will see that there are three different courses which are mentioned in section 3. I will read it for my hon. friend. I may be wrong but I think I am right. Take section 3 of the Railway Labour Disputes Act :

Whenever a difference exists between any railway employers and railway employees, and it appears to the minister that the parties thereto are unable satisfactorily to adjust the same, and that by reason of such difference remaining unadjusted the railway lockout or strike has been or is likely to be caused or the regular and safe transportation of mails, passengers or freight has been or may be interrupted, or the safety of any person employed on a railway train or car has been or is likely to be endangered, the minister may, either on the application of any party to the difference, or on the application of the corporation of any municipality directly affected by the difference or of his own motion, cause inquiry to be made into the same and the cause thereof.

So it is purely optional on the part of the minister, because it says 'if it appears to the minister.' But it may not appear to the minister that the investigation is necessary, and, in that case, no investigation will take place, the strike or lockout will be declared, but the public will not know the cause of the quarrel, and the parties will not have the advantage of placing before the public the nature of the trouble.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. minister will excuse me, but he has misread the section. It says :

If it appears to the minister that the parties thereto are unable satisfactorily to adjust the same, and that by reason of such difference remaining unadjusted a railway lockout or strike has been or is likely to be caused——

That is one of the alternatives, and it is complete. The word 'may' is not optional when applied to a public functionary like the minister. The minister is obliged to act, and would be guilty of dereliction of duty if, under such circumstances, he refused to act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Still my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), with his legal knowledge, is aware that under this wording, as it is understood in the Railway department, it is purely optional to the minister. I see that my hon. friend from South Simcoe shakes his head.

Mr. LENNOX. I certainly shake my head at that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Then my hon. friend has no reason.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister must exercise a reasonable discretion, but, when the case is clear, it is his duty to act—he must act.

Mr. BOYCE. The minister has dealt with the two parties to the dispute, as if no others were interested, so far as this Bill is concerned. But what is the minister going to do with the people, as represented by the municipal corporations? Take the case of a great railroad strike, in which neither disputant will make application un-

der this Act, is the minister going to ignore the right of the people to make an application under the Railway Labour Disputes Act? Suppose there is a big railway strike in the Northwest, one which would create a great deal of trouble with regard to the fuel supply, as was the case last winter, and neither of the parties to the dispute would make an application under either one Act or the other, the minister would have no jurisdiction except under the Railway Labour Disputes Act, under which he may, of his own motion, interfere. But if a municipality applies under the Railway Labour Disputes Act and the minister proceeds under the Bill now before us, where is he going to land, and what decision is the board going to give? Is he going to ignore the right of the public as representing the municipal corporations, or will he concede this right of the people by accepting the very reasonable amendment suggested by the leader of the opposition, which leaves the Railway Labour Disputes Act there to be invoked by those entitled to invoke it? The minister reverses the situation, and extinguishes the right given to the municipality under the Railway Labour Disputes Act. The effect of the minister's proposal is to deprive the corporation of any municipality of its right.

Mr. LEMIEUX. How?

Mr. BOYCE. Simply because he says that this Bill shall not apply unless the parties come forward and ask it to be made applicable. That I understand to be the position.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The municipality is protected under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. BOYCE. I should like to understand that more clearly.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Railway Labour Disputes Act is not repealed.

Mr. BOYCE. But if that were the case, you would have the municipality applying and exercising its right under this Act, which does not need to come into consideration. That is, if they apply under the Railway Labour Disputes Act, the minister would act under the other. The minister does not say that if a municipality applies, that will govern his decision, or that he will have any other jurisdiction.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) will see that in case the dispute should be referred under the present Bill, the dispute will be referred to the board appointed under this Bill, and, in the meantime, no strike or lockout can take place. Suppose a municipality applies to the minister to proceed under the Act of 1903, the minister may refuse or he may consider it; he may refuse, because the dispute is pending and a reference has been made under the dispute. There cannot be two references under the same dispute.

Mr. BOYCE. But under section 13, if the municipality applies the minister has no judicial discretion to refuse.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister has over and again stated that he is giving the railway employees an option of remaining under the Act of 1903. I think if he will put that into legislation it will probably be satisfactory. But I do not think the minister has carried into effect by the amendment the statements he made in his speech. I understand the amendment to amount to this, that if proceedings have been taken under the Act respecting Conciliation and Labour and have been disposed of, then the new Act will not apply. It is what the lawyers call a case of res adjudicata, it is a matter that has been disposed of. So that what the minister really gives in his proposed amendment is simply a gold brick; so far as it amounts to giving these men any remedy, it is absolutely useless.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will my hon. friend explain that?

Mr. LENNOX. I say that all it provides is this: That if proceedings have been taken under the Act of 1903, and have been disposed of, then they cannot come forward immediately under the new Act. What the minister proposes under the new amendment is absolutely useless and does not in any sense carry out what he proposes to give these men, that is an option. He also says that under the Conciliation and Disputes Act, when an application is made to him he may refuse it. Well, that is all the greater reason why he should make a distinct provision that until default is made by the railway employees or by the railway company in coming under the Act we have now in force, the new Act shall have no application at all. I understand the minister wishes to give these men an actual option to remain under the Act of 1903. But you cannot bring them under the new Act unless they have been guilty of some default in regard to the Act of 1903. Therefore I would suggest that this is the proper line of legislation to adopt.

This Act shall not apply to any railway company or the employees of any railway company unless and until the railway company or railway employees have refused to come under the provisions of the Act respecting conciliation and labour.

That is going, I acknowledge, further than the leader of the opposition suggested. He pointed out that probably the minister only intended to go so far as to say that if the parties had invoked the jurisdiction of the old Act then this Act should not apply. But the minister, in his speech, promised the employees that the Act should not apply unless they were in default and refused to come under the old Act. If the min-

ister means that, he is not carrying out the suggestion. I say in no offensive sense that the amendment as proposed by the minister does not carry into effect what he suggested, it does not show that he has very carefully considered it. At all events, it is only fair that these men should have an opportunity of considering it and formulating their answer to it. I therefore suggest that the minister will save time and be giving a greater measure of justice to the men, if he allows this matter to stand now so that the interested parties may have an opportunity of considering it.

Mr. VERVILLE. I think that some of the railway employees who are not supposed to come under this Act, according to the amendment, would not like to see others come under it. We must not forget that there are a certain number of them who are entirely favourable to this new Act. Last Friday, I met in this very hall a representative of one of the large railway organizations, that is the maintenance of ways men, and he plainly told me that he had been misinformed with regard to this Bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, the men who take care of the road, I say it with all due respect to other employees, are just as important to the road as any other class. If the road is not well maintained no trains will run over it. It is proposed to give some of the railway employees the option to come under the Act of 1903 or that of 1907. Of course there is a technical question here which the lawyers have been discussing.

I am not a lawyer and am glad of it. At the same time we must not forget that it is not just to exempt a certain faction of the employees of railway companies or any other from coming under this Act. I do not think it is just or right. I am not going to read letters from cigar makers although I have received some. I had one from Montreal but instead of reading it in this House I attended a meeting in Montreal and explained the Bill and they were satisfied. It is easy to satisfy the labour people of this country that the Bill is all right if you explain its provisions. Men have been misinformed in reference to this Bill in many parts of the country and they complain that it is compulsory arbitration. The trades congress does not come here to criticise legislation ; we come before a committee of the House and suggest whatever legislation we wish passed during the coming session. This is the proper way to do. I do not know that the railway employees do that. They criticise any legislation that comes before the House but never suggest to the ministers what legislation they think is necessary. I have always approved of this Bill in particular with the exception of two clauses, 62 and 63 which it was promised would be struck out and they have been struck out and I am now satisfied with the Bill. I claim it is completely unjust for a faction of the railway employees—we must not believe they are all that way—to prevent other people who may come under this Bill from deriving benefit from it. With all respect for Mr. Harvey Hall and for the railway men whom he represents, I wish to say this. It is not a question of more explanation and as far as technicalities are concerned, I leave them to the lawyers of the House. The railway employees have the option of coming under the 1903 Act or the 1907 Act, but I claim that this Bill should be passed as soon as possible, and then we would be able to observe the results of its operation and if necessary improve it next session.

Mr. BOYCE. With regard to the attitude of Mr. Harvey Hall on this question and in view of the fact that the minister read only a portion of the correspondence, I think it only fair to Mr. Harvey Hall who has met with such displeasing comments—

Mr. LEMIEUX. Displeasing—

Mr. BOYCE. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOYCE. I do not consider that Mr. Hall has received that fairness of treatment from the minister which the correspondence would warrant, and I shall place before the committee letters showing the manner in which Mr. Hall offered to meet the minister. There is a contrast between that and the way in which the minister treats the railway men as represented by Mr. Hall in introducing this amendment without consultation with Mr. Hall or those represented by him. I have here a letter which was in answer to the minister, dated from the Grand Union Hotel, March 4, 1907, to hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Minister of Labour.

Ottawa, Ontario, March 4, 1907,
Grand Union Hotel.

Honourable Rodolphe Lemieux,
Minister of Labour, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of February 22 wherein you ask if the railway organizations would be willing to make an undertaking that they would not go on strike until after an investigation had been held under the Railway Labour Disputes Act, and my reply to the same that I would place your proposition in the hands of the executive officers of the organizations I represent and that I would reply as soon as advised by them.

I am in a position now to say that they do not agree with the idea and they further intimate that there is no difference between your proposition and the conditions as set out in clause 57 of your Bill.

In your letter of February 25 you appear to invite further expression of my views in respect to your Bill. I therefore take this opportunity of presenting some further views in respect to the same.

There is no doubt that you are quite aware that the railway men are unanimous in their opposition to the principle of the measure, and further as you have stated that there are

certain organizations of labour who believe the legislation to be good and are willing to accept it, and further, I think you must admit, that it is experimental legislation. I feel that you could readily grant exemption for the railway men and let your Bill apply to those who feel that it would be in their interest. You have sufficient argument to sustain this position as has already been pointed out to you, and, as I believe, you know yourself that the railway men are negotiators and not strikers, and the record of these associations are such that no strikes of railway men interested in the train service in Canada have taken place for a great number of years, the public would suffer no inconvenience and parliament will be carrying out a much recognized principle in not amending or altering legislation that is on the statute-books that has proved so satisfactory as the Railway Labour Disputes Act has. Representation has been made that your Bill does not interfere with the railway men up to the time of a strike or the application to board of investigation. That is one of the principal points of our objections to your measure. We claim that it does.

We claim that under present circumstances we negotiate with the officers of the companies, both employer and employee standing on the same level. Your Bill alters that position. The employer knows that the employee can only go so far and no farther without giving due notice, which is done in the copy of the application which has been sent to the minister asking for the appointment of the board. This puts the employer in a position that he will take all kinds of an advantage of the employee and will not negotiate with that spirit of fairness that heretofore has prevailed.

I am inclosing you a copy of a letter that I have received from Mr. E. E. Clarke, a gentleman who was spoken of by yourself as composing a portion of the commission appointed by President Roosevelt to inquire into the Pennsylvania coal strike, and was also spoken of by other members in the House as sanctioning legislation such as your Bill contains. In reading Mr. Clarke's letter I am sure you will see that he points out practically the same objections to your Bill as I do, as you will notice he makes very serious objection to clause 57, which to my mind is the essential clause of the Bill and are its main objections as far as we are concerned.

Now, Sir, I feel that in all fairness to the railway men, who no one can say a word against in respect to the manner in which they conduct their business through their organizations, and the little cause that there is for any one to complain about any inconvenience that they have been submitted to through the actions of these organizations and your own sense of justice of a great number of citizens of Canada who are engaged in the railway service, that we shoud not be submitted at the present time to legislation of this nature, and I again appeal to you to exempt us from the provisions of this Act or that the Act should stand over until next session when its clauses can be more explicitly presented to all concerned. And let me say in conclusion, that if you adopt my suggestion that this legislation be made to apply to those who are willing to accept it, and it proves as satisfactory after a fair trial as it is maintained by its supporters that it will, in bringing about fair and amicable settlements of disputes, the railway men will meet you and give every consideration to the Act, and I will go farther and say assist you in making the Act a benefit to the country.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

Yours very truly,

J. HARVEY HALL.

So far from making an emphatic refusal of the minister's proposition Mr. Hall while dissenting from the proposition advanced by the minister in his letter that the railway men should undertake that they would not go out on strike pending a reference under the Railway Disputes Act says, that if the minister would either postpone his Bill or leave the Railway Disputes Bill as it was he would get all assistance from the railway men as represented by Mr. Harvey Hall. The situation is just where it was when the minister introduced this Bill and we know in what terms he then spoke of the Railway Labour Disputes Bill. There could not have been higher praise of the successful operation of any Bill than the minister bestowed on that Bill on that occasion. I quote from unrevised 'Hansard,' page 3075, the words of the minister:

> We have next the Railway Labour Disputes Act, and I think every one will admit that that Act, with its feature of compulsory investigation, has prevented any strike taking place in Canada.

If the Railway Labour Disputes Act has been so efficient as to prevent any railway strike taking place in Canada, can it be bettered by this experimental legislation which is complicated in its terms and cumbersome in its machinery. Mr. Hall's proposition to the minister is a fair one, and the minister might even now give it his consideration and postpone decision on this matter until such time as the organizations which Mr. Hall represents may have an opportunity of expressing their views. In justice to the railway labour organizations the minister should not force through this legislation without getting their opinion upon it.

Mr. CONMEE. I have had a number of communications from the railway employees and the ground they take is that they are opposed to compulsory arbitration or to any legislation that would prevent them quitting work either singly or in a body when the wages or conditions of their employment do not suit them. I agree that these are rights and privileges which should be safeguarded to them. The Bill does not impose compulsory arbitration, and it does not take away the rights to which reference has been made, but to a certain degree fortifies them. It will readily be admitted that every individual should be free to pursue his vocation and course of happiness in life, untrammelled by restrictions, so long as he does so without unduly infringing on the

rights of others. A strike or a lockout cannot take place without seriously infringing on the rights of others than those immediately involved in the dispute, and that being so, it is a fit and proper thing to be regulated by legislation. It is claimed that this Bill will be more expensive than the Railway Disputes Act of 1903. On the contrary, this legislation will be very inexpensive to operate; it will cost but little to invoke the establishment of the board, and, on the whole, the machinery provided seems to be satisfactory. It has been urged as an objection to this Act—but I think the objection is reached by confusing this Act with a Bill introduced in the Senate—the claim is that those who are not British subjects cannot appear before the board to advocate the rights of labour organizations. This Bill does not in any way interfere with that. Neither does it interfere with the right of labour organizations to have such repretatives negotiate with the employers with a view towards settlement. I have been told on the best authority that it cost over $25,000 to settle a dispute between the trainmen and one of the railway companies in this country. I cannot see how that large sum of money could possibly be expended under this Act, because the men can remain in their employment, continue to earn their wages, and their representatives can carry on their case before the board; their fees and expenses are paid, and the state bears the expenses of the board. I cannot possibly see how there can be any additional expense under this Act. It is contended by some that the delay involved may deprive the labour organizations of their right to select the time when a strike may take place, which is said to be a very potent weapon. I cannot see where in the Bill takes away that right. Of course, if both parties are to strive to take every unfair advantage of the other, difficulties will arise, but such difficulties can arise under the present legislation. It is fair to assume that all the skill and all the diplomacy is not going to be exercised by the employers. I believe the employees are equally capable of conducting their own side of the case, and that their diplomacy will be at least equal to that of their employers. These grievances do not crop up in a day or a week; they are usually of long standing, and there is nothing in the Act to prevent the giving of notice so that the employees can have the matter disposed of by the board and then be in a position to strike whenever they please and when it will best serve their purpose.

But I think the Act gives them another advantage. I might point out that it is not a question of a large body of men quitting work that will make a company yield. That will no doubt discommode a railway company, but that does not cause them to yield and accept the terms offered. The power to discommode the company and force conditions from them exists not so much in a body of men quitting work as it does in their sympathizers creating difficulties and disturbing certain connections, such as everybody knows takes place at the time of these strikes—the water supply is interfered with and the operation of the service is paralyzed. This power and influence does not come into operation except where there is a strong public sentiment behind the claims of the men. If this law were in force, would it not be a strong lever behind the negotiations? Would not the labour organizations be able to point to it and say: Our claim is just, and if you do not agree to it, we can invoke the power of the state under this law, which provides that you shall appear before an impartial tribunal, produce your books, and give evidence for the course you pursue, if you can justify it before public opinion. With the finding of the board, in whole or in part, behind the railway men, surely they will be in a much stronger position if they have ultimately to strike than they would be otherwise? And in conducting negotiations will they not be in a much stronger position after this Act is passed than they are to-day?

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman think that applies to the railway men, if the Bill is passed with this amendment?

Mr. CONMEE. I certainly do; that is my very point. They have an additional weapon which they can use with great force if they choose.

Mr. BOYCE. The weapon they have is paralyzed.

Mr. CONMEE. The only way they can embarrass a railway company is through the action of those who sympathize with them; because you will never get a railway man to admit that he himself disturbed the connections; it is always his friend who has done so, and I think that is generally the case. These things are done in defiance of the general law of the country, and at the expense and to the disadvantage of the general public. These strikes do expose a great many people to a good deal of hardship and inconvenience and the principle of bringing the people together in advance of these extreme measures, which is embodied in this Bill, is certainly in the public interest. I may point to the settlement of other matters as evidence that this Bill will be a potent factor in favour of a settlement even without its provisions being invoked. The trainmen now, in the case of an accident in which some of their number are injured, take proceedings through their agents, and I am informed that it is very seldom that the companies fail to settle. Why is that? Will it not be admitted that it is because the men have the general law behind them to protect them in all these matters if an

agreement is not made? It is true this is a double argument and can be used in this respect by both parties, but its greatest force is in favour of the labour men as against the corporations. They have always the recourse to say to the corporation: if you do not agree to this, we will bring you into court, and the courts of the country will give us our demand because it is just. That is a strong force in the hands of these organizations for the settlement of that class of disputes which do not come under this Bill at all, and it will be still more the case in the settlement of disputes here dealt with, after this Act is passed. I find myself in favour of the general principles of the Bill as I understand it, notwithstanding all the objections which have been raised. I believe it to be in the interest not only of labour organizations generally, but of locomotive engineers, conductors and firemen, who I understand desire to be excluded from its provisions. If there is one member of this House who is pledged strongly to support legislation in favour of labour organizations and labour men, I think I am that member, and I deside to carry out that pledge. I am bound to support anything which in my judgment is to their advantage, which will put them in a stronger and better position to guard their rights and privileges, and I am bound to oppose any legislation which I believe to be injurious to their interests. I believe I am consistent with that position when I advocate the principles of this Bill. We must remember that it is not a law of the Medes and Persians. I do not pretend to say that the Bill is perfect. In fact, I would have liked to have put some other amendments in it myself; but I am told by gentlemen of considerable experience that the principles for which I contended are already in the Bill. If so, well and good. If the Bill is found not to be what it has been represented to be or what we expected it to be, or if it does not accomplish the purpose for which it is enacted, we can amend it from year to year until we make it workable. I might go further in regard to the general scope of the Bill. Surely it is the right of the public, who are not a party to the dispute, to be protected by a provision that a strike or a lockout shall not take place until an effort has been made to bring the parties together to settle the dispute. The labour organizations, through their representatives, say: We always exhaust every honourable resource before we appeal to the extreme measure of a strike. Well, I submit that this Bill is an honourable resource which they should take advantage of before going on strike.

But the public have the right to have something to say as to what are proper efforts or endeavours, they have a right to say that before they are discommoded and their lives put in danger, the parties to the dispute shall invoke the provisions of this law. I think the public are entitled to that much protection, at all events. What is the position after that? If the finding is in favour of the men, in whole or in part, will it not be admitted that they are in a much stronger position? Sometimes in labour difficulties the military are called out. I can conceive that under this provision if there were a finding of that character, it would be a very difficult matter indeed for either party to procure military protection. For these reasons, I cannot but think that there is an advantage given to the labour organizations by the provisions of this Act. But there is another reason why I would support the Bill, and it is upon general principles. My view is that no set of men, whether they are railway magnates or walking delegates —I care not who they are—should be above the power of the state or beyond the power of the law. Then, surely it is within the jurisdiction of the government of Canada to regulate a matter that so seriously interferes with the public business, with the rights of every citizen, and if any set of men say that they are entirely outside the scope of legislation, that they are too big to have any legislation applied to them, I take issue with that position. I think it is the bounden duty of the government and of the state to provide machinery, not only looking to the settlement of disputes, but looking also to the protection of the rights of the citizens, the rights of the public, the rights of commerce, and of all other interests that are affected by so serious a matter as strikes and lockouts. The question is a large one. There is a great deal that one would feel disposed to say, but I merely wished to make the remarks that I have made in explanation of the reason why I find myself in favour of the Bill as I understand it. Coming back to this clause under discussion, I understand the purpose of the minister to be that the railway men may have a choice of coming either under the Act of 1903 or the Act of 1907. But in either case no strike or lockout can take place until the matter in dispute has been dealt with, either under the Act of 1903 or under the provisions of this Act or after a finding the parties refuse to accept it. It may be that it is held by some that this Act actually prevents a strike or lock-out. I do not so understand it. The only thing it does is to provide for certain proceedings, after which the men are as free to strike, if their terms are not accepted, as they were before. Neither the men nor the company are bound to accept the award. If the finding, in whole or in part, is in favour of the men, they are certainly put in a more favourable position than they otherwise would be.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The hon. Minister of Labour has stated, and his words are, that the railway men have an option as to whether they shall remain under the

operation of the Railway Disputes Act, 1903, or come under the Act now before the House. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) seems to take that meaning out of what the minister said. Then a word as to the effect of the Railway Disputes Act of 1903; upon all hands we have the same assurance of complete satisfaction with it. The railway men are satisfied with it, and the railway corporations appear to be satisfied with it. We have abundant evidence on all hands that the railway men are satisfied with it. Then the railway people, both the employers and the employees, are satisfied, the Act has worked harmoniously, the public interest has not suffered or been prejudiced, and all parties concerned, including the public at large, seem to be getting justice under the operation of the Act. As I understand the minister, it is his intention to leave the operation of the Act free to the railway men and to the railway companies to be invoked at will. I may be right or I may be wrong in that assumption. As I understand the minister, he emphasized and elaborated his position in that respect, and no two meanings can be taken out of his very plain, if not forcible, words on that point; but when you come to read the amendment, I certainly think it is at least doubtful if the amendment, as proposed, in any way carries out the explanation which he gave. Let us see what are the words. They are these:

> This Act shall not apply to any railway company or the employees of any railway company in respect of any dispute which has been referred and dealt with under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and labour 1903.

I contend that if this were crystallized into an Act of Parliament, and any lawyer were asked to give his interpretation of these words, he would say that undoubtedly this clause relates to something which has already been referred and dealt with under the provisions of the Act of 1903; that is, you are doing something here in this Act which accomplishes nothing, because it only refers to disputes which have been referred and dealt with, and if you attempted to deal with them again under this Act, as every lawyer knows, the matter would be said to be res judicata—already disposed of under another Act. There can be no two opinions about that position. I believe that every lawyer would agree that that is the effect of this legislation. If the matter were raised in court, and we must now have regard in the discussion of these matters to the construction of them in their legal aspect, there is no doubt that the meaning would be given to these words that this provision exempting railway men only applies to disputes which have heretofore been disposed of and settled, and that in any case they could not be raised, because it would be said, and properly said, that they were res judicata. That seems to make the amendment proposed absolutely worthless. Then, take the position of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). In the first place, undoubtedly you are confronted with this, that if the railway men invoke this Act of 1903, then, up to the time the matter has been finally dealt with, it is open for the other parties to the dispute to ask that the dispute be brought under this Act, and the matter would be dragged from under the Act of 1903 and disposed of under this proposed law.

Mr. D. ROSS. Suppose that the railway employees exercise their opinion of having the matter in dispute brought under the Railway Labour Disputes Act, and the matter was investigated and finally disposed of, would not that close the matter?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. It only applies to disputes that are finally disposed of.

Mr. D. ROSS. As I understand it, the men have the option of bringing their case under the Railway Labour Disputes Act. If they do so and if it is finally decided, what more is necessary?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. There is the whole point—'if it is finally decided'.

Mr. D. ROSS. Does not this give the men the option?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. It gives them a delusive option. It says that they may invoke the Act of 1903, but until the case under that Act is finally disposed of—

Mr. D. ROSS. This Act shall not apply.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. It may apply at any time until this matter is finally disposed of.

Mr. D. ROSS. As I understand it they have the option of coming under the Act of 1903, and as soon as the case is brought under that Act, you cannot apply the Act now under consideration.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. That is what I am asking for, but that is not what the amendment says. Something should be put in this section to provide that when the Act of 1903 is invoked, the dispute shall remain under that Act until it is finally settled.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I share to a large extent the view of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville). We have had this matter fully considered, and the difference seems to be a difference between the lawyers. I think there is a fairly unanimous understanding as to the intention of the minister, which is that the railway brotherhoods represented by Mr. Hall may be exempt from the operation of this Act. Like

my hon. friend from Maisonneuve I am aware that there are a number of railway men in this country who are in favour of coming under the operation of this Act. There can be no doubt of that whatever. A large organization of railway men has signified its willingness to come under the provisions of the law we are now considering. Surely we are not going to deprive those who are well deserving of being heard in this connection of the benefit of this Act? The minister is willing to exempt the other railway organizations, and so far as I am concerned, I do not see why there should be any further question about the matter.

My hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) rather dissented from the observations of the Minister of Labour concerning the representative of the railway men in this legislation. I do not share the view that the Minister of Labour was in the least unfair to that representative. On a former occasion, when this matter was under consideration, I found fault with Mr. Hall for certain representations he had made to certain railway organizations, and I wish to emphasize the objections I then made, which I think, were well founded. It was pointed out that, in a circular issued by Mr. Hall he had stated—

Mr. TAYLOR. We had that once before.

Mr. JOHNSTON. But, the question having come up, I want to emphasize my objection to what I regard as not a fair statement made to the railway men of this country. I have had an opportunity of discussing it—

Mr. TAYLOR. You told us that before.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And it has been made abundantly clear that the railway men with whom I discussed it, shared my view that the representations made by Mr. Hall were not proper representations——

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Has he any evidence, by way of resolution or otherwise, from any railway men's organization to the effect that he has just stated.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have evidence which is abundantly satisfactory to me.

Mr. BOYCE. Is it in writing?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, it is in writing.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the hon. gentleman mind placing it——

Mr. JOHNSTON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) is extremely curious about the matter I will place in his hands certain correspondence. But as a matter of fact, that is not the important point. I say there are large numbers of railway employees who, having had the matter satisfactorily explained to them, do not hold the views as strongly as they did that this Bill would be inimical to their interest. I wish to point out, for the information of those who are not familiar with the matter that in his circular Mr. Hall said:

> The measure is one that may have a very serious effect in the operation of our organization and is the second step made by the present government towards compulsory arbitration.

A fair assumption must be that the first step was necessarily the Act of 1903, and Mr. Hall represents to the workingmen of this country that the Railway Disputes Act of 1903 was a step in the direction of compulsory arbitration. So far as I am concerned, the position I have always taken is that, whilst I am in favour of investigation, I certainly am opposed to compulsory arbitration. I would be opposed to this government or to any other government if it introduced compulsory arbitration at the present time. I dissent from the view of Mr. Hall that the Conciliation Act of 1903 was a step in the direction of compulsory arbitration. But if that Act was a step in that direction Mr. Hall himself is on record as being in favour of it, and while that may be satisfactory to Mr. Hall, I doubt if it will be satisfactory to the railway organizations. I agree entirely with the position taken by the Minister of Labour that these people who have expressed a willingness to be exempt from the operations of this Act should be exempted, and those who have expressed a willingness to come under the operation of this Act should not be deprived of the power of coming under it. Therefore, I think the amendment proposed by the Minister of Labour should be adopted, because I think it will meet the views of all parties interested. If any defects should manifest themselves in the future they can be remedied.

Mr. BOYCE. With regard to the statement that Mr. Hall is alleged to have made that the Act of 1903 was a step in favour of compulsory arbitration, we do not have to go any further for confirmation than the words of the Minister of Labour himself as to the Act of 1903, which I find on page 3073 of the unrevised 'Hansard,' where he spoke as follows:

> Sir Wm. Mulock, however, stated at the time that in all such legislation we should be very wise, very prudent and very cautions, that the time would come when perhaps it would be necessary to extend that Conciliation Act, but that for the present the country should be satisfied with it. Time went on, and during the session of 1902 he introduced a Bill which received only its second reading. That Bill embodied exactly the same principle which had been advocated the year previously when he had introduced the Conciliation Act. The Bill contained the principle of compulsory arbitration.

Now, my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) knows, and his minister

knows, that the Act of 1902 which the minister says contained the principle of compulsory arbitration, was only introduced by Sir William Mulock, who did not attempt to force it through the House. It was a drastic measure and he gave full time for the country to consider it. I think I may say to the present minister, with the utmost respect, that he might take a lesson from the wisdom of Sir William Mulock in that respect. He was a man of great experience; he was prudent and cautious, and he did not believe in drastic reforms. That Bill was a compromise upon the question, although the present Minister of Labour declares that it contained the principle of compulsory arbitration. The member for Cape Breton did not say that Mr. Hall asserted that this Bill was the second step in the direction of compulsory arbitration. We have the minister's admission that Sir William Mulock's Bill was the first step. Now, we will look for some other authority as to the fact that the hon. gentleman's Bill contains the principle of compulsory arbitration. He will bow, I know, in recognition of such an authority as Mr. E. E. Clark, now of the Interstate Commerce Commission, who was one of the arbitrators in the great Pennsylvania coal strike, whose remarks were quoted by the minister himself when introducing this Bill. Mr. Clark in a letter to Mr. Hall under date February 27, 1907, says:

Section 57 contains provisions which to me seem to inject into this Act actual compulsory arbitration.

The minister smiles at Mr. Clark now——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have read that opinion and he is completely at sea on that.

Mr. BOYCE. But he does not hesitate to quote Mr. Clark when it suits him.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Would my hon. friend read the section referred to and tell the House whether he reads it as embodying the principle of compulsory arbitration? It is as clear as daylight that it is compulsory arbitration.

Mr. BOYCE. I shall read an extract from the letter for the edification of the last speaker (Mr. Johnston) if not of the minister and in justification of the charge brought against him by my hon. friend (Mr. Johnston). Mr. Clark proceeds:

Personally I do not believe that either employer or employee should be restrained by such a provision. I believe it is the proper function of government in these later days to provide an easy, efficient and fair method of settlement of these disputes by arbitration. I do not believe that the government should intervene as an arbitrator except by consent of the parties to the dispute. I should favour a provision in such an Act as that now under discussion to that effect. . . . If the compulsory feature of section 57 is eliminated and it is provided that the Act will operate only with the consent of both parties to the dispute, I should think sections 59, 60 and 61 were proper.

Mr. D. ROSS. Well, my hon. friend as a lawyer and a very good one, states it as his opinion that section 57 involves compulsory arbitration?

Mr. BOYCE. I am reading from a greater authority than myself——

Mr. D. ROSS. Would he give us his own opinion of section 57?

Mr. BOYCE. This is not the time or the place to give my opinion on section 57. I am reading the opinion of Mr. Clark and the minister after, I presume, giving careful weight to Mr. Clark's judgment, has seen fit to cite him as an authority, so his opinion must be received with respect.

Mr. LEMIEUX. May I cite a paragraph of Mr. Clark's letter?

Mr. BOYCE. Will my hon. friend allow me to conclude my citation from Mr. Clark and then he can refute it?

Mr. BOYCE. (reading):

I approach with much hesitancy any criticism of the Bill which you send because of the fact that in order to make reply promptly as requested by you and because of other pressing matters my review of the Bill must be most superficial.

Mr. LENNOX. Did the minister read that when he quoted Mr Clark the other day?

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is not the opinion I cited. This is the superficial opinion; I read the weighty opinion.

Mr. BOYCE. I am giving what Mr. Clark thinks on a more careful consideration. He further says:

Section 65 of your Act contemplates in substance the same thing, but at the risk of repeating will say that it seems to me the terms of section 59 introduce a compulsory feature which is wholly inconsistent with the idea of mutual agreement. In other words it would seem to have the effect of forcing people to agree against their will.

It must be apparent that my hon. friend's criticism of Mr. Hall is absolutely unjustified by so high authorities as Mr. Clark and Sir William Mulock both of whom are cited as authorities by the minister.

Mr. PARDEE. In order to meet the objection of my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) might not this section be amended to read simply:

This Act shall not apply to any railway company or an employee of any such company in respect of any dispute which has been the subject of a reference under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and labour, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906.

That is to strike out the words 'refer' and 'dealt with,' and simply add 'which has been the subject of a reference.'

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. That certainly does not meet the case, it simply deals with something that has happened in the past. My intention was to secure the benefit of the operation of that Act to two parties who desired to invoke its operation, provided they had initiated proceedings under it. This amendment does not meet that case, because it simply says that it concerns disputes which have been disposed of or dealt with.

Mr. PARDEE. My hon. friend could add a rider to this effect:

Provided it shall be optional with either the railway company or the employee to refer under this Act or the Act respecting conciliation and labour, 1903.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I would suggest that the language of the leader of the opposition (Mr R. L. Borden) be used exactly; that covers the ground fully.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I shall move my amendment in a slightly different form in order that it may be before the committee. I move:

This Act shall not apply to any railway company or the employees of any such company, if before the appointment and establishment hereunder of the board of conciliation and investigation in respect of any dispute, either party thereto applies to the minister to cause inquiry to be made into such dispute and the cause thereof under the provisions of the Conciliation and Labour Act.

That is to say, if either party starts under this Act, the other party has the right, before the board is fully completed, to go on under the Act of 1903.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That all comes back to the point that the parties may apply to the minister under the provisions of the Act of 1903, and no investigation may take place. Under these circumstances we would not satisfy public opinion. There will be no investigation and a strike or lockout may take place. What we alm at is that the parties cannot strike or lockout without an investigation taking place. The Act of 1903 leaves it optional to the minister to grant an investigation or to refuse it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is rather a remarkable reason to give against the amendment, that the minister will not do his duty. I would not do the minister that injustice—

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The Act of 1903 does not interfere with the right of the men to go on strike pending an investigation, and they would have that right under the amendment of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difference between my amendment and the amendment proposed by the minister is, that mine gives the absolute option in the first instance, and the amendment of the minister does not. I say that if the employer or the employed makes an application for the purpose of invoking the provisions of this Act, then, before the establishment of a board, the other party should be enabled to invoke the provisions of the Act of 1903, and in that case this new law should not apply.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If they invoke the provisions of the Act of 1903 they have the right to go on strike.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Exactly.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Even during the investigation—there is no penalty under the Act of 1903.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Quite so, I understand all that fully.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And under this amendment, even if the minister grants an investigation, the strike can go on?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Quite so. I say that my amendment is justified by the declared intention of the minister. The minister, first said, that he proposed to give these men an option between the Act of 1907 and the Act of 1903. If he did not mean that the question falls; if he did mean it then my amendment should be adopted. The men certainly have now the right to strike, and until the men have an opportunity to appear before a properly constituted committee of this House to urge their claims, that right ought not to be taken from them; and especially in view of the repeated declaration of the minister, that the Act of 1903 has given the most perfect and absolute satisfaction up to the present time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is true that the Act of 1903 has given satisfaction, but the time has now arrived to provide against any possible strike or lockout in public utilities. I say, that the duty of this parliament is to include employees on railways, just as well as employees on other public utilities. I do not see why railway corporations or their employees should be excluded or why they should be given any pretext to declare a strike or lockout before an investigation has taken place, when others engaged on public utilities cannot do so.

Mr. LENNOX. If the minister means what he says now, he did not mean one word of what he said this afternoon. He declared many times this afternoon that the railway employees should have the option of coming under either one Act or the other and the amendment of the leader of the opposition provides for that. We have lost five or six hours in discussing this matter absolutely for nothing. The minister does not seem to have definitely made up his mind, and the little group who sit behind

him do not seem to be able to help him to. At the last hour the minister declares that he does not mean what he said and that he will not concede to the railway men what he said he would concede. We might as well vote and lose no more time.

Mr. CONMEE. The minister also said, that the intention of his amendment was that a lockout or strike could not take place until the matter was dealt with by either one of these boards. It is not fair to take one part of the statement of the minister without taking the whole.

Mr. FOSTER. The matter is in a condition now where it ought to be allowed to simmer and to be thought over. I do not say that with any intention to obstruct the Bill. We have been engaged for five or six hours in discussing this clause, and it all comes back to this: That when the minister stated he intended to give the railway trainmen an absolute and unconditional option to take the 1903 legislation but that he wanted to give an opportunity for other organizations of railway men that were in favour of the clause to have the benefit of the new Bill, I thought that a very fair compromise. We have had amendment after amendment proposed, and for the life of me I cannot see that the minister's amendment does give a fair and full and unconditioned option to the railway trainmen to take the 1903 legislation. If that were so, I think it would be a fair compromise, but so far as I can see that is not so. I do not understand that the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition makes it so that the intention of the law can be evaded and that strikes can take place before an investigation takes place. The railway trainmen say, let us have our investigation under the 1903 Act, and the minister said he was quite willing to allow that to be done, fully and freely and without conditions. If that be so, and you provide against the contingency of a strike without an investigation, it is simply a matter of getting the instrument to express the intention. You have now four different attempts to do this, and every one is an honest attempt, but yet we are not at one. So I think the best course for us now, having had the discussion and having practically the same end in view, is to let this matter simmer and let the minister have a talk with his deputy and I think they will bring in an amendment which we can all support.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The object of my amendment, as I have repeated so often, is simply to prevent the railway employees from striking or the railway companies from declaring a lockout until a public investigation has been ordered, in order to ascertain the cause of the dispute. If the hon. gentlemen opposite agree to that principle, it will be easy to draft an amendment that will suit them. Under these circumstances I propose that we leave the section as provided by my amendment and I will have the Bill reprinted with all the amendments that have been made and agreed to, and this clause will remain to be reconsidered at the next sitting of the committee.

Progress reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Marine Branch.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 12, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 110) respecting The Trader's Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. A. Johnston.

DEATH OF THOMAS MARTIN, M.P.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, less than a week ago we had to mourn the loss of one of our colleagues. Within that very short time death has again visited this House and removed one of its members in the person of the member for North Wellington, Mr. Thomas Martin. Mr. Martin was one of the new members of the House, elected only in the last general election. His career amongst us has therefore been very short, but in that very short time he had endeared himself to all those associated with him—indeed, to all those who came in contact with him ; and I am quite sure that I express the unanimous feeling of this House when I say that we extend our sincerest sympathy to his bereaved family and to his large circle of friends.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire, on behalf of the members on this side of the House, to associate ourselves with the words of sympathy which have just fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister. Mr. Martin had been a member of the House for only a short time, but in that period he had shown us that he was a man of strong intellect and force of character; and, although he spoke seldom on public

questions, he always spoke to the point and was listened to with great respect by the House. I desire on behalf of those sitting to your left, to join in the sympathy which has been so feelingly expressed by the Prime Minister.

WAYS AND MEANS—EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER moved that the House go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the government, especially the Minister of the Interior, to a report which was published in the Montreal 'Daily Star' of Saturday, March 9, as follows :

Ottawa, March 9.—In consequence of the termination last fall of the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company respecting the encouragement of emigration to Canada from European countries, the government has now made a new arrangement to insure the continuance of work in the interests of the Dominion in Europe. On the advice of the Minister of the Interior, an order in council has been passed providing that a commission of ten shillings for each adult and five shillings for each child shall be allowed to continental steamship booking agents on all the emigrants booked for Canada. The emigrants booked must, however, be of the same classes as those upon whom the bonuses are paid in Great Britain and Ireland.

I would like to know if that report is true.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Yes.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Then I give notice to the government that I will bring the matter up Thursday before going into supply.

THE YUKON.

Mr. A. THOMPSON (Yukon Territory). Before the motion is put to go into supply, I desire to call attention to some questions relating to the Yukon. Since I had the honour of addressing the House before on this question, we have had some very important information supplied us by the Geological Survey with regard to the value of the gravels which exist and are being mined in the Yukon. Until last year, the future of that territory, as regards the quantity of gold that might be found in it, was more or less problematical. All we knew positively was the amount of gold that had been extracted. Last spring, however, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) sent into that district a corps of geologists, under Mr. McConnell, and some engineers, and they examined and prospected the gravel beds still existing in that country. The result of their prospecting has been most gratifying and has placed the future of that territory absolutely beyond peradventure. On account of the limited time at their disposal in one season, they were able to survey only a portion of the territory, but the amount of ground they did survey and examine has produced in actual results nearly $95,000,000 and Mr. McConnell estimates that the amount of gold still left in that area represents some $53,500,000. Here is what Mr. McConnell says:

This estimate is based on sampling done by ourselves, on the results of actual mining operations, and on the data carefully examined and sifted, furnished by miners and others familiar with the ground and is believed to be a reasonably close approximation. In a rich district like the Klondike, however, sources of gold crop up in unexpected places, and any estimate is apt to be considerably under rather than over the mark.

The section of territory which he did not have time to examine has produced in round numbers some $25,000,000 in gold, and, judging by the topographical and geological indications, will no doubt produce as much more. This, if I am correct, indicates an amount of gold still contained in the hills and valleys of that region equal to $75,000,000. I mention this to show that the last chapter in the history of the Yukon has not been written by any means, and that it is still a territory worthy the very best attention of this or any other government. Before I leave this particular phase may I be permitted to point out that the values I have mentioned as having been produced and those yet to be produced are actual values in dollars and cents, in gold itself, and not represented by any stocks or bonds or other things that go to represent values in other mining camps. The fact is we are so far removed from money centres, that stock flotations have not as a rule been a success, and the operations in the main have been based absolutely on the actual production of gold. In stating that that territory will yet produce some $75,000,000 in gold, I am stating a fact based upon actual examination over a very large portion of territory—not by any means over the whole of the Yukon Territory because the amount of ground still unprospected in that district is very vast. The production of gold has supported in that territory a population which is one of the best consumers of Canadian products from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is a community which produces absolutely nothing to any considerable extent except gold. The people there have to be fed and clothed by the outside world, and in the main, I am glad to say, are fed and clothed by Canada, so that per capita the people in the Yukon furnish today the best possible market Canada has. Anything that will encourage the mining industry there cannot fail to be of great advantage to the people east—to the people of the plains who raise wheat and cattle and the manufacturers further east, as in the

Yukon they will have the very best possible market, and one within their own borders. To-day the Yukon is some eleven years old. It was discovered in 1896, prospected in 1897, and began to produce in 1898, and it has produced over $120,000,000 in the past ten years.

The first thing I would like to draw attention to is the constitution of the government or the legislature in that territory. It is known as the Yukon Council and is partially elected and partially appointed. Five members of that council are appointed by the government and five elected from the various districts, and the commissioner acts as president of this council. That was not always the case. In the early days, all the members of that body were appointed by the federal authorities. Gradually these members were added to by members elected by the people themselves. First two members were elected by the people, and at the next election five members were elected by the popular vote. So that to-day we have five members elected by the people and five appointed by the government, and the commissioner acts in the dual capacity of speaker of the legislature and governor of the territory. The term of the present elective members is about to expire. They are elected for two years, and new elections will be held some time in April or May. I submit that the time is now ripe to give that territory a further measure of self government by making all the members of the council subject to election by the people themselves. That council became gradually developed from a fully nominative body to a body half nominative and half elective. I would like to see that development carried further and have the whole council elected and directly responsible to the people. I am not asking for complete provincial automony. The people of that territory feel they are not prepared at present to assume all the provincial responsibility such a course would entail, but we ask that the same measure of automony which the territories enjoyed before they were erected into the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan be given to us. In asking this, I am simply expressing the sentiment of the people and am not submitting anything in the shape of a party question. In fact the platform of every man who has ever come before the people of the Yukon for election has had a plank to further that automony which I am now asking. I have in my hand a letter from Mr. T. Dufferin Patullo, secretary of the Yukon Liberal Association, in which he says:

I have the honour to inclose herewith copy of resolution passed at a recent meeting of the Liberal association with reference to a wholly elective Yukon council:

Whereas the Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, has on several occasions assured the parliament of Canada and the people of the Yukon that the Yukon council would be made wholly elective, and

Whereas the present commissioner of Yukon, Hon. W. W. B. McInnes, immediately upon his arrival in the territory publicly declared that there would be changes in the council, and

Whereas the Yukon Liberal Association and the people of Yukon have at all times declared themselves in favour of a wholly elective council, and

Whereas the Yukon council as at present constituted is not in harmony with the spirit of Canadian institutions, and does not give to the people of this territory that measure of responsible government which the constitution of Canada insures to its citizens, and

Whereas the resources of the territory have induced the investment of a large amount of capital, and the building of thirty miles of railway from Dawson during the past summer which will probably be extended next season another forty miles, thereby greatly aiding in the stability of conditions here and the assuring of a permanent population,

Therefore be it resolved that this association is of the opinion that the granting of a wholly elective council should not be longer delayed;

And be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister, the Minister of the Interior, the Commissioner of Yukon, and the member of parliament for Yukon.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a party question. What I have said is simply a reflection of the opinions of the people of all political parties residing in the Yukon. Nor will the granting of a wholly elective council be an experiment. The people of that country come from the several provinces of Canada, from the various countries of Europe in which representative government exists and from the states of the country to the south of us. Those who were not British subjects, but have become British subjects, have been accustomed to the franchise. And I am sure that the hon. gentlemen in this chamber will agree with me that those members of our community who came from the various provinces of Canada are well acquainted with the uses of the franchise, so that if the franchise is conceded to them we may be sure it will not be abused. The trouble with the present Yukon council is that it is not sufficiently representative; it is not sufficiently in touch with the people, not close enough to the people. The five members who are appointed draw salaries as occupants of various positions under the government, and they are, therefore, necessarily not as closely in touch with the people as would be men who were elected directly by the people. This is the only territory in all this vast Dominion which has not full and complete autonomy, the only portion of Canada that has not directly representative institutions. If the change desired is not made in time for the coming elections, two years will elapse before the opportunity will come again to give the people more than five members in a council to represent the people of the territory. I submit to the government the

propriety of widening the Yukon council so that it will be composed hereafter of men who directly represent the people from the various portions of the territory, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and this government, and the people of this country, that if that boon is given it will not be abused.

Another question I wish to discuss very briefly, and that is a perennial question in the Yukon—concessions. In the early days of that territory vast areas were given to various people as 'hydraulic leases,' but now known and discussed in recent years as 'concessions.' These concessions were granted upon the representations of men who came down to Ottawa and told the government that the ground in these areas was too low-grade in character to be worked by ordinary placer methods, and that, in order to work the ground successfully and win the gold, water had to be brought in under hydraulic pressure. I may say, in passing, that the knowledge that these men possessed at that time was absolutely insufficient to justify them in forming the opinion they expressed. In some instances since that time the ground has proven so rich in certain sections that it could be worked very profitably by ordinary placer methods. It is true there are portions of these large areas which will have to be worked by hydraulic methods or some other, but there is ground in each of these concessions which could be worked, and worked profitably, by the placer miner. The locking up of this ground during all these years has prevented the development of certain sections of the country and has lessened the number of ounces of gold the country would have produced, besides throwing a wet blanket upon the energies of the people, which energies in the main, are directed to the mining of gold. These concessions are of various sizes and cover different creeks, and some are still extant. In an interim report in 1906, Hon. W. W. B. McInnes, then commissioner of the Yukon, said :

> They were granted for large tracts of mining land upon the strength of representations made to the government, and upon the distinct understanding that the ground included within the concessions was of too low a grade to permit of its being worked by the ordinary placer mining method, and that it could only be profitably worked by the installation of costly modern machinery, or extensive hydraulic works. . . . And one of the provisions (section 4) of the leases specifically requires 'that the said lessee shall have sufficient hydraulic or other mining machinery in operation on the said demised premises within one year from the date hereof to permit of his beginning active operations for the efficient working of the rights and privileges hereby granted.'

Now, Sir, these people who owned these concessions have persistently and continually evaded the letter and spirit of the law, and, without exception they have left this ground lying idle, playing the part of the dog in the manger by failing to work the ground themselves and refusing to allow anybody else to work it. The existence of these concessions has produced a continuous agitation, and until something is done, that agitation must continue, because these concessions are not for the best interests of the territory. The gold bearing area of the country is now very well known, and every acre subtracted from it means so many ounces of gold less. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) visited that territory two years ago, and, after examining into these leases himself, was satisfied that the attitude of the concessionnaries to the government, to the people and to the leaseholds they occupied was such that he could not consistently allow them to hold the ground as they were holding it. He decided to cancel these concessions, and he did cancel them. But the ground is still locked up, and what we in that territory want is that the ground shall be worked. It is at present absolutely useless because it does not provide employment to our people, it does not increase our output of gold. I ask that this concession question be looked into as soon as possible, and that these concessions be cancelled and the ground opened for work, or the concessionnaries compelled to work it. The people of the Yukon ask that the ground be thrown open for placer mining, and this course I would urge in as strong words as I can command. The territory which has produced the gold in the Yukon is of small extent compared with the whole Yukon territory. The Yukon territory comprises an area about equal to the area of France. Judging from the reports which we have received from geological experts, there is a large area in which the prospector has a good chance of finding gold. But, up to the present time the prospectors operations have been confined to the Klondike and Indian river valleys chiefly. In order to have that territory go ahead we want some help for this mining prospector, the man who makes it possible to have a Klondyke, who made it possible for Canada to produce $120,000,000 of bullion in the last ten years. And when we get our mint finished, in a few years, we shall need this gold. For we of the Yukon are the only people in this country who are producing gold in any considerable quantity. In British Columbia you have large productions of silver and copper ; in Ontario, in the Cobalt region, you have silver ; and you have some gold produced in Nova Scotia. But the great production of gold has been in the Yukon, and that supply must continue to come from the Yukon. The man who has made it possible for us to produce that gold is the prospector.

Mr. BENNETT. May I be allowed to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thompson) if the Bronson & Ray concession, which was discussed here, has been cancelled ?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is among those that the Minister of the Interior cancelled, but it is still tied up.

Mr. HAGGART. How can it be tied up if it is cancelled ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, the Minister of the Interior I presume can answer that. It is cancelled by the government, but not thrown open, I understand it is in litigation. Now, Sir, the point I am making is this, that in order to exploit and develop that vast territory we want to get the prospector upon the hills up the side streams which are tributary to the Yukon, and in order to do that we want a subsidy for a line of light draft boats which will carry him to the head waters of these navigable streams where he may spend the spring and summer, and bring him back in the fall. We want the government to set aside a subsidy for small draft boats, of which we have plenty in the Yukon, but which at the present time do not find a sufficient amount of travel up these side streams tributary to the Yukon to make it profitable for them to ply their trade. I want to ask the government to give a subsidy for these boats, so that the prospector may go up with his outfit in the spring and live there during the summer, and let them make another trip in the fall and bring him down, about two trips in the year. There is no doubt about the future of that country. The limited area which has been prospected so far has produced vast wealth, and we have the evidence of Mr. McConnell that the wealth so far produced is only a nucleus of greater wealth that still exists in that vast district. I submit for the consideration of the government that they should assist the prospector in this way. The method of mining is changing somewhat in that country, and dredging is becoming an important factor. Dredges are coming in in considerable numbers, and we hope to see more in the next few years. This particular form of gold mining is used extensively in New Zealand, in Australia and in California, and I am glad to say that the government has seen fit to remove the duty on dredges that are used in that territory, and in the main they have very materially assisted the development of that particular industry. As it is only in its infancy, I am led to believe, on the very best authority, that it will yet become a very great industry in the future production of gold in that country.

A few days ago I had the pleasure of laying on the table of this House a sample of wheat which was grown in that Yukon valley. Now I said a few moments ago that gold was the chief product of the Yukon, and so it is, and it must necessarily be so for years to come. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I want it understood that gold is not the only thing that can be produced in the Yukon. Gold is the only thing we export, but we have other products in that country, and year by year, as the country develops and labour becomes less expensive, we find certain people turning their attention to agriculture. During the past year some 75 tons of potatoes were raised successfully near Dawson, and oats and barley have been raised in the Yukon valley with fair success, although not as successfully as I think they can be raised. I have under my hand a return from the Department of Agriculture which gives an analysis of the wheat which I had the honour to lay upon the table of the House the other day. It is this :

Pecentage of germination, 96. Grown in the valley of the Yukon river, latitude 63. In point of vital energy this sample is above the average even of northern grown wheat. The percentage vitality is also unusually high.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to say that the Yukon is a great agricultural country, but I do say that we have there demonstrated the fact that wheat can be grown, and grown successfully, and that the quality of the wheat is quite equal to anything that can be grown in the Northwest. By these remarks I am leading up to ask the government to establish there a small experimental station to see what can be done in the way of agriculture. Our friends the Americans are very active along these lines, they have stations, not experimental farms, but stations where they send the seed to certain individuals and pay them to sow it, look after it, harvest it and make a return. I submit that is a question which this government might well consider, and if they do so, I am sure the result would furnish some very agreeable surprises. The quality of the soil there is good, and while we have not the number of growing days you have here, we have the number of growing hours, because during the months of June and July we have practically no darkness at all.

Another thing which is of vital interest to that country is telegraphic communication. We are far away from Canada and the centres of civilization. The present telegraph line, which is government built and government owned, is probably as satisfactory as it can be, traversing the country which it does. But at best it gives a very intermittent service, particularly during the winter and spring months, as those are the months in which the snowfall is greatest over that section of the mountains traversed by this line between Quesnel and Hazelton. In looking up the reports I find the greatest number of breaks in that particular section. I submit for the consideration of the government the advisability of bridging that section with a wireless system. On this subject permit me to read a brief extract from a despatch from India. It is headed 'Kitchner will see his projects to completion.' I will not read the whole article, but only that which is pertinent to the wireless question.

Incidentally I may mention that Lord Kitchener has lately begun the establishment of an elaborate system of wireless telegraphy along the entire frontier of India, which will enable the withdrawal of a number of isolated military posts hitherto maintained in order to keep up the line of communication which will now be furnished by means of this wireless telegraphy.

That struck me as being the solution of our telegraph question in the Yukon. It would be better if we had a wireless system right through. But we have a government line there now, which line must be maintained, and it has cost a considerable amount of money. I do not advocate that it be replaced by a wireless ; I would suggest that the wireless cover that section where the greatest number of breaks have occurred, where it has been proven by several years experience that it is almost impossible to keep up continuous communication.

Mr. FOSTER. How many miles ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Approximately three hundred miles, I think, five hundred at the outside. I have examined the question a little, and I believe it is quite within the range of possibility and feasibility to establish such a system, and if it were done, it would decrease the annual expenditure for the maintenance of the present line. But, Mr. Speaker, whether that line cost $100,000, or $1,000,000, we have got to have it. We must not settle down to the belief that that territory is to remain completely isolated from the central government, for the want of a telegraph line. If we do not have a line of our own we shall have to patronize the American cables and connected land lines. To-day the Americans in Alaska, while they are not so far advanced in governmental institutions as we are, have paid particular attention to two things, namely, the geographical and geological examination of their territory, and communication between that territory and the outside world in the way of cables and land lines.

Now I submit that we want as good a service as it is posible to get. We pay large tolls. In some countries they would be regarded as prohibitive almost. They are excessive but it is a costly line to keep up and we simply have to have it. But, I submit that the government should bridge that section of the line with the wireless telegraph, and from the information I get I believe it would be very successful. I have nothing further to say to-day except to express the hope that the government will take into consideration the various requests of the people of the Yukon.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House and the country are interested in this far northwestern corner of the Dominion, a territory as large, as my hon. friend, has said, as France, and a country of such wealth that in a short period of time it has produced over one hundred millions of dollars of gold, something that may be considered the wonder of the world. It is not only in the amount of gold that this country has produced that it is important and valuable to the Dominion. Canada has an immense area stretching over many degrees of latitude and its population has until recent years, been restricted to a narrow fringe north of the international boundary. It had been accepted until the discovery of gold in the Yukon that the vast hinterland of Canada was of no value, but that immense discovery of gold in the Yukon has changed all that, and now, instead of the hinterland of Canada being considered as so many leagues of snow, it is looked to with hope and confidence as a land of riches such as the world has never seen. To the men who have had part in the discovery and development of these riches in that far distant corner of the country, whose discovery has resulted in such great advantage to the country, every one must give consideration, and when their representative in parliament voices a demand or a request for a fully elective local government that demand must receive careful and full attention. It may be asked why has not that territory been given full representative local government before now? There are many sides to the question of government. It is not yet settled in fact what is the best form of government in this world, although there have been governments of many, many different kinds ever since the world began. Therefore, it is not altogether settled that under all circumstances representative or elective government is always the best for all parties concerned. The conditions as they have existed in the Yukon were that a small number of people were occupying a large territory with immense, but indefinite or undefined riches, which riches might be exhausted within a very short period of time, or, on the other hand, development might continue and go on for ages to come. All that has yet been attempted in the Yukon in the way of government has been to meet the conditions as they existed, believing that as time went on, as conditions developed then those new conditions might be met in due course. It is far better to meet the conditions as they arise than to provide for conditions which may never arise when the provisions which you have made may be a hindrance and not a help to development. As far as matters have yet gone in the Yukon I do not know that there is anything to be said against the form of local government that has existed there. It is true that the local government of the Yukon has not had the entire approval of every one either inside or outside of the Yukon territory, but that is a misfortune which is common to many governments and even appertains to the government here. The fact that there has been criticism of the government of the Yukon

is no evidence that it is at fault in its form, or that a change of form would have obviated criticism. On the whole, I think that the speech of my hon. friend here to-day will indicate that there has been a very satisfactory progress in conditions in the Yukon towards a fuller development which is certainly not in condemnation of the government or the form of government as it exists.

Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the population of the Yukon was for some years on the decrease rather than on the increase, that is, that where there was a population of some 20,000 or 30,000 in the early nineties, some three or fours years ago the population had shrunk very materially, and it was for some years a question whether or not the camp had seen its best days, or indeed if it would not become within a very few years as mining camps must necessarily always become at some time. However, I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it was because of this contingency that perhaps no greater effort was made to meet the natural desire of the people of the Yukon for an entirely elective local government. It is, however, something that I think this whole country may be congratulated on that the change has come, and that instead of the Yukon being a small and transitory mining camp, there is at any rate every prospect that it has become a country of vast future mineral development not only capable of providing means of subsistence for a large population, but whose development will render necessary the presence of a large population. In view of the facts as they were, I have already said the government did not see its way hitherto to granting the very natural desire of the people of the Yukon for an entirely elective council, and although we are, as we believe, on the eve of a change, on the eve of an upward movement, or in fact have already begun that progress, the change has not yet come. Had the expectations which are held in regard to the next year or two been realized during the past year or two, my hon. friend might rest assured that he would not have needed to call the attention of the government to the desire of the people of the Yukon for a wholly elective council. But if the hopes now entertained are fulfilled, while it will not be possible at this present session of parliament to meet the desires of the people of the Yukon as expressed to-day for an elective council with respect to the elections now pending we may take it for granted that the pending election will be the last that will be held in the Yukon where a council not fully elective will be chosen. Although there is no doubt on the part of this government in regard to the propriety of giving a fully elective council when the time arrives, doubts have been expressed by people who are responsible and whose views are entitled to consideration. For instance, my hon. friend on the other side, at the last session, seemed to hold the view that although we had an independent legislative body legislating for and governing the Yukon it was not right or proper that that legislative body should have an independent right of control. Not once but twice, with that ability, those gifts which he unquestionably possesses he urged upon the House and upon the country, upon the government particularly, the advisability of exercising their dominant authority which is entirely repugnant to the ideas of self government held by the people of the Yukon and by the people in all parts of Canada, especially in those districts where liberal sentiment predominates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To whom does my hon. friend refer ?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I might say that at this time violent appeals are being made through the newspapers for an interference on the part of this government with the control of local affairs in the Yukon, with the exercise of its rights by the Yukon Council. These appeals may have good foundation or may not, I only submit to the House that there is antagonism between the appeals to this government to exercise an authority which is vested in it, but the exercise of which would be contrary to the principles of self-government, and the granting of further powers of self-government to the people of the Yukon. We cannot at one and the same time give the people local self-government and exercise an arbitrary or dominant authority over their affairs. It has been the policy and principle of this government to give the local government of the Yukon the fullest possible scope in the exercise of the responsibility placed in its members looking only to the Council and to each member of that Council to discharge the duties of their positions with regard to the interests of the Yukon, that is to say to act according to their best judgment.

I might say a word as to the principle underlying the granting of hydraulic concessions. It is an accepted principle that wherever the individual miner can advantageously work the ground containing mineral wealth he should have the first and the best and the only opportunity to acquire that wealth in that way. But it is also a well known fact that conditions may exist wherein the individual miner, the man whose capital is his labour, his persistence and his skill is not able to advantageously work the mine. Under those circumstances combinations of capital have to be called into action and concessions have to be made such as will sufficiently induce the investment of aggregations of capital. It was in view of this consideration that hydraulic concessions or leases were granted in the Yukon. It was represented to the government at that time that there were large areas of ground containing gold in limited quantities which the individual miner with

individual appliances could not profitably work, but that these areas, if aggregations of capital and suitable appliances were brought to bear, could be profitably worked. The object of the government was to secure the development of the natural resources of the country and while provision was made for the operation of individual mines by individual miners provision was also made for the operation of large areas of low grade ground by heavily capitalized companies, or in other words, a large number of hydraulic concessions were granted. Of course there is a large area of country to be considered and it may very well be that while in a small area immediately adjacent to Dawson, it would be proper that only the individual miner should be given the opportunity to operate, it might easily be that in the balance of a territory as large as France, there might be room and opportunity for the profitable investment of millions in the operation of low grade mining ground. However, as the case worked out, a number of applications were made for hydraulic concessions and a number were granted. They were granted on certain well defined conditions. One condition being that the lease should be efficiently operated by hydraulic or other method, and it was recited in the lease that the reason for the granting of the lease was the necessity for the application of hydraulic methods or such other methods as would require a large amount of capital in order that the ground might be made productive. A number of these leases were granted and a number of lessees went on and operated according to the letter and spirit of their agreements, and a number did not. It is not necessary to recite the conditions in connection with each of these leases; it is sufficient to say that several of these concessions were located in the immediate vicinity, in fact actually adjoining the valuable gold bearing territory which was operated by the individual miners, and when these leases were not operated, as the agreement required, it was certainly felt to be a substantial grievance on the part not only of the individual miner who desired to work a claim on the concession but also from the standpoint of the general interest of the country, as in this way its natural resources were tied up from development and the country was held back to that extent.

While it was brought to the attention of the government from time to time that holders of hydraulic leases were not operating these leases, the government hesitated to use its right or authority of cancellation of the lease on the one hand in the hope, that by refraining from cancellation the lessee would be enabled and would as a matter of fact operate the lease, or, on the other hand, if they cancelled the right which the company had acquired to the lease the fear was that capital which was required for the further development of the territory at large would take fright and the country would suffer a permanent injury because of that cancellation in that way. There was the possibility that, as a result of the cancellation of a certain lease according to the letter of the contract, the country at large would suffer a very great loss by reason of capital being deterred from investment.

For this reason, I say, the government for some years held its hand and did not cancel these leases, even though the lessees were not fulfilling the conditions of their contract with the government. I had the privilege of visiting the Yukon territory two years ago, and, having looked over the conditions as they existed then, it seemed to me that the time had come when it was necessary for the government to take a stand on this matter, even with the possibility of deterring the investment of capital, in order to justify the policy of the government in having granted the hydraulic concessions in the first place. No one objected to the concessions provided they were worked, but every body objected to them provided they were not worked; and so at all risks the decision was reached that the concessions, on which there was no fair or reasonable or proper attempt made to comply with the conditions of the leases, should be cancelled. In pursuance of that policy some six leases were cancelled. They were: the Klondike government concession, generally known as the Anderson; the Bonanza Creek hydraulic concession, generally known as the Bronson-Ray; the Washburn and Ritchie, the Palmer, the Quartz Creek and the Scroggie. Whilst the government felt it necessary to cancel the agreements under which these parties held their several concessions, it also felt that it was not desirable to alarm capital or to create the impression that every justice was not being given to investors in that country; and all of these parties had invested money to a greater or less amount in their respective concessions. Therefore a proposition of settlement was first made to the concession holders. We said to them: Your right is forfeited; but, in consideration of the expenses that you have made, we will give you a certain small part of your concession —say three, four or five claims as the case might be—if you will give up peaceable possession of the remainder. If you will not do that, and you desire to question the right of the government to cancel your concession in the courts, you will be given a fiat to enable you to proceed in that way. If you will not do either the one or the other, then the government will take proceedings in the courts to oust you from possession. As a result of the notices, two concessionnaries agreed to the terms. The Quartz Creek and the Scroggie each accepted a part of their concession, and gave up all claim to the remainder. The other four concessionnaires maintained their position. They did

not agree to our offer of settlement; they did not take proceedings in the courts; they simply sat still and did nothing; and at last we had to take the proceedings in order to oust them from possession. It was because of this procedure, which we felt it was right and proper to take in order that we might not deter capital from investing in that country, that there has been so much delay in clearing the ground of these concessions.

Mr. FOSTER. And these four are now in that position?

Mr. OLIVER. These four are now in that position. The pleadings have been entered, I understand, and the cases will be tried in the Exchequer Court at the earliest possible date. We declare that these people have forfeited their rights, and we ask for a legal ejectment of them from the premises in order that the ground may then be absolutely clear for being dealt with according to the mining law of the Yukon.

Mr. THOMPSON. May I ask my hon. friend if the Exchequer Court will sit here or in Dawson?

Mr. OLIVER. In the absence of the Minister of Justice I am unable to answer that question, but I understand that it will sit in Dawson, as that will be found more convenient. Under the letter of the agreement with the companies, our cancellation was final, and we could then and there have declared the ground open for staking by miners; but we did not feel that that would be good policy. While we hold that these concessionaires have not fulfilled the requirements of the contract, they hold that they have. They have certainly spent a considerable amount of money; they have done what they call their assessment work; and the whole question between us is this: are we entitled to force our understanding of the agreement as to efficient working? That is the point that will be decided by the court—whether these people have actively, efficiently, and, according to the spirit and letter of the agreement, operated their concessions. If the court holds that they have, as they claim that they have, then of course our concellation will be of no effect, and they will be maintained in possession; and the reason that, having declared the concession cancelled, we did not there and then throw it open for staking by free miners, was the possibility of the concessionnaire re-establishing his right before the court, and thereby creating a very serious complication in regard to the men whom we might have permitted to stake on the ground. That is why we thought it better to accept the delay necessary to secure an absolute and legal clearance of the ground in these concessions without undertaking to deal with it without that legal clearance, and possibly bring about complications that would be very unfortunate for all the parties concerned. In the case of the Quartz Creek concession, I may say that it was some time ago that they accepted our offer of settlement, and the concession will be open for staking by miners on the 1st of June next. The Scroggie concession will shortly be in the same position. I regret as deeply as any one that our government has not apparently been more prompt, but I beg to assure the House and the people of the Yukon as well that we have been as prompt as the circumstances permitted, having due regard to the rights of investors and the welfare of those who might eventually desire to acquire titles in those lands under our cancellations.

There is nothing my hon. friend has said as regards the importance of considering the prospector that I cannot fully agree to. Any mining country absolutely depends upon the prospector, and in facilitating prospecting we are aiding the country. I believe that the action taken by parliament last session in passing the Yukon mining code has had a great deal to do with stimulating prospecting in that country. There was previously a lack of knowledge of the conditions, and possibly the conditions were not altogether as satisfactory as they might have been. The mining code itself was practically prepared by the Yukon council, the people understand its provisions, its provisions are suited to the country, and I am satisfied that prospecting has received considerable impetus from the passing of that Act. Furthermore although we have cancelled the concessions and to that extent interfered with what are claimed to be the rights of capital, yet the fact remains that never in any year has there been such a large investment of outside capital in the Yukon as during the year in which those concessions were cancelled. And no doubt while this large investment of capital has let free a number of men who were working on claims more or less profitable and enables them to go out prospecting, it has also given a general confidence in the country which we had hardly hoped for a few years ago. The investments of capital have been large and the developments have been substantial and genuine. And what has been hoped for during many years, the development of low grade levels on the Klondike side of the Dawson mining area, now seems in a fair way of fulfilment. I am not able at the moment to give any definite answer to my hon. friend's suggestion regarding the assistance by government of steamboat navigation in the various streams in the country. I can only assure him that every consideration possible will be given by the government to the further development of that country. The government have the highest appreciation not only of the past and present value of that country, but also the highest possible expectations of its future permanence and development through the energy and enterprise of the men who have gone out there in quest of gold.

Another suggestion of my hon. friend concerning which I cannot make any definite statement is his suggestion to substitute wireless communication for the present telegraph line. No doubt there is a great deal to be said in favour of the proposition he puts forward, but it is something which has to be worked out and it would not be well to take too much for granted regarding its practicability. The government, however, will give the proposition most serious consideration, and we hope that in one way or another communication with the Yukon will be maintained and improved. And while it is not my place to pledge the government, I can say that my hon. friend has given expression to the general policy of the government that communication with the Yukon must and will be kept up.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). It is always an interesting occasion when the far away member of a far away country goes through his annual function of making his budget speech to the House. It is a budget speech somewhat different from that made by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) inasmuch as the latter promises expenditures and largesses in one way or another, whilst the former is largely composed of requests often reiterated, and, I am sorry to say, not as frequently answered to the full. It is also interesting to have the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) reply in gentle and sympathetic tones to the representative from this far off section of country. He evidently does not feel quite the same towards my hon. friend as he does to some others of us here. He does not use the same amount of caustic in his treatment of him that he does with reference to myself and other more militant members on this side. But if this annual function is usually interesting, it is much more so this year for two reasons. Something tells me that within the vicinity of this House, and probably within the hearing of the two hon. gentlemen who have just acquitted themselves so well, there is in the flesh the late Commissioner of the Yukon (Mr. McInnes). And an eighth or a ninth sense—for it appears in these days, when we have to take so many methods of informing ourselves, these additional senses have to be developed—rather gives us to understand that the incoming commissioner for that far off territory is also present in the flesh and not very far from us. So that we have the past with all its glory, the present with all its struggle, and the future with all its promises. What could an audience require more and what could a speaker desire more as an impetus? That is one reason why I think that the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), to say nothing of the speech of my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson)—whose speeches are always good—fell upon sympathetic ears; and for my part I give my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) a measure of compliment for the way in which he has met the requests made by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson). However, it does not do any harm to have a little talk with reference to some of these questions. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) made some reference to myself. I roused myself from a partly dormant condition when he began his remarks, but I did not get sufficiently awake by the time he had ended that part of his address to find out just exactly what he thought I meant last year. Anyway, I did not come to the point of a personal agreement with him, if I understood his English. The government occupies an anomalous position in the Yukon. There is a council which administers the Yukon, the majority of which is appointed by this government and the minority elected by the people. So long as the government controls the council by having a majority of appointed members, just so long this House will hold the government responsible for the administration of that council. If the Yukon had an entirely elective assembly or council, which had the spending of the appropriations by this government in addition to what they get from their own revenue, then they would have the management of their own affairs financially and would be altogether responsible for that management.

But, as it is now, the government through its nominees and representatives dominates the whole situation, directs the policy of the administration in that country, and consequently will be held responsible not only for the financial management but also for the general trend of policy there. I do not see how any other position can be maintained. On that ground, I held the government responsible for the general trend of the expenditures in the Yukon, and I think I was perfectly right in so doing; and, so long as the present state of things holds, I do not see how we can do anything else. At the same time, I am absolutely at one with the hon. member for the Yukon and with the desires of the people of the Yukon that they should have the election of their own council. I could not understand the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). He said that if things had gone as had been hoped during the last year or thereabouts there would be possibly have been an elective council before this time, but things did not quite go as they were expected to go, and consequently the old hybrid system still remains. I endeavoured, but failed, to divine what possible reason there could be for affirming or denying a principle of government for the reason that things had not gone as expected, in the way of the output of gold and the development of the country—to which, of course, the minister must have referred. Surely, the capacity for a people to govern itself is not dependent upon the question whether there is a superabundance or a scarcity of rainfall or a large or small output from the

mines. The question of the kind of government and the basis upon which it shall rest is entirely apart from such considerations. The minister did not tell the House what were the expectations which had been blighted in the bud, and the blighting of which has made it impossible to carry out what otherwise would have been carried out—the giving of autonomy, in the way of power to elect their own council, to the people of the Yukon. May be it was because the operations of that celebrated member of the administration, or high officer of the administration, the Dawson rainmaker, did not turn out as well as the government thought they would, or well enough to justify the appropriation that was made. That was a disappointment, a sore disappointment. But I protest against such a thing as that operating to keep the people of the Yukon from having the right to elect their own council at as early a date as possible.

Now, as to the relation of the prospector and the large operator, we have had information this afternoon that six concessions were dealt with. Two sets of concessionnaires proved themselves amenable to reason and to self-interest and made their peace with the administration. They have their little portion and are carrying on their operations as best they can, while the rest of their territory is given back to the department and is again under the administration of the Minister of the Interior. With reference to the four other concessions the hard hand of the law is being put upon them, and gradually and in the course of time it is hoped they will be ejected from the barren privileges which they have had. I am not going to quarrel with the minister because he acted thus cautiously. I am not going to say that his was not probably the better method under the circumstances. We do not want to be too drastic and so run the risk of frightening capital from the company and especially of keeping foreign capital out. At the same time we must safeguard the rights of the people in these lands. The minister did not tell us what other concessions there were. Are these two concessions that have been compromised and these four of which the government are trying to get possession all the concessions? Or is it true that there are dozens and dozens of concessions, and, if so, how are these being dealt with? Are the concessionnaries being kept to the letter of the law? Are the concessions situated in districts appropriate for placer mining? This is information which the minister might have given the House and which I am sure would have been useful in further discussions of the subject. I draw the attention of the minister to this matter so that when the subject comes up again, as no doubt it will, we may learn from the minister about these other concessions. It is proposed that small boats should be subsidized to go up the streams to carry the prospectors up in the spring and afterwards bring them down with their goods. Give the prospector a chance; that is the plea of the hon. member for the Yukon. But if the prospector is only to toil, to have the claim that he has hunted out at great personal risk, inconvenience and labour, gobbled up by the Guggenheims or other corporations and monopolies of that kind, very little good will come to the prospector. If the prospector gets any advantage it will be only a transitory advantage. And is it not true that great corporations, especially the Guggenheims, are gathering to themselves by purchase, by concession, or by claim-taking, a very large proportion and the very best part of the ground in that territory? If so, that does not mean large population, numerous small holders and the wide distribution of wealth. It means working by machinery, with the minimum of manual labour and the smallest number of colonists for that great country. It prevents the influx of population and prevents the equable distribution of wealth. While it is fair that you should take certain of these lands that cannot be worked in any other way, and, by giving reasonable terms, put it in the power of capital to work them economically and profitably, I think great care must be taken, on the other hand, to retain for the small miner the land which he can work with advantage, making the small miner's profit thereout. The trend to-day seems to be to discourage the small miner and to place matters in the hands of capitalists. Is that an absolute necessity, or is it not possible, by government regulations and appropriate arrangement, to encourage also the small miner by keeping the best places for him to carry on placer mining, thus retaining for the Yukon that class of people who, of late years, have very largely drifted out of that territory and gone to other mining regions.

Now, it seemed to me that the Minister of the Interior was a little too self-congratulatory. He thought everything in the Yukon had gone on in the very best way. Well, I differ from the minister in that respect. I say that in some way or other a loose hand, whosoever it was, has been had upon the Yukon. There has been almost unexampled extravagance, there has been expenditure in the most reckless fashion, without any return, and there has been no strong hand put forth to curb that expenditure in proportion to the needs of the country for it, particularly in the way of administration, of employees, of civil servants, and of the many aids that the government officials there think they must have—there has been no strong progressive hand which has taken hold of that branch of the subject and has endeavoured to curb the reckless expenditure and pare it down. To-day you can take up the public accounts, the expenditure on the one hand and the

revenue on the other, to which we must always have regard, though it is not absolutely certain that because the revenue is not up to a certain point, therefore no expenditure should be made; but with reference to receipts and expenditures there ought to be a fair balance kept, and we ought to pare down in that country the immense expenditures and curb the reckless extravagance which have characterized the administration of the Yukon since the hon. gentlemen opposite got the administration of it into their hands. I think the minister has friends in the Yukon, and I am quite certain that the public accounts and the reports of the departments would give the minister fair knowledge with reference to these things, and that some more decided steps should be taken, and some more decided results should be shown, in the way of curbing the extravagance which has been so characteristic of the administration of the Yukon.

There is no use going back to old things, such as the telegraph building and its administration. Whether that line was ever properly built in the first place, I do not know, but certainly it has been a most expensive line to maintain, it has been remarkably so. We might say that it has recently been more celebrated by its breaks and its failures than by its success in giving a fairly good communication with the Yukon. The time was, under this administration, when a corporation eminently able to carry on the service, and which could have been controlled as to rates by the government itself, offered on a very reasonable basis to build that communication and to carry it on. But the government proposed to carry it on themselves, and the result has been a poor service and a very heavy Bill of expenses for maintenance, and for repairs of breakages and consequences. And after all that expenditure we have come to a point where the people of the Yukon are cut off from the outside world and proper communication, more or less, during all portions of the year, and in some portions of the year for very long and inconvenient periods.

There are other questions as well. What reason is there, if, theoretically or practically, we need a commissioner of the Yukon, that he should not be there attending to his duties, and that if his duties are interrupted by a call to a lower kind of work, some one else should not be appointed. It is always best, if you have a head to an administration, that the head should be upon the body, and about it. It leads to all sorts of maladministration and carelessness if the representative head of a territory, a government or a province, vacates his position and his duties for a long period, and is not present at his post. What is the reason that if it became necessary for the administration to—what shall I say?—degrade the gubernatorial or the commissional position by bringing it down to the rough and tumble turmoil of party politics, what reason has the government to give why it should not have placed another head to that administration, and done it within a reasonable time? I ask the minister now if, from the time that the late commissioner was taken away from his duties until the present, there has been any legal representative of this government in the shape of a commissioner in the Yukon Territory to attend to the duties that commissioner has to attend to. I am informed that there has not been. Again we press the question, why, if the commissioner is necessary, he should not be on the spot and be attending to his duties. Some one says the commissioner must have a holiday. Well, according to some representations, it is a perpetual holiday in Dawson city, daylight for twenty-four hours of each day for a certain period of the year, electric lights and all other kinds of lights for the darker portion of the administration's existence in the Yukon. But taken altogether, variety and excitement seem not to be entirely absent in that far nothern portion of our territory. How can a man keep away from a position in the Yukon for such a long period of time? How is it that the government can take away the prospective head of that great and growing country, where the best wheat in Canada is got from the soil—how can the government be so cruel as to keep him from the scene of his labours by not appointing him straightway and letting him take his position and do his duty?

Well, there is another point. A year or so ago my hon. friend who sits by my side (Mr. R. L. Borden) called the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the extraordinary discrepancies in the royalties for gold. I think the Minister of the Interior, while not ready to answer the question at the time, or to make a statement, promised to take the matter up and have an investigation made. I find in the 'Hansard' of 1906 that:

> Mr. R. L. Borden (Carleton) asked the Minister of the Interior whether he had been able to make an investigation into the royalties received on the product of gold in the Yukon.

Then he gave his tabulation of the reports, and showed the very considerable discrepancy that had occurred. The minister answered that his attention had not been called to the discrepancies, that the matter had really escaped his attention, but he said, 'I will see that it is attended to.' Now the whole matter of the collection of and the charge upon these revenues was set out in clear light by the leader of the opposition. It required an answer, it required careful looking into, and instant looking into. There was an inference from the whole statement which was not creditable to the government and not creditable to this country. Whilst the minister may have an answer to it or be able to get it, it is important that the answer should be forth-

coming at a fairly early time and not have the country waiting in suspense for an answer to the statement or the implication in the statement for so long a time. The minister has not given us any information in reference to it. It is another one of the things which are not pleasant features of the work of the Yukon. As enforcing my plea that the commissioner should be appointed to the Yukon I would like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a very remarkable letter which appears in the Toronto 'News' of March 11. It is not an anonymous letter. It is openly signed by the writer and the writer is, I believe a presbyterian minister, and who, writing over his own signature and making these allegations, seems to have been well informed and to be able to substantiate what he has therein stated. I may say that within the last three months I have received repeated communications from the Yukon along the very same lines; in fact, the intimations have not been confined to the last three months, but they have been common and repeated for many, many months. I see that in another House a member has called the attention of the government formally to the matter. Now, Sir, on the question of responsibility, so long as this government has seven out of the elective council and has a majority of that council it should be particularly sensitive to such matters as are complained of in this letter and it should be a rigid rule, so rigid that if it were frequent fatal results would take place, that no high official of the government representing and standing for the order and respectability of the government, should give any countenance whatsoever to the class of evils which is complained of here as being licensed under the council and as being licensed favourably under that council. I am not going to read just now to the House every thing in connection with it but I am going to mention two or three facts. One is that an official of the Yukon council, the license inspector, paraded his presence in a very questionable way, at a very questionable time and before a very questionable audience in a way which gave the sanction of that official, in so far as he could give it to the very thing which every straight and honest inhabitant of the Yukon disbelieves in and would feign discountenance. So that in reference to the official life under this council and consequently under this government I think a direct duty rests upon the government here and upon the minister who particularly represents the government in that country as it comes under his administration to call to instant and bitter account any of their officials who are found flaunting themselves in that way. I do not say that the government could interfere with the morals or the habits, or the likes, or the pleasures of a private individual but it does become a different thing when a representative, an official, be he high or low, of the government is concerned in these things and therefore, to a certain extent, compromises this government—that is not so important—but compromises government generally and the best that government stands for. I am not saying this in a partisan way but simply as a general principle. Now, there are one or two parts of that letter which I think it would be well to read. Attention is called to the fact that in the Yukon and in Dawson city there are families, there are children, and no healthier and better children, they say, can be found elsewhere that are found in the Yukon territory and in Dawson city. The influences on family life and on growing children ought to be as carefully looked after as it is possible to do. The Rev. Mr. Pringle goes on to say:

> The members of the government at Ottawa are aware of this condition. Again and again they have been appealed to, to rid us of this menace and disgrace, without result, without, in some cases, the courtesy of a reply. The latest answer is, that the licensing power has been delegated to the Yukon council and that therefore, the federal authorities have no jurisdiction. Has there been delegated to the Yukon council, or any other inferior legislative body, the power to frame iniquity by a law, to license prostitution in contravention of the criminal law of Canada? But what is the Yukon council?

I will omit what he says in reference to the composition of it:

> If the men who are appointed to serve on the Yukon council will not serve the moral interests of the people of the Yukon—and to be perfectly frank they are the last interests we should expect some of them to serve—let the government appoint those who will, or tell the present appointed members, all government officials, that if they permit this infamy to exist any longer under cover of an ordinance, their positions will be to let. They have shown themselves to be the subservient tools of the worst executive we ever had in the perpetration of a wrong. Let the government tell them, if they are ignorant, where the path of right and decency and safety lies.
>
> Nor is it to be overlooked that the legalizing of the added attraction in these two houses is an injustice to those who are in the legitimate liquor business, and a discrimination—I am almost ashamed to write this—against the much less dangerous houses in Klondike City.
>
> I have a few words more to say. We are without a commissioner. Doubtless within a month or two an appointment will be made. Much depends upon the personal character and moral ideals of the executive. Send us a man to whom a drunken orgy will be but an incident amongst other commonplace incidents; who has no moral ideals, or has ceased to regard them; who will prostitute the moral and material interests of the people to private or party exigencies; who will lead a lewd life before the people whose interests he is appointed to serve; who is by habit or business allied to the lowest elements of our social life—let the government send such a one and

discontent will persist and grow. Nemesis will run abreast of him from the start and may thrust itself across the path of those who send him.

But give us a clean, sane, upright man, who will frown upon vice in official and private life alike, whose life itself will be a rebuke to the drunkenness, lust, gambling and graft which have been our shame; who has high moral ideals and the courage to move persistently if slowly towards their realization, and he will effect the contentment of the great mass of our people as to moral and material interests alike.

Reading that letter all through it does not strike one as the letter of a bigot; it is the letter of a man who takes a reasonable view of society in a new and peculiarly constituted country like that, a mining country. He gives and takes, and is willing to give and take but he does ask, in the interests of morality and of the abiding population of Dawson City and of that country, that certain excrescences be cut off and that certain clean principles shall be carried out in certain ways in the administration of that country. I have great faith in that northern country; I have greater faith every hour I live in the unknown and unexplored portions of this Dominion. What we have had lately revealed to us when the lid has been but partially taken off with reference to the great areas that we had looked upon as being absolutely worthless, gives us great hope and confidence as to what may be found in the good time of Providence when still more northern areas are opened up by the enterprise and industry of our people and made to contribute their quota to the wealth and to the progress of this country.

COLONIAL SECURITIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to bring another matter to the attention of the government, of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) particularly. The minister will recollect that during the session of 1906 I made certain inquiries of the government with respect to the application of the Imperial Colonial Stock Act of 1900 to the securities of the various provinces of Canada. By the Act in question the power of trustees in the United Kingdom under the Trustee Act of 1893 was extended and provision was made for the investment of trust funds in colonial securities under regulations to be made by the Lords' Commissioners of the Treasury. The regulations of the Lords' Commissioners of the Treasury were promulgated in due course, I do not know exactly at what date, but they are as follows:

(a) The colony shall provide by legislation for the payment out of the revenues of the colony of any sum which may become payable to stockholders under any judgment, decree, rule or order of a court in the United Kingdom.

(b) The colony shall satisfy the imperial treasurer that adequate funds (as and when required) will be made in the United Kingdom to meet such judgment, decree, rule or order.

(c) The colonial government shall place on record a formal expression of opinion that any colonial legislation which appears to the imperial government to alter any of the provisions affecting the stock to the injury of the shareholders or to involve a departure from the original contract, in regard to the stock would properly be disallowed.

The government of Canada secured within the last ten years, I do not know exactly at what date, the necessary consent of the imperial authorities and the securities of Canada at the present time are available for investment by trustees in the United Kingdom. The following self-governing colonies and Crown colonies have taken advantage of the Act, passed the necessary legislation and given the assurances required under the treasury regulations.

(a) Self-governing colonies, the Dominion of Canada, Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Newfoundland, New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia.

(b) Crown and other colonies, Barbadoes, British Guiana, Ceylon, Gold Coast, Grenada, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Lagos, Mauritius, St. Lucia, Sierra Leona and Trinidad.

As a result the financial position and credit of those colonies which have come under the Act and under the regulations of the Lords' Commissioners of the Treasury have immensely improved and their securities have obtained a better status in the market. We know that the various provinces which now constitute Canada were united into one Dominion under the British North America Act and various orders in council passed at subsequent dates under the authority of that Act. I understand that the inscribed stocks of the provinces of Canada are eligible for registration under the Colonial Stock Act of 1877, and amending Acts, and the word 'colony' is defined in the Colonial Stock Act of 1877 as follows:

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires. The expression 'colony' means any dominion, colony, island, territory, province, or settlement situate within Her Majesty's dominions, but not within the United Kingdom, the Channel Islands, or Isle of Man, and not forming part of India as defined for the purposes of the Acts for the time being in force relating to the government of India; and for the purposes of this Act the whole of the dominions, colonies, islands, territories, provinces and settlements under one central legislature, and also such part of the said dominion and such of the said colonies, islands, territories, provinces and settlements as is under a local legislature is deemed to be a colony.

It would appear that the difficulty in the way of extending the benefits of the Act of 1900 to the provinces of Canada is to be found in the provision of the third of the treasury regulations. This difficulty is that

the treasury regulations require that there shall be a formal assurance to the imperial government that any Act of the colony which in any way interferes with the value or security of the stock may properly be disallowed. The power of disallowance so far as the legislation of the provinces of Canada is concerned, is vested not in the imperial government but in this government, and it is of course obvious that the imperial government not having the power of disallowance, or rather the Crown disallowing through the executive of Canada and not through the executive of Great Britain, has not the same control as it has in respect of the other colonies and dominions of Her Majesty which I have just now named. I understand that the provinces of Canada have proposed to get over this difficulty by giving the same assurance to this government which has been given by the other colonies that have obtained the benefit of this Act to the imperial government, and they propose further that this government should in respect of the disallowance of any such Act proceed upon the request or advice of the imperial government so that in that way every necessary assurance would be given to the holders of such stocks in the United Kingdom. I understand perfectly that there are difficulties in the way; there were difficulties, which were not overcome for some time before, this government succeeded in having its securities inscribed for investment by trustees in the United Kingdom; but I would think that by some such means as have already been suggested the object might be accomplished, and it is to be supposed that the governments of the respective provinces of Canada would be prepared, and I think they would be prepared, to give any further assurance in addition to that which I mentioned which would make the holders of stocks of the provinces of Canada in the United Kingdom just as secure as the holders of the stocks of the Dominion of Canada. I bring the matter once more to the attention of the government because my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, during the last session, after having alluded to the difficulties I have just now suggested, promised that the matter would receive the attention of the government, and that, as the subject was a very important one for the provinces, the best efforts of the government would be directed towards securing for the different provinces of Canada the same treatment that is accorded in the United Kingdom to the securities of even some of the minor Crown colonies. It does seem very ridiculous that when the securities of these small Crown colonies may be invested in by estates in the United Kingdom, securities of Quebec, Ontario and the other great provinces of Canada are excluded. To say the least, it seems a very striking anomaly, and I sincerely trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will either to-day or at some early day in the session announce that some progress has been made or that the matter has engaged the attention of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not had this matter before me for some time, and I am therefore obliged to speak from recollection; but my impression is that there has been no recent change in the situation. The impression that seemed to prevail in the mind of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that this was a matter within the control of the federal government is an erroneous impression.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not say it is within their control.

Mr. FIELDING. The provinces must be left to a large extent to work out their own salvation in a matter of this kind. If our good offices can help them in any way, certainly they are entitled to them, and they will always be given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seemed to me that the matter could only be worked out effectually by the intervention of this government, because it holds the power of disallowance in respect to provincial Acts.

Mr. FIELDING. There would be no difficulty in our giving the British government the assurance that we would undertake to disallow any Act of a provincial legislature —if one could conceive of such an Act under our system of government—whereby a province would attempt to repudiate or in any way minimize its obligations. I quite realize that it is very desirable that the securities of our provinces should have the advantage of being included in the trustee list ; but I am satisfied that that is not the real difficulty, and we have had no intimation that the British government take that view at all. The objection of the British government rests on other grounds. They are very unwilling to enlarge the trustee list at all. The same question has arisen with respect to stocks which are more than provincial—which are essentially Dominion stocks ; for instance, the stocks which the government and parliament of Canada have guaranteed with respect to great railway corporations—the Canadian Northern in the first instance, and the Grand Trunk Pacific in the second, as well as originally the Canadian Pacific Railway. Each of these stocks, it would seem to the ordinary observer, has all the merit of a Dominion stock plus the obligation of the company itself. It is the case of having the promissory note of the company and the endorsement of the Dominion government. Yet, strange to say, the imperial authorities will not admit these stocks to the trustee list. That is a stronger case in one respect than the case of one of our provinces, because it is a security in which the resources of the Dominion of Canada are pledged ; but so strong is the opposition of the imperial authorities to the enlarge-

ment of the trustee list that they have refused so far to allow a stock bearing the guarantee of the government of Canada to be included, although they will admit a straight government stock. If by taking the steps which my hon. friend suggests, we could secure this advantage for the provinces, it would be both our duty and our pleasure to take it; but the impression that that is the real cause of the difficulty is a very erroneous one.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the real reason ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think there are two reasons. There is first the natural conservatism of the imperial authorities in matters of this kind. My hon. friend knows that in his day what he thought was a perfectly complete case for the admission of our Dominion stocks into the favoured trustee list had not the desired effect, and the only reason was the natural conservatism of the Englishman, especially in financial matters. Probably another consideration in the mind of the imperial authorities is that the broadening of the trustee list has the effect of making British consols much less sought after than they used to be. That is regarded in some circles as one reason why British consols have fallen to very low figures, though I would not attach much significance to that assertion. I suppose no English statesman would like to admit that this consideration has influenced his mind to any extent, but it is in the mind of some financial writers. However, everything that my hon. friend has said with regard to the admission of our provincial securities into the trustee list has my sympathy. It does seem unreasonable that the stocks of a small colony with small resources should be admitted while the stocks of one of our great provinces are excluded; but the explanation is that the imperial government has a direct connection with and control over these colonies, which it does not possess in the case of our provincial governments under our federal system. As my hon. friend has pointed out, the power of disallowance of provincial Acts rests not with the imperial authorities, but with the government at Ottawa ; while in the case of the Crown colonies to which he has referred, the power of disallowance rests directly with the imperial government. That is where the line of division comes. However, I would not utter a word other than one of hearty sympathy with what my hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House, and if by any Act of ours we can bring about so desirable an end, I can assure him it will be both our duty and our pleasure to do it.,

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. I would invite the attention of the committee to several matters in the order in which they appear in the tariff resolutions. In resolution 1, the first subsection proposes to repeal a large number of Acts. We find that since that section was drafted the revised statutes have been brought into operation, and they have repealed all these Acts ; therefore it is not necessary for us to repeal the Acts specifically, but merely to repeal any section of the revised statutes which deals with them. I propose therefore that resolution 1 be reconsidered and amended by substituting for paragraphs Nos. 1 and 2 of resolution 1, the words :

Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal chapter 49 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, entitled the Customs Tariff.

The effect is the same, but it is a better form of legislation than repealing Acts which have already been repealed.

Mr. FIELDING. In resolution 2, for the same reason I propose to strike out the words I shall now read:

As amended by section 2 of the Customs Amended Act of 1888.

The recent revised statutes consolidate the whole Act and therefore we do not need to refer to these amendments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN And the section is the same.

Mr. FIELDING. Strike out the words 'as amended by section 2 of the clause amended Act of 1888.'

Agreed to.

On item 79,

Mr. FIELDING. I propose, before the word 'araucarias' in the second line, to insert the words 'seedling carnation stock.'

Agreed to.

On item 433.

Mr. FIELDING. This item comprises a number of things connected with the printing industry. We have the articles of metal and the articles of paper associated together and want to separate them. I propose to strike out the words 'matrices or' in the fourth line.

Agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. I propose to insert a new item 433a:

Matrices for stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids, described in item 433, per square inch, one-half cent.

The old item was one and a half cents per square inch, it being rated in combination with a number of other thing. We made a distinction between these various items and in part got a reduction and in part let the item stand. The reduction, as applied to these matrices, was from one and a half cent to one-eighth of a cent. It is an article the value of which is rather hard to establish. After careful consideration, we have formed the impression that the reduction was perhaps too severe, and we pro-

pose that the rate for these matrices shall be half a cent instead of one-eighth.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister make any distinction between matrices for newspaper plates and for advertising?

Mr. FIELDING. For advertising purposes that will remain as before. They were not reduced. The reduction only took place on the newspaper matter.

Mr. FOSTER. It is featured matter.

Mr. FIELDING. That would be regarded as newspaper matter. It would be hardly deemed an advertisement. This rate of half a cent will work out very reasonably for the industry.

On item 441,

Type casting and type setting machines, adapted for use in printing offices; and typewriters.

Mr. FIELDING. We find that typewriters had been classified with type casting and type setting machines, for convenience, but the effect was to make a reduction which was hardly contemplated. The common typewriter is not properly classified with the type casting and type setting machines. We propose to strike the typewriter out of item 441 and make it an independent item, which will leave the rate of duty as before, without change except as to the fraction in the preference. I propose to strike out of item 441 the word 'typewriters' and to make a new item, 441a, typewriters seventeen and a half per cent, twenty-two and a half per cent, twenty-five per cent.

Agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. We find that horse-powers are mentioned in two different items. Horse-powers for farming purposes are included in the amended item 447, and horse powers are also mentioned in item 448. We have concluded that, having provided for these for farming purposes we need not mention them in the other item. I move therefore, that 'horse-powers' be struck out of item 448.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. Iron tubing of certain sizes has been made free when imported by the manufacturers of bedsteads. This has been in the tariff for years. Our attention has been called to the fact that the same article is used by manufacturers of carriage rails, and so we propose to insert a new item, No. 486a, as follows:

486a. Iron tubing, lacquered or brass covered, not over two inches in diameter, and brass-cased rods and brass trimmings, when imported by manufacturers of carriage rails for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories, free, free, free.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. I propose to insert also a new item, No. 650a, as follows:

Button blanks of animal shell, in the rough, 7½ per cent, 10 per cent, 10 per cent.

These are practically raw materials which are imported for the use of manufacturers of buttons, and we make a low rate of duty accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. In the drawback schedule, schedule 'B.' I propose to insert a new item. Certain articles of cordage, lines and twines for use in the fisheries are made free. It has been represented to us that, in the changing conditions of the fishing industry, particularly on the Pacific coast, a galvanized wire netting is now being used in the fish traps. It is practically a portion of the netting of the fisheries, but, probably, under a rigid interpretation of the item as it reads, it would be held to be dutiable. We desire to give the same concession on this as is given on the lines and twines used on the Atlantic coast. Therefore, I propose the following item in the schedule 'B':

1020. Galvanized wire netting of a class or kind not made in Canada, when used in traps for the fisheries, 99 per cent drawback.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that disposes of the tariff matters before the committee except two items relating to boots and shoes.

Mr. FOSTER. If I may, I would like to call to the attention of the minister a matter relating to the importation of machinery as between Great Britain and the United States. The British exporter, of course, gets the preferential rate. He has to charge for the packing of the machinery and the recipient here must pay for it. Owing to the long voyage, machinery imported from Great Britain must be securely and therefore more expensively packed than machinery coming from the United States. The machinery sent in by the American producer is sent to Canada by car and comes at much less expense in packing, and the packing is largely returned. It is impossible to return more expensive packing used by the British exporter. The effect of this is to give a decided advantage to the exporter from the United States. The attention of the minister has been called to the matter, and my informant tells me that he has a promise of its consideration. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will easily see how this works out to the disadvantage of the British manufacturer and to the advantage of the American. Well, we do not want the advantage that way but rather the other way. I would like to hear whether any attempts were made to do

away with this discrimination—as it virtually is—against the British producer.

Mr. FIELDING. The criticism would apply not only to these but to all packages. No doubt, the proximity of our country to the United States enables the producer in that country to send in goods at less expense for packages than the British exporter must face. But, while this is a fact, I do not see how we can overcome it, unless we abandon the system of taxing packages altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, has the minister looked into that matter? Why should the case in which a piece of merchandise comes may pay a duty? If I buy merchandise in a foreign country and carry it in in my hand, I pay duty only on the merchandise. What difference can it make if I bring it in in a box? Of course, I understand that goods may be brought in in packages and that packages themselves may become merchandise. In such a case, of course, it is fair to charge duty on the packages. And I know that it has been the policy to charge duty on packages but I would like to know on what theory it is done?

Mr. PATERSON. You could not do without the package clause very well. In the working of the department a uniform rule has been adopted. In the case of goods bearing a specific duty, the packages are free, unless the packages themselves can be sold and used again. For instance, a flour or sugar barrel, one that will not hold water, is not charged a duty; but a tight barrel, which can be sold as merchandise would be dutiable. In the case of goods on which there is an ad valorem duty, if the value of the case is included in the value of the goods, there is no separate duty on the case; but where the package is specifically charged for, it bears the same ad valorem rate of duty as the contents.

It will not bear so hardly upon the line that my hon. friend has mentioned as it will upon the gentlemen in the drys goods trade, who have objected to it. The reason is that, recognizing that machinery, packed as the English have to pack it to cross the sea, costs so very heavily, we endeavoured to meet that by giving a greater reduction to the machinery from Great Britain. Machinery before was 25 per cent and the English rate of course was 16⅔ per cent. We have raised the general tariff to 27½ and we have lowered the preferential rate to 15. That will largely overcome the difficulty, a very serious matter, with reference to the cost of packages which are so expensive. But the difficulty remains with the dry goods, and it cannot be considered in any other light than that it does detract that much from the preference. But I think in many classes of dry goods there has been a lessened preference rate.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. BOYCE. I was not in the House when item 210a was dealt with, that is, caustic soda which, when in packages of not less than 25 pounds weight, is free, and over that 15 per cent under the general tariff and 10 per cent under the British preferential. The minister had, I presume, a knowledge of the conditions existing with regard to the manufacture of bleaching powder and caustic soda at Sault Ste. Marie, and I understood that he had promised, or suggested, that some protection to that industry might be granted when the tariff came to be revised. Strong efforts were made some years ago when the factory was first started, to induce the government to give some protection against foreign competition, and those who saw the minister were told, as I am informed, to carry it along as well as they could and not allow it to go to the wall. They did so in the hope that some remedy would be afforded by the government. The minister is familiar with the conditions that existed there, so I merely ask whether any reconsideration could be given to this item, or whether he has lost sight of the representations that were made to him, and which, as I know, were entirely in accordance with the facts. This was an industry in which $300,000 of capital was invested, paying about $40,000 a year in wages. It was manufacturing an article of a quality and in quantity sufficient to supply not only the Canadian trade but it exported some abroad, for instance, to the United States. But this industry has been entirely crushed out of existence, and the factory has been sold under liquidation sale. Those conditions were brought to the attention of the minister some years ago, and I now ask whether it is possible to reconsider this item.

Mr. FIELDING. Is the article now made at the Soo?

Mr. BOYCE. No, I do not understand it is now made at the Soo; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that if he would carry out the promises that I understand he made—I am not speaking authoritatively, I am merely repeating what was told me—the manufacture could be revived, and probably something could be done towards recovering the trade which had been lost.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend says that any promise was given by the government that a duty would be imposed on that article, he has certainly been misinformed. I recollect that several years ago urgent representations were made of the kind the hon. gentleman mentions, but he has no authority for any statement as to any promise having been given obliging the government to impose any rate of duty. The matter was brought before us when we were at the Soo, and my impression is that the industry had been abandoned. I think I am correct. That being the case, the matter was not pressed upon us as strongly as it had been at a pre-

vious stage. This article has been on the free-list for generations, and the promoters desired us to make it dutiable. But on the other hand there were manufacturers in Canada who used it and who offered strong objections to that course. While representations were strongly made in favour of that industry, when we found that it had been abandoned, the matter ceased to engage our attention as closely as it had done on the previous occasion.

Mr. BOYCE. Of course, this is very much in the nature of a post mortem over an industry. But in justice to the people who made the representations I would like to draw the attention of the committee to the facts as they occurred chronologically. The factory was completed about the 1st of June, 1903, upon which there had been expended in round figures $300,000. Its payroll was between $30,000 ond $40,000 a year. The total output of the factory was sufficient, not only to supply the trade in Canada, but a large part of the trade in the United States. On or about the 1st of February, 1903, a deputation waited upon the Minister of Finance and made an argument in favour of the protection of that industry, which was then ready for work. Tables and figures were laid before the minister to show him that with a little protection as against foreign importations and to shelter them from the disturbed conditions of the markets in England, Germany and elsewhere, this industry could be carried on successfully, and be of great benefit to that neighbourhood. These arguments I believe were made before the minister on the 21st of February, 1903. They were oral arguments and the minister requested the deputation to put them into writing. This was done by a letter under date of March 4, 1903, which was acknowledged by a letter from the minister dated March 7, which I have in my hand. In it the minister promised to give consideration to the matter. The budget was brought down about the middle of April, but no mention whatever was made in regard to this industry. In the month of December of that year the Soo industries met with temporary embarrassment, and suspended.

They passed into the the hands of a receiver. Thus, although an independent industry, it was indirectly affected by the result. It was an auxiliary industry to the Lake Superior industries, because a large amount of the product of this factory was used in the manufacture of pulp and paper by the Soo industries. Towards the latter end of December, 1903, I am informed, that Mr. James Bicknell, who was then the solicitor for Speyer & Co., who had taken possession of the plant at Sault Ste. Marie, had a conference with the Minister of Finance. He told the minister, as I am informed, that the company would have to go into liquidation unless something were promised in the shape of a protective duty on caustic soda and bleaching powder. I am further informed that the Minister of Finance asked Mr. Bicknell to make it his care and to see as far as he possibly could that the company should not go into liquidation. In February, March and April, 1904, I understand that Mr. J. J. Kehoe, who was the unsuccessful candidate at the last Dominion election, waited upon the minister and impressed upon him again the desirability of something being done in this matter. Again I understand that other efforts were made by Mr. Clergue and possibly by other directors of the company. The ultimate result was that absolutely nothing was done, a winding up petition was filed against the company under its debenture mortgage and the industry had to close its doors. I submit with very great respect that it is a little late for the hon. gentleman to say that if steps had been taken and representations had been made something might have been done in this tariff when the strongest possible representations were made to the government and the Minister of Finance at a time when the minister was in a position to stimulate this industry. The result was disastrous to the company. Although they continued as long as they could to struggle against the competition that existed, although the price of their goods, as shown in the tables on file in the minister's department had month by month steadily decreased, and although that was impressed upon the minister personally, by petition and by argument, in the strongest possible way, the hon. gentleman allowed that industry to be crushed out of existence for want of acceding to the request which, I think, under all circumstances, having regard to all the arguments, seems to me to be a fairly reasonable one and one which would create no difficulty for or have any injurious effect upon any other industry or trade and which would have been most acceptable to the people of Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. FIELDING. The only part of my hon. friend's remarks with which I wish to disagree is the statement that there was a promise given to these gentlemen. It was a religion with us throughout the whole tariff inquiry that while we listened to everybody respectfully, and we certainly did not desire any man to close up his industry if any sympathetic word would help him to keep his factory open, no promise was given that any special rate of duty would be imposed. What he says as to the representations made from time to time is quite correct. There were numerous representations made several years ago.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to the item in regard to rolled brass and to ask him if he has any

further information in regard to it. I understood, when we were discussing the matter before, that he would make some inquiries as to whether that was manufactured in Canada or not, and that if it were not manufactured in Canada perhaps some change might be made or some consideration given to that question. I may say that since the matter was discussed here I have made some inquiries myself and I have received from manufacturers using that class of goods some correspondence in which they assure me that rolled brass is not manufactured in Canada at all. As late as December of last year orders were given to the firm outside of Toronto that reference was made to, the orders were refused and those giving them were told that that firm was no longer in business. It is impossible to obtain these goods in Canada and I would repeat my request that the manufacturers who use these goods be allowed to bring them on duty free or that they be given a rebate.

Mr. FIELDING. This matter was considered and dealt with in the tariff the other day. Our discussion, in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) participated, had reference more particularly to the question of nickel and German silver than to that of brass. But the two items were associated in the discussion and the point that my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) drew attention to was that we were allowing a drawback to persons who were using nickel and German silver for certain purposes and he suggested that we extend it to locks. I remember asking him if these articles were used to any extent in the manufacture of locks and he said they were, and his claim was that the manufacturers of locks should be treated in the same way as the manufacturers of certain articles to whom that concession was given. We did give the matter further consideration, and we came to the conclusion that as respects nickel and German silver we would make them free so that the industry the hon. gentleman refers to will be placed in a position of equality with other industries, but as respects the item of brass, which was not the one which was under discussion, we determined that as there was a fair prospect of the factory being reopened we would let the duty stand, and give these industries the benefit of exemption from the duty on nickel and German silver, which is only a secondary business as compared with the manufacture of brass.

Mr. PORTER. I regret that I failed to make myself understood before. The hon. gentleman is quite right in the statement he makes in regard to what I said about German and nickel silver. It is used in the manufacturing concerns to which I refer, but it is not the principal thing that is used. Brass is the principal thing that is used by these lock manufacturers, and what I asked for was that brass, which is not manufactured in Canada, be put in the same position as nickel and german silver. That is still my request, and if the minister understood me as abandoning that contention as to brass being put upon the free list or a rebate being allowed upon that, I beg to correct that because that was not the intention that I endeavoured to convey to the House. It was that brass, being the principal article used in the manufacture of locks, should be treated in the same way as nickel and German silver by being made free or rebate allowed.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but we were not giving any drawback to anybody on brass and therefore the discussion chiefly concerned nickel and German silver, although it is quite right to say that brass is associated with it. However, the conclusion we reached was that if we would make nickel and German silver free we would to that extent meet the hon. gentleman's criticism. Brass has been manufactured by that Toronto concern to a very considerable extent. A very considerable sum of money was invested and when we determined to put the item in our tariff we understood that the industry was in operation. Further inquiry, however, led to the discovery that the factory which had been in operation had suspended, but we have some assurance that it is likely to reopen shortly. There is a large amount of money invested, it has not been abandoned, the promoters contemplate reopening the factory, and if a small duty of 10 per cent will help them we do not think that we should deprive them of it. It is not a very heavy duty if it has to be paid by the various industries which use brass, most of which have a fairly good protective duty themselves.

Mr. PORTER. Then these manufacturers are to understand that this is the reason and the sole reason why brass is not treated in the same manner in this tariff as German silver, namely, that this is a proposal of a manufacturing concern in Canada manufacturing the brass. That is the only reason?

Mr. FIELDING. That is hardly a fair way to state it. That would imply that someone was contemplating the establishment of a brass factory; that is not the situation. A factory has been established and was in actual operation and sold brass goods to scores of manufacturers in Canada, but owing to financial difficulties the company suspended operations. The brass is their principal product. They also ask consideration with regard to German silver, but as that is not their principal product we thought that we would give them this little advantage with regard to brass and leave German silver free. We think it is a fair arrangement and that the industries using

brass will not have occasion to complain of a 10 per cent duty when they have 20 per cent and in some cases 30 per cent on their finished article.

Mr. PORTER. If it were understood by the firm in Toronto that is likely to start up again that the admission of brass free of duty would only extend to such time as they required to get into operation, would that affect their business?

Mr. FIELDING. It would be rather hard to introduce an item of that kind in the tariff. If we did it here we would have to do it in other cases, and I really think the duty is so moderate that it will not be a burden to any one.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

CENTRAL CANADA MANUFACTURERS MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Calvert—considered in committee and reported.

On motion for the third reading.

Mr. AMES. This Bill has been so considerably changed that it should be reprinted before its third reading so that those who have any objections may see whether the Bill in its amended shape is not open to objection.

Mr. FIELDING. The main objection was on the question of deposit. The company have consented to the view of the committee on that point, and as far as I am aware there is nothing debateable in the Bill now. The reprinting would have the effect of putting the Bill before us in simpler form, but there is nothing controversial in it. Of course the promoters will have to pay for the printing.

Mr. LENNOX. The matter of the deposit is governed by the General Act.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I understood it was a violation of rule 112 to go into committee on a Bill before it is reprinted, and I thought there was an understanding that that rule would be enforced.

Mr. CALVERT. The reason why it has not been reprinted is that the promoters of the Bill expected that in all probability they would have to withdraw it. It is only to-day that I was notified the company were officially prepared to accept the proposition made by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) to put up a deposit. As the Bill has been fairly discussed in committee, I would ask the House to permit it to pass. It will be reprinted before it goes to the Senate. As the Bill has met the approval of everybody, why not let it pass this House and let it go to the Senate?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I am speaking upon the general principle. This thing is being done from day to day. What I am anxious for is that the rules of the House be complied with and every member be given an opportunity to see the Bill as it passed the committee. That is the only way in which a Bill can be discussed intelligently.

Mr. AMES. I do not wish to delay the passage of the Bill, but I would like to ask the promoter whether Bill (No. 93) is also to be proceeded with ?

Mr. CALVERT. I expect that when it comes before the committee, it will be dealt with along the same lines as this Bill.

Mr. AMES. My object would be quite attained if this Bill passed its third reading and was reprinted for the Senate, so that, in its reprinted form, it would be in the hands of members before Bill (No. 93) is actually taken up in committee.

Mr. CALVERT. That could be done.

Mr. AMES. Is that agreed to ?

Mr. CALVERT. Yes.

Bill read the third time, and passed

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again in Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING. I suggest that we take the two items relating to boots and shoes together.

611. Boots and shoes, pegged or wire fastened, with unstitched soles close edged, 17½ per cent, 22½ per cent, 25 per cent.

611a. Boots, shoes, slippers and insoles, of any material, n.o.p., 20 per cent, 27½ per cent, 30 per cent.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the change there ?

Mr. FIELDING. It means, briefly, that the coarser goods remain as before, but, on the finer classes of boots and shoes the duty is advanced five per cent.

Mr. BOYCE. Item 219 of the old tariff reads as follows :

Boots, shoes and slippers of any material, n.o.p., 25 per cent ad valorem.

In the tariff introduced on the 29th of November last, this was changed, and now we have the two sections as read by your-

self. Mr. Chairman, the question of the duty on boots and shoes, as the minister knows, raised a great deal of difficulty with the Tariff Commission, while a good deal of what might be called the internecine strife between the boot and shoe manufacturers on the one side and the tanners on the other, was disclosed to the ministers. I propose to consider these items before the committee as briefly as possible. It will be seen that boots and shoes, pegged or wire fastened, with unstitched soles, are left as under the old tariff, while an additional protection of five per cent is given to the manufacturers of all boots and shoes coming under section 611a. This change, as I understand it, is the result of representations which were made by a very large delegation which waited upon the Tariff Commission in Quebec, and of some negotiations since that time. In order to outline the difficulties which led up to the amendment of this tariff, I cannot do better than read the memorial addressed to the Tariff Commission by the manufacturers of boots and shoes :

To the members of the Tariff Commission, 1905—

Gentlemen,—The undersigned representatives of the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers, beg to submit a statement as to the condition of the industry at the present time, and the reasons why we consider that necessary changes should be made in the tariff on boots and shoes.

Size and extent of industry.

At the present time there are about eighty-two concerns engaged in the manufacture of boots and shoes. These represent a capital investment of $6,000,000, and they annually turn out about 12,000,000 pairs of boots and shoes valued at $15,000,000. These factories give employment to 10,000 hands whose wages amount to $3,700,000 per annum.

General condition at present time.

The boot and shoe industry is now, and has been for some years past, in a depressed state. The figures of the United Shoe Machinery Company, which may be taken as authentic, show during the past year an average decrease in royalties from boots and shoes in the better grades of 5,000 pairs per month instead of showing an increase in accordance with the growth and general prosperity of the country.

This depression is largely due to the increased importations of American shoes which last year, according to the official figures of the blue-book amounted to $1,107,100. If this amount of money had been put into Canadian goods, our manufacturers would be able to further specialize in their lines, to reduce the cost of production as well as improve the character of the output. In addition about $300,000 extra would have been spent in wages, and from 700 to 800 more hands employed in our factories.

The extra output which this amount of trade would have required would have enabled the manufacturer to sell goods at a lower figure on account of the reduction in his fixed costs.

Only one other country buys more American shoes than Canada. The value thus afforded to the American industry is well stated by 'American Shoemaking' as follows: 'Had Canada purchased no more boots and shoes in 1904 than 1903, United States exporters would have shown a falling off of $124,908 from 1903.'

Owing to the smallness of the market, and the vast extent of territory to be covered, and the necessity of making so many classes of goods in one factory, the cost of administration and distribution is greater in Canada than in the United States.

Raw materials used.

Canadian manufacturers of boots and shoes have to pay high prices for their raw material. The tariff on the raw material averages about 21 per cent, as it is the finished product of other manufacturers in this country who enter the bulk of their raw material free of duty, and have a protection varying from 15 per cent to 35 per cent on their finished product. The sources of supply are chiefly Canada and the United States.

Competition.

The chief competition which Canadian manufacturers must meet is that of the United States.

The imports of boots and shoes from the United States last year amounted to $1,107,100, all in fine and fine medium goods, competing with $4,250,000 of similar goods made in Canada. In other words over 25 per cent of the fine and fine medium styles of boots and shoes sold in Canada were manufactured in the United States.

This competition from the United States has been steadily increasing during the past nine years, shown in the government records as follows :

1897	$ 320,025
1898	378,453
1899	451,376
1900	541,665
1901	542,790
1902	701,383
1903	743,378
1904	1,002,900
1905	1,173,113

While the records of the leather trade in so far as disconnected with the shoe manufacturing industry are the reverse.

One reason for this competition is that of late the United States manufacturers have been compelled to seek the foreign market in order to get rid of the large amount of goods annually turned out by their factories, and their attention has been directed towards Canada on account of convenient access to the Canadian market, and the low tariff which it imposes.

In order to secure home business United States manufacturers advertise extensively in the cheaper magazines. These enter Canada free and are distributed without charge by our post office, to the disadvantage of the Canadian manufacturers. Thus the American manufacturer secures Canadian advertising without extra cost.

Some United States factories do such a large business that it would be easy to find three whose output is equal to the entire output of the eighty-two Canadian factories.

CHANGES DESIRED.

We require with present duties on raw material a duty of 35 per cent on boots and shoes, and should the duties on our principal raw

materials such as leather, &c., be increased over present rates, that the same advance over 35 per cent be allowed on our finished articles, namely, boots and shoes.

An increase in the duty on boots and shoes will enable the Canadian manufacturer of these articles to handle more effectively the home trade and also put him in a better position to enter the export field. It will also give increased business to the leather people and the other manufacturers whose goods we buy, thereby increasing their cost of administration.

To show that many, both inside and outside the boot and shoe industry, are aware that our trade deserves the increased duty asked for we append the following resolutions.

There are the signatures of the different firms signing the memorial. The raw material spoken of there is subject to an average protective duty of about 20½ per cent. For instance, on a fine and fancy article such as patent leather shoes, the raw material which goes to make up the article is protected to the extent of 26½ per cent, and the manufactured article comes in under a tariff duty of 25 per cent. Now, that is, shortly, the request that was made to the Tariff Commission by the manufacturers. At the same time there was some difficulty as between the manufacturers and the tanners, that is the importers of the raw material or sole leather. Now it is to be observed that the amendment to this tariff provides an increased protection to the tanners of 5 per cent. The relation between the tanners and the manufacturers have become, during the last five years, considerably strained, owing to the efforts which were made by the tanners to form what I conceive to be, from the information I have obtained, an improper combination against the manufacturers, a combination most injurious in its effects, and which had for its most apparent object the forcing of the manufacturers of boots and shoes to purchase from the tanners at their prices, and from the tanners alone. In support of that statement I can give to the committee the facts contained in several documents under my hand. As long ago as 1895, a combination was formed of fourteen tanning firms, which number was subsequently reduced by the acquisition of some of the firms by the remainder to seven, which subsequently controlled the tanning combination. The combination formed by the tanners, which I think was very detrimental to the boot and shoe and leather trade of Canada, is defined and shown by documents which I will read. The first is a letter marked 'Confidential,' dated 6 Front St., East, Toronto, December 21, 1895. It is a circular letter addressed to each member of the Manufacturers Association, that is the manufacturers of boots and shoes.

Confidential.

65 Front Street, East,
Toronto, December 31, 1895.

Dear Sir,—A careful analysis of the Canadian supply of and demand for sole leather, proves that the normal annual Canadian consumption absorbs only about sixty per cent of the number of pounds annually being tanned in Canada, and the conviction is thus forced upon us that, only the choice between two expedients remains, viz., by restriction of the output of sole leather by nearly one-half, or, the development of the export trade therein.

Recognizing the hardship upon our employees, which the necessarily large restriction of output would entail as well as the loss to those supplying our raw materials, and being assured that by working our tanneries to their full capacity, and thereby reducing the cost of tanning to the lowest possible point, successful competition could be made in foreign markets, we confidently appeal to our customers to aid us in the development of the export trade, by confining their purchases to the product of our several tanneries, thus assuring us of a steady volume of trade.

Believing that the result of working our tanneries to their full capacity will sufficiently reduce our cost of tanning to justify a rebate being paid on all purchases of sole leather from us, we hereby tender you the opportunity to avail yourself of a reduction in price in your future purchases of sole leather.

We have therefore authorized Mr. D. A. Burns, 65 Front street E., Toronto, acting for us and on our behalf, to pay you in the month of July, 1896, and in each succeeding month, providing you shall have for the six preceding months bought and received sole leather only from us, the undersigned sole leather tanners and dealers, and the same has been duly paid for, a rebate of five per cent (5 per cent) on the net amount of all invoices of such sole leather bought by and delivered to you from us during the sixth (6th) preceding month respectively.

It will however be necessary before such rebate shall be paid, that you shall furnish us such satisfactory evidence of such continuous exclusive purchasing and delivery, as may from time to time be required.

We reserve the right upon notice, to cancel all or any part of this proposition, but not thereby to relieve ourselves of any obligations that may have accrued hereunder.

Yours truly,
Marlat & Armstrong,
Muskoka Leather Co., Ltd.,
Acton Tanning Co., Ltd.,
Magnetawan Tan. & Elec. Co., Ltd.,
Wingham Tanning Co.,
S. Arscott & Co., Benton, N.B.,
Warren Tobey & Co.,
Shaw, Cassils & Co.,
Beardmore & Co.,
Breithaupt Leather Co., Ltd.,
Logan Tanning Co., Ltd.,
C. S. Hyman & Co.,
Bowman & Zinkan,
Dowker, McIntosh & Co.

Mr. BERGERON. Who was that firm of C. S. Hyman & Co.?

Mr. BOYCE. I believe that the head of that firm is the present Minister of Public Works. There is a memorandum attached to that letter to this effect:

Memo.

In July the rebate will be paid on January invoices.

In August the rebate will be paid on February invoices.

In September the rebate will be paid on March invoices.

And so on month by month irrespective of the time when the contracts of purchase may have been made.

The foregoing applies to sole leather of all descriptions.

Now, Sir, the declaration which the tanners exacted from the manufacturers as a condition of obtaining the shoe trade rebate is somewhat extraordinary in its nature. I will read the substantial part of it.

In the matter of the rebate allowed by members of the Tanners Association to purchasers of sole leather, private.

In the matter of the rebate allowed by members of the Tanners Association to purchasers of sole leather from them.

A - of the of in the county of do solemnly declare :

1. That I am a member of the firm of carrying on the business of in the of and as such have a full and intimate knowledge of all transactions of my said firm or business, and know that the statements herein contained are absolutely true.

2. That since the day of up to the time of the making of this declaration I have neither purchased or used in any way whatsoever, nor contracted to buy directly nor indirectly, nor contracted for the production or manufacture of any sole leather of any kind or description whatsoever (except imported oak sole leather insides, back or bonds) save from the following firms :

Shaw, Cassels & Company ; Beardmore & Company ; Breithaupt Leather Company, Limited ; Logan Tanning Company, Limited ; C. S. Hyman & Company ; Bowman & Zinkan ; Dowker, McIntosh & Company ; Marlatt & Armstrong ; Muskoka Leather Company, Limited; Acton Tanning Company, Limited ; Magnatewan Tanning & Electric Company, Limited ; Wingham Tanning Company; S. Arcott & Company; Benton, N. B.; Achille, Gagnon & Company.

3. That my firm has not, neither has any partner of mine, nor has any one acting as my agent, nor has any one acting as the agent of any partner of mine, nor has any one acting as agent of the business described above, nor has any one connected with me or with any partner of mine in any way whatsoever in the business referred to above, nor has any one connected with my firm or with the business described above, either purchased or used in any way whatsoever, or contracted to buy directly or indirectly, or received for sale or sold on commission, or dealt in any way with or contracted for the production or manufacture of any sole leather of any kind or description whatsoever except imported oak sole leather in sides, backs, or bends, save from the above-mentioned firms.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. member whether he asserts that a member of this government was a party to that illegal contract ?

Mr. BOYCE.

Mr. BOYCE. I assert, Sir, at the time this contract was formed, apparently this present government was not in existence, but that the firm of C. S. Hyman and Company, Limited, of which the present hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) was the head was a member of that combination and that it existed until just forty-eight hours or thereabouts after the Minister of Finance, on the 29th November last year, introduced the amended tariff, that within forty-eight hours after that was introduced this combination, of which C. S. Hyman and Company, Limited, was a member, was dissolved and notice given to the manufacturers of boots and shoes that it was dissolved, so that thereafter the boot and shoemakers might take care of themselves and be free from the parental care of the Tanners' Association.

4. That I and all who are in any way connected with the business described above, have done no act that would disentitle the said business to the said rebate offered upon certain conditions by the firms mentioned above, in two circulars dated December 31, 1895, and January 31, 1896, but on the contrary, we have faithfully fulfilled both in letter and spirit all conditions contained in said two circulars.

5. That the statement marked exhibit 'A' to this declaration is a true and complete account of the sole leather purchased or contracted for by any one connected with the business described above from the above-mentioned firms.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

Then again we find the letter referred to in the declaration of January 31, 1896 :

Toronto, January 31, 1896.

Gentlemen,—Referring to the letter addressed to you by the undersigned, dated December 31, 1895, offering you, under certain conditions, a rebate of five per cent on your purchases of sole leather from us, we beg to say that said offer was made on condition of your beginning the exclusive purchasing and receiving sole leather from us on January 1, 1896, but having learned that there exists some misapprehension on this point through our not having made it sufficiently clear in our letter, we now beg to extend the said date to February 3, 1896.

That was the position from January, 1895 up to the time at which the difficulties began to arise and at which the stress began to get too great from the tanners upon the manufacturers. The manufacturers of boots and shoes had for ten years suffered under the grievous oppression of this combine. They had objected to it, they had writhed under it and they had attempted to get rid of this incubus but without success. It will be somewhat surprising to this committee and to the country to learn that the tanners were not satisfied with the grievous burden which they were imposing

by the letters I have just read and by the declaration which they exacted from the manufacturers but they wanted more. They were not satisfied with that but the burden became so great and the quality of the goods obtained from the tanners was so inferior and at such excessive rates that the Boot and Shoe Manufacturers Association of Quebec decided that they would tolerate the Tanners' Association no longer, and they crystallized their complaint into the form of a letter which I will now read to the committee. It is dated August 10, 1906. That is more than ten years after the combination had been in force. Some seven firms were maintaining this combination, of which the firm of C. S. Hyman and Company, Limited, was one and since that combination had been formed the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who was called upon to form a government, had called on Mr. Hyman, the head of that firm to join his cabinet although during all that time he was a member of this tanners' combination. This is a letter that was addressed by the secretary treasurer of the Quebec Boot and Shoe Manufacturers Association to Mr. D. A. Burns, secretary of the Tanners' Association, Toronto :

Quebec, August 10, 1906.

D. A. Burns,
Secretary Tanners' Association,
Toronto.

Dear Sir,—For some time it has been found that the sole leather obtained from the members of your association has been loaded with foreign materials.

The effect of this adulteration has been not only to obtain payment, at the price of leather, of substances of no value as such, but to deteriorate the quality of the goods manufactured therewith to the great injury of the reputation of our manufacture and to make accurate costing of the goods impossible.

We are compelled to ask for a definite assurance that the practice complained of shall cease and that the leather supplied by the members of your association shall in future be such, in respect of the defects mentioned above, as it used to be before the loading was begun. Unless we obtain satisfaction in this respect, we shall bring the matter before a commission which we are informed it is the intention of the Quebec government to appoint for the purpose of investigating matters prejudicially affecting the trade and take such other steps as we shall deem necessary for our protection.

This communication is, of course, without prejudice to the remedies which the individual members of the association may conceive it in their personal interest wise to enforce.

Yours truly,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Quebec Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, Quebec, P.Q.

That was replied to by a letter from Mr. D. A. Burns under the letter head 'Tanners' Association' written from 32 Adelaide street East, Toronto, on 13th August, 1906.

THE TANNERS' ASSOCIATION.
32 Adelaide Street East,
Toronto, August 15, 1906.

D. A. Burns,
Secretary.
J. A. Cloutier, Esq.,
Secretary-Treasurer,

Quebec Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, Quebec, P.Q.

Dear Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th, and in reply beg to say that I shall be pleased to bring the matter in question before the next meeting of the committee of the Tanners' Association, which will be held at an early date.

Yours truly,
D. A. BURNS,
Secretary.

It may be argued that the effect of that arrangement was not a combination and that it did not restrict or restrain the manufacturers of boots and shoes from buying where they liked. But with the duties as they were at that time, with the scant protection that was afforded the shoe manufacturers, they were forced to purchase the classes of raw material which went to make up the boots and shoes from the Tanners' Association and from them alone ; and the effect of it was very apparent for we find that the Canadian shoe trade was offered, by British sole leather dealers, Canadian-tanned sole leather made by members of the combine at rather less money than it could be bought for in Canada, and that after paying freight twice across the Atlantic, insurance expenses and profit to the British dealer. That will indicate the conditions which were imposed by the Tanners Association upon the manufacturers. The manufacturers then endeavoured to adjust their grievances with the tanners in a double way, to get rid of the burdensome combination and to get from this government such protection as would enable them to compete with the American importations of the fine and fancy article for which there was a growing demand in Canada, owing to the increased trade. Meetings were held between members of the Tanners Association and the Shoe Manufacturers Association and an effort was made to adjust their grievances. These meetings took place in the fall of 1905, but they did not result very favourably as appears by the resolution of the tanners association, a copy of which I will now place on record.

Tanners' Branch, Board of Trade, the city of Toronto, secretary's office, Toronto, October 13, 1905.

Excerpt from minutes of section meeting held October 10, 1905 :

Resolved, that this section, having heard the report of the delegates, Hon. E. J. Davis and Mr. W. D. Beardmore, who were appointed to meet the shoe manufacturers of the Dominion at Montreal on October 3, have decided that while they are prepared to do everything in their power to assist the shoe manufacturers in obtaining as high a duty as possible, at the same time they feel that they should be left free to state their case from the tanners'

standpoint before the government commission appointed for that purpose, in order that they may obtain such increase in duty on leather as would seem reasonable and proper under all the circumstances.

Further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the president and secretary of the Shoe Manufacturers' Association.

Late in 1905, I think, the Tariff Commission sat at Quebec and the memorial which I read was presented asking for a 10 per cent additional protection. After some argument before the commission in support of that memorial, I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and possibly the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) conceded that some concession should be granted, some further protection accorded to the manufacturers on some lines which they were manufacturing and it was suggested, I believe, that a line should be drawn between the different grades so that protection could be afforded to that grade in respect to which there was the greatest competition from foreign importations. It was suggested, I believe, that the line should be drawn on Goodyear or welted goods. At any rate, without going too much into details, that was not considered satisfactory and the line that was drawn was the line that appears in section 611 as amended by the minister, the line being drawn at boots and shoes pegged or wire-fastened with unstitched soles and close edged. Those were the coarser goods and the others were to be subjected, as the manufacturers state they believed as the result of that meeting to an increased protective duty of 10 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. Five per cent.

Mr. BOYCE. The minister says 5 per cent. I do not know if he will agree with me that when the manufacturers left the commission in Quebec or very shortly afterwards they were given to understand that with this line of demarcation between the different classes, their demand of 10 per cent additional protection, that is a protective duty of 35 per cent, would be afforded on fine and fancy boots.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly not, certainly not.

Mr. BOYCE. I will just put it that this was the attitude taken by the shoe manufacturers association and that up to a day or two before the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) introduced his amendment the manufacturers were positively assured that with that line of demarcation drawn they would be accorded on these classes on which there was competition and on which they desired to increase their trade, the additional 10 per cent. I am so informed, and that a gentleman who interceded with the government between the Manufacturers Association and the commission, positively assured the chairman of the Shoe Manufacturers Association, as the result, as he said, of an interview with hon. ministers representing the commission, that the matter was all settled and that, with that discrimination and that line drawn, the 10 per cent additional would be accorded to the manufacturers. Well we see what the result is by this tariff. But at the same time that the shoe manufacturers were accorded only one-half of their demands, the Tanners' Association, strong as they were, influential as they were and not needing that protection for the want of which the shoe manufacturers were suffering, came to the Tariff Commission on their own account, threw overboard the shoe manufacturers and got from the Tariff Commission an increased protection which was not so much required, if required at all, as was the full increase asked by the Shoe Manufacturers Association.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was there any increase on boots and shoes in the first tariff brought down?

Mr. BOYCE. In the first tariff brought down there was no increase at all on boots and shoes and there was 2½ per cent increase on leather and all the change that has taken place was the result of very determined effort on the part of the manufacturers since the tariff was brought down by the minister on November 29. So it will be seen that the Tanners' Association had not lost any of its influence. It still had considerable influence, and before the manufacturers were able to get any little concessions of which they originally stood in need, both to protect themselves against foreign competition and against the tyranny of the combination, the tanners could easily go to the government or to the Tariff Commission, and without any memorial or audience of a grave nature or the employment of expensive counsel, could get brought down on the first revision of the tariff an increase of 5 per cent in the duty on imported sole leather. Another feature of the matter is the cut-sole business. No change took place in the tariff, I believe, with regard to that. Two of the tanners have engaged in this business—the firm of Beardmore and the firm of Hyman. The effect of the present tariff is to enable those who get the increased protection in that business to further hamper the manufacturers in making the finer classes of boots and shoes and in competing with importations from the United States; because by engaging in that industry these firms can with increased protection, compete to that qualified extent with the manufacturers. The manufacturers felt at the time that they were considerably handicapped by the influence which was strong in the tanning combine. There was a good deal of correspondence with reference to that influence. At the risk of prolonging the discussion I will, in order to make myself clear, read some of the letters. There is a letter under date of October 14, 1905, from W. D. Beardmore, the chairman of the Tanners' Association, to John Ritchie,

of the John Ritchie Company, who was the chairman of the Manufacturers' Association :

Dear Mr. Ritchie,—I have been from home since Thursday and returning this morning find your letter of the 11th instant, notifying me of a meeting of the joint committee on the tariff revision.

Mr. Davis called me up at noon to-day saying he had a similar notice and asking me what I proposed to do in view of the action which had been taken by the Tanners' Association, of which you will have received a report. I told him that I had written you on Wednesday telling you exactly the position the tanners were taking, and I thought it would be best to write and ask you what you would like us to do in view of all the circumstances. If you want us we are quite willing to attend, but unfortunately I am afraid I shall have to be in New York on Thursday. Mr. Davis says that it would suit him far better if you could have the meeting fixed for either Saturday or Monday instead, and either of these days would also suit me equally well with Friday.

Last week when returning from Montreal, I met Mr. James Robinson, the shoe jobber, on the train, and we had a long talk that night on tariff matters. I was glad to find that he is very thoroughly in favour of an increased duty on boots and shoes and thinks the tariff should be forty per cent. He says that he is prepared to go before the commission and advocate an increase as a shoe buyer having no interest in manufacturing, and he is further prepared to say that he is quite sure his shoes will not cost him any more in consequence of any increase which may be granted by the government. Would not this be a good strong card for the shoe manufacturers to play ?

I expect, however, it is going to take all the pressure that the leather and shoe industries can bring to bear on the government to get them to increase the duties. One very prominent man and a very strong supporter of the government who is also most anxious to see a general increase in the tariff, told me yesterday that he was afraid the government was weak-kneed and would do very little, if anything. He further added that they would bring about their own downfall just as the local government in Ontario had through being half-hearted and weak-kneed. This, however, should not discourage us, for the leather and shoe industry ought to be able to get what they wanted if any industry can do so.

Unless I am obliged to change my plans I expect to leave here on Tuesday evening for New York, where I shall likely be on Wednesday and Thursday. Will you please address your reply to this letter to the Manhattan Hotel, Forty-second street, New York.

Yours truly,
W. D. BEARDMORE.

The weak-kneed and half-hearted government of which the gentleman complains were not a bugbear to him, in view of the influence which he pointed out in these few lines, so that they were not to be discouraged, because they could get what they wanted if any industry could.

Mr. FIELDING. It appears that they did not.

Mr. BOYCE. The tanners did.

Mr. FIELDING. He said he wanted to combine the two.

Mr. BOYCE. But my hon. friend will remember a letter which has gone on 'Hansard' and since that time the tanners threw the manufacturers to the winds.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman must be fair to Mr. Beardmore. He did not claim that the tanners were big enough or that the shoe men were big enough, but he claimed that when they got together they could get what they wanted. But unfortunately neither of them got what they wanted.

Mr. BOYCE. Yes, the tanners got what they wanted.

Mr. FIELDING. Both got what they did at the same moment.

Mr. BOYCE. The tanners got their duty when the hon. gentleman introduced his budget speech.

Mr. FIELDING. The two items were introduced at the same time.

Mr. BOYCE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; he is right. A meeting was held at Quebec on the 24th of October, 1905, or thereabouts. As a result of that meeting a letter was written by the chairman of the manufacturers to Messrs. W. D. Beardmore and E. J. Davis, the representatives of the Western Tanners' Association :

Gentlemen,—In reply to your several letters I beg to inform you that I have been appointed to take care of and lay before the Tariff Commission the memorial of our industry. I think you should know how we shoe manufacturers resent what we consider an attempt on the part of the western leather trade to hold us up, and obtained from us a slice or 'rake-off', from any such needed increased protection our industry requires and hopes to obtain, your only weapons being that you will use a stronger political pull which you pretend to have in certain quarters than we have, as expressed by you at our meetings.

This is addressed to the committee of the Tanners' Association, the ring of the invincible seven :

Your only reason given for asking this rake-off being that 'you wanted it', and that at some remote period this market might be flooded with English leather under a preferential tariff and on account of their cheaper labour.

Now the history of the leather trade in Canada and England for many years back is a sufficient reply to this, coupled with the fact that I have been personally told by many if not most of the eastern leather trade that they are satisfied with the present tariff and fear no danger from the United States, from which source if there were any danger to the leather trade it would come.

Now we have no wish to antagonize any portion of the leather trade, but must protect the interests of our industry as far as it is in our power, and I beg to say that if your

western leather association does not carry out what you two gentlemen promised to do instead of trying to shield themselves behind your personal promise and give me full assurance of this, I personally will lay the whole story of the 'hold-up' before the Tariff Commission.

The shoe industry has no wish to injure your trade in any way and will do nothing to do so as they feel sure their cause can rest on its own merits.

We have resolutions in favour of increased duties on shoes passed by many other branches of trade, and even labour organizations without solicitation or any demand for a 'rake-off', and it rests with the western leather men entirely as to what will not be done in this connection.

I suppose I should apologize to you for some words used in my telegrams but I would say when a man feels himself taken by the throat human nature is apt as a rule to use similar expressions.

I have submitted copies of this to the committee who had seen the correspondence.

I remain yours truly,
JOHN RITCHIE.

Mr. FIELDING. Addressed to the tanners ?

Mr. BOYCE. To W. Beardmore and E. J. Davis, representatives of the western tanners. The letter is dated 24th October, 1905. Here is another letter under date Montreal October 25, 1905 from J. Hagar to John Ritchie, Quebec :

Montreal, October 25, 1905.

John Ritchie, Esq.,
Quebec, Que.

My dear Mr. Ritchie,—I had a long chat with Mr. Hyman this morning with the result that he was as far as possible neutral in the matter, but he brought up the Beardmore statements and asked me to write him a letter stating what Beardmore had said. I incolse you the letter that I purpose sending and would ask you to look it over and see if I am correct.

Mr. Hyman would be very much indebted to you if you would write him a letter stating what Beardmore said to you, as he claims that he was very much mis-reported, but would like to have an opportunity to contradict the reports covering his name with them.

Confidential.—A very strong point will have to be made as regards the importation of fine and coarse goods. We know pretty well that in coarse goods there are very few American goods imported, but we will have to convince the commissioners on this point. I am writing to-day to several parties trying to get the names of the exporters of Goodyear and Turns from the States. We will then try and find out what each of these parties have sent into Canada. In the face of it it looks as if we had 90 per cent of the shoe trade in our own hands, so that a very clear statement will have to be made as to where the hardship comes in to the Canadian manufacturer of fine shoes, owing to the large amount of these lines that are imported.

Yours truly,
J. HAGAR.

Mr. PATERSON. Addressed to whom?

Mr. BOYCE. To John Ritchie, chairman of the Manufacturers Association. Here is a letter again from Mr. Beardmore, chairman of the Tanners' Association :

39 Front street East,
Toronto, October 26, 1905.

John Ritchie, Esq.,
The John Ritchie Company,
Quebec, Quebec.

Dear Sir,—Coming down to my office this morning (Thanskgiving Day) I find your letter of the 24th instant. I am just leaving for Bracebridge and shall not be back before Saturday, and I may not be able to see Mr. Davis before Monday next. Of course it will be necessary for me to see him before I can reply to your letter, and I am merely writing this to acknowledge it and explain the delay which will necessarily take place before I can reply to it.

I feel in justice to myself and Mr. Davis, however, that I must absolutely deny your statement that either of us claimed at any of your meetings that we had any stronger political pull than the shoe manufacturers, or indeed that we ever referred to political pull in any way.

According to my recollection, however, what did happen was that one of your members (I think it was Mr. Jas. McPherson, of Hamilton), made an incidental remark that the shoe manufacturers recognized that the tanners had a stronger political pull than the shoe manufacturers. We did not consider this in any way pertinent to the object of our meeting, which was that we should arrange for joint action before the Tariff Commission, and no reply or reference to the remark was ever subsequently made by either Mr. Davis or myself. As a matter of fact to neither of us, nor do I believe to any of the other tanners who have attended the meetings has the idea ever occurred of antagonizing or working in any way against the interests of the shoe manufacturers, and it would be the height of folly for us to do so, and your accusation that we are attempting in any way a 'hold up' of the shoe manufacturers is doing us the grossest injustice.

As before stated, and as you well know, Mr. Davis and I were appointed by a meeting of tanners here in Toronto as delegates to meet the shoe manufacturers to try and arrange joint action before the Tariff Commission. As a condition of this you stipulated that we should give a certain pledge for the whole tanning trade which Mr. Davis and I after considering the matter did not think we were justified in doing from the fact that we did not believe we had the power without first of all calling another meeting of the tanners. This was thoroughly understood between you and ourselves and that the meeting which was subsequently held did not empower us to give the pledge was not our fault. By the action of the meeting Mr. Davis and myself no longer held the position of representatives for the western tanners and neither of us have any authority to speak for the trade and each can only speak for himself personally.

I, and I believe Mr. Davis also, as we stated at your meeting, were ready to go before the commission, putting forth first of all the case of the shoe manufacturers and then the case of the tanners and supporting them on exactly the same lines that we conditionally agreed upon at our joint meeting in Montreal, and I, and I believe Mr. Davis also, are still

ready to do this, and if you will allow me to say so I think it is unfortunate that you should have thought it necessary to adopt the tone which you have done both in your telegram and now in your letter, as it makes it more difficult for Mr. Davis and myself to get the unanimous co-operation of the tanners in support of the case of the shoe manufacturers which we both feel is paramount to any other consideration even if you will not do us the justice of recognizing that this is the case.

I will write you further as soon as I have seen and consulted with Mr. Davis.

Yours truly,
W. D. BEARDMORE.

And so the correspondence goes on down to the point at which the resolution was passed by the tanners, intimating to the manufacturers that henceforth they would look after their branch of the case and the manufacturers could do likewise. The tanners were successful in getting what they wanted. The manufacturers succeeded only to a certain extent in getting the protection absolutely necessary for an industry which is of very great importance to Canada. The curious fact, and one which certainly calls for some little comment, is this, that the moment the tanners got their increased duty, the moment they had outclassed and handicapped the manufacturers by means of the Tariff Commission and by the so-called adjustment of the tariff they dissolved their combine which had been in force ever since December 31, 1895. Within forty-eight hours after the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) delivered his budget speech, the tanners, evidently satisfied that the minister was acceding to their demands, evidently satisfied that their interests would be protected, dissolved their combine and wrote a letter as follows:

The Tanners' Association,
Toronto, December, 1905.

Gentlemen,—Acting for the udersigned firms I hereby beg to notify you that I shall not pay the usual rebate of five per cent on any purchases you may make or any deliveries of leather made to you after November 30 last.

That was written the day after the Finance Minister delivered his budget speech.

I shall, of course, continue paying you the rebate on all the leather invoiced to you prior to the 1st of this month, providing that you have complied with the conditions up to that date——

That is this beautiful declaration.

—but from that date you are free to purchase as you may see fit without affecting the rebate on leather invoiced prior to December 1.

Yours truly,
D. A. Burns, Secretary,
Anglo-Canadian Leather Co.,
C. S. Hyman & Co.,
Beardmore & Co.,
Marlatt & Armstrong,
Breithaupt Leather Co.,
Maganetawan Tanning Co.,
Logan Tanning Co.

It will be noted that that letter is dated December 6. I wonder whether the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) was then in condition to attend to business. It will interest the members of the government to know whether that was signed by himself, in view of his serious condition of health, as explained to us about that time.

P.S.—I understand that the individual firms, each for itself, intend to allow a rebate of 5 per cent on all deliveries made after December, on contracts made prior to that date.

I desire to take up as little time as possible with the discussion of this matter. But, in order to show the relative position of the tanners and the manufacturers, I wish to place on record two letters which indicate that manufacturers are supported by the retail trade in the position which they take. The first of these letters is from the Fogarty Company, Limited, a well known firm in Montreal, whose letter is as follows:

February 21, 1907.

Mr. John Ritchie,
President of the John Ritchie Co., Ltd.,
Quebec,

Dear Sir,—We take great pleasure in endorsing your undertaking to have the duty raised to thirty-five per cent, or higher, on American boots and shoes. We may state that we are the largest retailers of boots and shoes in the city of Montreal, and we know that if the duty is increased it will mean a great protection to us from American manufacturers, who are opening retail stores in our city. If you think these few lines would further your good cause, you may use them for all they are worth.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) THE FOGARTY Co., Ltd.,
Per .E. J. WAYLAND.

And Waterbury and Rising, large dealers in excellent standing, of St. John, N.B., write as follows:

St. John, N.B.,
February 13, 1907.

Messrs. John Ritchie Co.,
Quebec, P.Q.

Dear Sir,—We notice by this mornings' papers that the duty has been advanced five per cent.

The government have evidently ignored all the manufacturers have done and have simply added enough to the duty to give themselves a little more revenue, which is about what the advance will mean. All they appear to be looking for is more money to blow in, as I do not believe it will have any effect on the importation of American goods. We should have had ten per cent or no change.

Yours very truly,
WATERBURY & RISING.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the bare outline of the grievance of the manufacturers which they desire to have laid before this committee. Their position at present is a very serious one. If their trade is to be protected they must have some addition to the very small and inadequate protection

which has been afforded them. As hon. ministers doubtless, are aware, the competition that the manufacturers have to contend against is in the fine and fancy article, If they are to compete successfully in this, large sums of money must be expended, particularly in the purchase of lasts and dies, which are continually changing. I am told that an average expenditure for lasts and dies, would be about $1,200 a set, and only one year's lasts and dies would be taken into stock in computing the assets of a firm, though there might be a hundred thousand dollars' worth of lasts and dies in the place. This shows what tremendous expense is involved in the manufacture of fine and fancy boots and shoes. I understand that one firm expends annually from $5,000 to $7,000 in lasts and dies. To enable the manufacturers to equip themselves to meet competition, they must have the volume of business. It has been contended, I believe, that the importation of boots and shoes into Canada is but a small percentage of the value of boots and shoes manufactured in Canada. It has been said that it only amounts to 5 per cent. I would like to point out that that is an erroneous impression. The quantity manufactured has been quoted from last year's census as $18,000,000. The real figure is $14,000,000, of which $8,000,000 was of the coarser class of boots and shoes, in respect of which there is no competition. The fine and fancy goods made up only $6,000,000. The importation of fine and fancy goods in 1905 and 1906 was about $1,250,000 and $1,500,000 respectively. If you add the 30 per cent duty, that would bring the importations up to $2,000,000, or nearly one-third of the manufacture of fine and fancy goods.

The manufacturers laid their case before the Tariff Commission in the hope that what seems a reasonable request might be granted. They desire the volume of business in order that they may increase their factories and the number of hands employed and compete with American manufacturers in fine and fancy boots and shoes. The market and other conditions are ripe, but the element of protection is lacking. I think a strong case has been made out for the manufacturers in this connection; I think they made out a far stronger case than did the tanners who appear to be the favoured ones before the Tariff Commission and the government. Certainly, the treatment that the manufacturers have received at the hands of the government has retarded the development of the industry which otherwise would have been built up handsomely. It is an industry which, If stimulated as it might have been by reasonable protection, would have done much for the trade of Canada. It is along the line of sound policy that such an industry should be stimulated, so that the Canadian manufacturers may be assisted and strengthened and encouraged to put upon the market an article which will compete with the importations from the United States. The ministers know perfectly well what difficulties have appeared in the path of the manufacturers of Canada. The market of Canada has been assailed year after year by that article, and the only protection which the manufacturer could get to enable him successfully to compete is the protection which he asks from this commission, and which was backed up by the retailers themselves, who pointed out that the general trade of Canada would be, within that sphere, increased and strengthened, that additional factories would be built, that additional hands would be employed, that additional articles would be purchased to be manufactured in Canada, and that a large amount of capital would be employed, all to enable the Canadian manufacturer to retain for himself the Canadian market as against the American market.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the hon. member's proposition ?

Mr. BOYCE. I have already laid the proposition of the manufacturers before the committee in the memorial of the Manufacturers' Association, asking the 10 per cent which they say would be adequate to build up their industries, and that the Tariff Commission should not confirm the opinion that has been written by Mr. Beardmore. I ask that the hon. gentleman reconsider the situation, and ascertain whether it is not possible even now to take such prudent steps as will stimulate this industry in the general interests of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I would be doing an injustice to the hon. member for West Algoma if I said that four-fifths of the purpose of his speech was to associate the Minister of Public Works, who happens to be a member of the firm of C. S. Hyman and Company, with this matter of the increased duty on sole leather.

Mr. BOYCE. I had no such intention.

Mr. FIELDING. Then why did he so repeatedly drag in the name of the Minister of Public Works ?

Mr. BOYCE. I read all the correspondence that bore upon that subject, in order to show that I was not casting any imputation on the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman made several allusions to the Minister of Public Works, and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) took pains to put the question directly so that the hon. member for West Algoma might have an opportunity of renewing his statement that the Mr. Hyman mentioned was the present Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BOYCE. He is only one of seven.

Mr. FIELDING. That may be, but the hon. gentleman is not much concerned with the other six.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why should not the name of the Minister of Public Works be introduced if he is a member of a combine?

Mr. FIELDING. I will come to that point presently. I say again that four-fifths of the hon. gentleman's speech seemed, I think, to most hearers to be devoted to the purpose of implying that the tanners had received some special consideration which they were not entitled to, and that they had received it through the instrumentality of Mr. Hyman, who is a member of the firm of C. S. Hyman & Company, engaged in the tanning business.

Mr. BERGERON. The boot and shoe men were under that impression.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think so. But I desire to state now that the Minister of Public Works was never present at any meeting of the government when the question of tariff revision was brought before the government. I want to say that the work of tariff revision has been carried on since the Minister of Public Works was absent from his duties; he has never been present at any meeting of the government when these tariff items have been considered; and so far as I have knowledge, and to the best of my belief, the member for London, the Minister of Public Works has no more to do with the revision of the tariff on leather than any hon. gentleman who sits on the left of the Speaker. Now having said that much, there is really not anything left to answer in the speech of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is one thing more. The minister stated that there was no change in the duty on leather in the tariff as first brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. I said on sole leather. There were two different items. There was the duty on one class of sole leather, and when the second tariff came down the two duties were made alike. Now let us come to the question of a combination. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the memorial of the boot and shoe men presented to us at Quebec as presenting all the essential facts of this case. Well, it is a curious fact that in that memorial the hon. gentleman read there is not one word about any leather combine. He has read a lot of correspondence that appears to have been going on with respect to an alleged combine. But it is a fact that when the boot and shoe manufacturers appeared before us and presented this comprehensive memorial, so far as my recollection goes of the presentation at Quebec, they had not one word to say with respect to the existence of any combination. Now if this combination had existed as stated by the hon. member, and if it was regarded by the boot and shoe manufacturers as a very great evil, and as one of the grounds upon which they should seek a further revision of the tariff, does it not strike the hon. gentleman as rather singular that the very gentleman who has given him all this information never came before the government with any complaint about a combination among the tanners?

Mr. BOYCE. Did the minister not hear of any combine?

Mr. FIELDING. I will come to that in a moment. The hon. member has presented his grievance as that of the shoe manufacturers, and as I heard him read the memorial, and according to my recollection of it, the boot and shoe manufacturers made no representation whatever as to the existence of this alleged combine. More than that, in the memorial that was submitted to us at Quebec, it contained a statement that the leather manufacturers joined the shoe manufacturers in the application that was being made for an increased duty on boots and shoes. So it would seem that the boot and shoe manufacturers were perfectly prepared to avail themselves of the services of this wicked combine to assist them in making representations to the government. It would not be I think, an ungenerous criticism to say as respects the particular manufacturers who made that statement, that they seemed to be quite willing to join the combine if they could only arrange to divide the spoils. But at a later stage they come in and, through the hon. gentleman, make a complaint about the combine. I do not think it is unfair to state that if the boot and shoe manufacturers had a grievance in regard to the existence of a combine, they had ample opportunity to present that grievance to the government in various forms without waiting until this late date and then confining the matter to the tender care of the hon. member for West Algoma. It is a little late for the boot and shoe manufacturers to complain of a combine when they seem to have been quite willing to join a combine in making representations.

Mr. BARKER. Has not the hon. gentleman found it to be the case that the victims of a combine are obliged to combine with the people who are coercing them?

Mr. FIELDING. Just so, but if a man enters into a partnership with another man to impose some improper burdens on the public and to divide the spoils, all I can say is that he had better not have any thing to say afterwards about it. He had better share the burden as he has been willing to share the advantages to be derived from it.

Mr. BOYCE. He has no alternative, he has to submit.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, my observation of the gentlemen connected with the boot and shoe trade that came before us is that

they are not the kind of men who would be very easily intimidated by any combination, whether of tanners or of anybody else. The hon. gentleman asked if I had never heard of the existence of the combine. I will answer him candidly. As far as my recollection goes no representations were made to the government or before the Tariff Commission about a combine. I do not wish to be too positive about that. There was a vast mass of evidence given and before speaking positively I would require to have time given me to make a search, but at this moment I do not remember that the boot and shoe manufacturers made any complaint with respect to a combine. Quite a long time ago, I remember, some persons called upon me and talked about a combine in leather and wished the government to take steps to reduce the duty or some such action. I remember calling the attention of the parties—I do not remember who they were—to the clause in our Tariff Act in relation to combines. This House had determined, and I think they had wisely determined, that it was not wise to leave with the government of the day the duty of determining when a combine existed in regard to any item which might be affected by the tariff. The House had determined that before a combine could be believed to exist there must be a judicial proceeding and that the parties who made the complaint of the existence of a combine must take certain steps to establish the existence of that combine before a judicial tribunal before the government could take cognizance of it and make any tariff change. Well, that was the position involved as repeatedly explained in the House, and it so happened that if there was ever a belief in the existence of a combine no person ever took the steps contemplated by the Act to establish its existence, and to the best of my knowledge and belief for several years we have had no complaint whatever in regard to the existence of any such combine. I would like to look up the records of what appeared at the Tariff Commission before I would make a positive statement, but speaking from memory I would say now that the boot and shoe manufacturers, while they made representations and presented their grievances, did not mention the existence of a combine as one of their grievances. Now, we come to the question of the duties on imports. Are they reasonable or unreasonable? The duty on sole leather is 12½ per cent under the preferential tariff. Is that or is that not a reasonable duty ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do they pay on their raw material ?

Mr. FIELDING. Nothing ; hides are free.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the average duty on the raw material used by the manufacturers of boots and shoes ?

Mr. FIELDING. I could not tell that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They assert that it is a little over 20 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not contradict that because it is a matter of calculation. The tanners have a duty on sole leather of 12½ per cent from Great Britain. Is that an unreasonable duty ? Judging that with almost any other line of manufacturing industry will it be said that 12½ per cent from Great Britain is too high a duty ? The duty on most articles in the tariff which have a protection is much higher than that, and when I point out that the duty on sole leather coming from Great Britain is only 12½ per cent, and when competition is beginning to come from Great Britain, I think it will be admitted that the duty on sole leather is not an extravagant one. There is a less duty to-day on sole leather than there was in the days of the national policy. The duty on sole leather in the days of the national policy was 15 per cent from all quarters and the duty on sole leather to-day under the tariff now before the House as respects imports from Great Britain is only 12½ per cent. In the face of these figures what reason can any one have for saying that the duty on sole leather is excessive ? Is it because a member of the government happens to be engaged in that particular industry that all reason is to be set aside and we are to be told this is an extravagant duty imposed by the government for the benefit of a minister of the Crown ? That is not a reason. Is it that it is excessive ? Who will say that 12½ per cent on sole leather coming from Great Britain is an excessive duty ? I do not believe any member of this House, if he looks at the question on its merits, will say that the duty is excessive. Well then, what is there to complain of with respect to the duty on sole leather ? I can think of nothing more to say upon that question. It is simply a question of whether the duty is fair or not and who, having regard to the rate of duty imposed on many other articles under our tariff, will say that 12½ per cent on sole leather can be regarded as an excessive duty ? Then, I come to the question of the duty on boots and shoes. The hon. member for West Algoma treats the increase of 5 per cent on boots and shoes as a matter of no account. He says that the tanners have all they want. Well, the tanners have 2½ per cent of an increase on their sole leather and the boot and shoe manufacturers have a 5 per cent increase against the United States on a certain class of boots. That is a very considerable class. We have drawn a line at the rougher shoe, the shoe which may be described as a coarse shoe such as is used by our fishermen, farmers and by men who want a rough, common coarse shoe.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. They are very likely imported.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, they may be. Then, if we have added 5 per cent to a class of shoes that is largely imported the criticism might be offered as to why we had increased the duty.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is what I want to know.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend wants to know why we increased the duty on boots and shoes by 5 per cent I confess that I have not as good an answer to that question as I have to the question of the hon. member for West Algoma as to why we increased the duty on sole leather.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I quite agree with you.

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad to know that there are some reasonable men over there. If this hon. gentleman had complained that this 5 per cent increase was too much I must confess that perhaps I would not have as good an answer, but when the hon. member for Algoma says that 5 per cent is nothing and asks why we did not make it 10 per cent I submit that there is no ground for the attack which is made upon the government. An increase of 5 per cent is quite a material increase. It is 5 per cent upon a considerable article of importation. When my hon. friend complains that the boot and shoe people are treated ungenerously because there is an increase of 2½ per cent on sole leather while they get an increase of 5 per cent on a very large part of the importation of boots and shoes it seems to me that the hon. gentleman cannot show that he has made any case whatever. There are the three positions; first, the personal element in regard to the Minister of Public Works. I have dealt with that. Secondly, the combination; I have stated that the boot and shoe manufacturers have made no grievance out of the existence of a combination, that they have made no attempt, such as is contemplated by the Tariff Act, to prove the existence of a combination. As to the duty on sole leather I submit it is a reasonable duty and not an excessive duty and I further submit that when we increase the duty on a very considerable percentage of shoes to the extent of 5 per cent we are showing our desire to give the shoe manufacturer all possible consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not rise to discuss the question as to whether the increase is sufficient or insufficient, but I rise more particularly to refer to the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that it was not brought to his attention for a long time that there was a combine in the leather business.

Mr. FIELDING. I stated how it was brought to my attention.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to remind the minister, that several years ago I brought it to his attention. I read this agreement and I read all the affidavits in connection with it and I made an appeal to the Minister of Finance. It will also be remembered that Mr. Garrow who is now Judge Garrow endeavoured to have the Minister of Finance and the government take advantage of the clause in the Tariff Act providing that if it were found that a combine existed they would take the duty off the article and allow it to come in free.

Mr. FIELDING. But it was not found.

Mr. SPROULE. It was found as far as the men in business proved it by affidavits.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not what the Act said.

Mr. SPROULE. What did the Act say? It was proven to the satisfaction of the government that a combine existed.

Mr. FIELDING. No, pardon me; it had to be proven through a judicial investigation.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the first time, in so far as I remember, that the contention was ever set up that it must be proved through a judicial investigation.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken. That is the law.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the law? It was brought to the attention of the government and in every way that intelligent men could bring it to their attention. It was also pointed out to the government that it was a great injustice to the small tanners of the country and the manufacturers of leather goods.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At what date?

Mr. SPROULE. I think that I first brought it to the attention of the government in 1898, but before that a memorial had been brought down by Mr. (now Judge) Garrow, who made out a very complete and strong case for the small tanners, which I afterwards used before the House at the request of himself and a number of tanners in order that the government might take some action. It was brought up two years afterwards when I used the same arguments and appealed to the government to take action and they again refused. It was brought up once or twice afterwards and it was brought to the attention of the government that C. S. Hyman and his firm were in the combine and he was at the same time a friend of the government. It was brought to their attention not once or twice, but three or four times and the government were aware of every fact in connection with it at the very time they made Mr. Hyman a minister of the Crown. While declaring that they were opposed to combines, they were at the same time supporting and strengthing them and knew that a member of their own Cabinet was inter-

ested in that combine and carrying on its nefarious operations in the country. Yet to-night the minister says he was not aware of it and that the manufacturers never brought it to his attention, yet they had brought to his attention from time to time and failed to get redress. The appeal to the government fell on deaf ears and at last they abandoned it because they were unable to bring any influence to bear on the government to induce them to do anything to give relief. But the members of the combine had always the ear of the government. That was the condition in which the small tanners and the manufacturers were, but they could not get the government to take the duty off that special article of Spanish sole leather or to give any redress whatever, and when the Minister of Finance complains to-night that they were not aware of the fact I can only say that his memory must be very bad, because it was brought to his attention over and over again and he did nothing either to relieve himself or the Cabinet of the stigma that one member of the Cabinet was in a combine, supporting and helping to maintain it, and that the Cabinet itself made no effort to dissolve the combine or to give the people of the country that relief which they so desired and for which they so often prayed. They asked for this relief and the government might have given it to them if they had chosen to do so.

Mr. FIELDING. If there is any defective memory in connection with this, my hon. friend's memory is at fault and not mine. There is nothing wrong with my memory on that at all events. When he says he never heard until to-night that the proceedings to establish the existence of a combine had to be of a judicial nature his memory is not good, because it has been discussed a dozen times in this House and has been in the tariff for ten years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did not the government initiate the proceedings?

Mr. FIELDING. It was never intended that they should. The House deliberately resolved that they would not leave the government to take the proceedings, as that was thought to be a dangerous power to place in the hands of the government to decide that there was a combine and that the duty should be reduced or removed. The House, after consideration, resolved that the procedure should be as is stated in the Act, and whenever parties have come to us our statement has been: Take the procedure established in the Act and the government will take it up.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did the minister not give the same reply to the small tanners of the country that he gave to the consumers of paper when they appealed to the government? Had he told them to do that they would have taken advantage of it, but they were not aware that it was necessary or they would have availed themselves of that procedure.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend makes a strange reflection on a gentleman now a judge of the highest court in Ontario who he says did not know the law on the subject. The law is very plain. He asks why did we not give the same answer to the small tanners as was given to the consumers of paper? The Press Association took the procedure contemplated under the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the procedure?

Mr. FIELDING. The party who takes the responsibility of making the accusation must be prepared to come forward and prove his case and unless he is prepared to prove his case we ought not to proceed to issue a commission to establish the existence of a combine.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The provisions of the statute are as follows:

18. Whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that with regard to any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among manufacturers of such article or dealers therein, to unduly enhance the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any superior court in any province of Canada, to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such trust, combination, association or agreement exists.

My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) states that one of the best lawyers in Ontario was employed by these small tanners, that he prepared an elaborate statement to prove the existence of a combine and submitted it to the government on behalf of the tanners, and although that gentleman, who has been deemed worthy of a seat upon the bench of the Court of Appeal in Ontario, was so commissioned and performed his duty presumably, as there is no evidence to the contrary, the government failed to take any actions whatever. What else could the small tanners do? They placed the matter in the hands of a counsel who has since been placed by this government on the bench of the highest court in Ontario and he according to my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) made every statement and representation that could be made on the subject and yet the government took no action. What more was there to do in order to induce the government to perform its duty?

Mr. FIELDING. In every case where parties have made representations to the

government in regard to combines our practice has been to call attention to the wording of the Act and to say: If we issue a commission are you prepared to come forward and prove your case? I cannot remember the conversation that took place with Mr. Garrow, if there was such a conversation, but I know that when such a matter is brought to our attention that is the position we take. In the case of the paper consumers they said: Yes, give us a commission and we will prove it, and they did so; the existence of the combine was established and the remedy applied. In another case it was alleged that there was a lumber combine in the west. Some gentlemen declared that they would be prepared to take up the matter. We issued a commission on the strength of the representations so made, but when the commission went west and tried to investigate no witnesses came forward. Our position simply means that we must have assurance that the parties are prepared to carry it forward if a commission is granted. I do not think any application was made for the appointment of a commission in the particular case to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking from memory now and I may be wrong, but my recollection is that they did make that challenge: Give us a commission and we will prove it.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it took that shape.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking on a remembrance of what occurred several years ago and may be wrong, but that is my recollection, that they offered to prove it to the satisfaction of the government before any commission, but the government did not see fit to issue a commission and gave no redress.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE. I think the object of a combine is to increase prices and the evil aimed at by the law and by public opinion is the enhancing of prices against the consumers. I do not know that there is any law in this country against a combine for reducing prices. The combine, I believe, amongst the tanners was to give a certain discount to people who dealt constantly with them and by that means they reduced the prices on sole leather below the prices charged by the small tanners. I do not know if I am correct in that or not. I would like to address a question to my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce), who is an expert in the boot and shoe business: Whether the duty as charged would allow the manufacturers of ladies' boots and shoes in Canada to produce an article which would be saleable and used by the ladies throughout the land at as cheap a rate as shoes of American manufacture can be sold in this country?

I would also ask whether the article which is manufactured in the United States is not superior to any that can be made in Canada; whether he is acquainted with the range of leather that can be bought in the United States; and whether the machinery used in the United States is not better than any machinery used in Canada? He will also inform me whether the same argument applies to men's boots and shoes, and to what grade of men's boots and shoes, and whether the finest grade of men's boots and shoes can be produced in Canada at the present time. I have no doubt that the medium grades of men's boots and shoes for men can be manufactured as well and as cheaply in Canada as in the United States, but I am informed by men who are experts in the trade that under no circumstances can boots and shoes for women be produced in Canada at the present time equal to those which can be produced in the United States, and I do not know that the increasing of the duty from 25 per cent to 30 per cent will affect that fact, or whether any reasonable amount of duty would give us a greater consumption of ladies' boots and shoes made in Canada over those made in the United States.

Besides the American manufacturer has the advantage of the southern states market for fine boots and shoes all the year. In Canada we have only half the year.

Mr. BARKER. I have listened with a good deal of interest to this discussion, because in the city of Hamilton we have some very large interests in the boot and shoe trade. I can only say on behalf of those interests that I feel very much indebted to the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) for the labour he has devoted to this question. I also feel that I ought to say something in resentment of the position taken by the hon. Finance Minister, who has apparently attempted to charge the manufacturing interest with something approaching improper conduct in the way they joined the tanners. My view is that the manufacturers were honestly and properly seeking protection for their own industry. In seeking that protection they did not object to protection being furnished as well to the tanners. They were quite willing to join with the tanners for the general protection of the trade. To say that there was anything wrong in that is in my opinion most unjust. They did what every trader and every manufacturer is entitled to do, and they did nothing wrong to the country at large, assuming that protection is right and I do not suppose that the Minister of Finance, at this date, at all events, will pretend that it is not right. The position of the manufacturers as compared with the position of the tanners, seems to me not unlike:

That well known young lady from Niger
Who went out to ride on a tiger ;
They returned from the ride
With the lady inside
And a smile on the face of the tiger.

The manufacturers went out for a ride with the tanners, but thanks to the Minister of Finance and the Tariff Commission they have returned, the manufacturers inside, and a very broad smile on the face of the tanners.

Mr. FIELDING. They have not shown it to me, I am sorry to say.

Mr. BARKER. They are not so foolish as to show it. But I venture to say that among all the tanners there is none who bears a broader smile, notwithstanding the state of his health, than the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would like to know if the Minister of Finance thinks it a fair deal to raise the tariff 5 per cent after the orders have been placed for these American goods. I misunderstood one night what was said in the House about the duty on boots and shoes, and I went over and asked the Minister of Customs, and he told me it was 25 per cent. The orders which have been placed for the goods for the spring trade have not come in yet and is it fair under these circumstances that the retail dealer should pay that extra 5 per cent ? I appeal to the hon. Minister of Finance to allow the retail trade to bring in the goods that have been on order for some time at 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. The retail dealer will have to charge my hon. friend and myself the difference. I do not see that there is any help for that. Every tariff change creates more or less disturbance. That is to be regretted, but there is no help for it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. You gave us the assurance that there would be no change.

Mr. FIELDING. No. I would not even at this late date give my hon. friend an assurance that there would be no change. The tariff is open until the last touch is put upon it, and, while I hope there will be no further change, we cannot apply to the boot and shoe trade a different rule from what we apply to others.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Have you not sometimes done that ?

Mr. FIELDING. When a particular item has been increased, we may have sometimes provided that goods imported within a certain period would be admitted at the old rate. While the changes are not very great, there are changes all along the line, and if we had to take into account all these changes, it would be an endless task for the Customs Department. With every desire to meet the views of the business community, I am afraid that there would be difficulty in meeting them generally, and I do not see how we could make an exception of boots and shoes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It is a spectacle, I think, to be wondered at by any one having a knowledge of the history of the Liberal party, to see a free trade government putting an extra duty on one of the prime necessaries of life ; because these boots and shoes will be brought in. When the manufacturer says he has no protection beyond 25 per cent he takes the ground that he cannot get as good material in this country as he can import. Has not the retail dealer as good a right to take that ground as the manufacturer ? I will tell you an incident with regard to a manufacturer. Before the last election, knowing that he had supported the Liberal-Conservative party, I asked him for his support. He said : When you were in power, I supported you ; the Liberals are now in power, and I am supporting them ; when you come back to power I will support you. I am afraid that is very general with the manufacturers. I brought to the notice of the Minister of Finance some years ago a combine in rubbers, and offered to furnish him with the report of the annual meeting of the combine and the instructions given to their travellers, and he said he would appoint a commission if I would go to the expense of providing the witnesses. He was perfectly safe in making that offer, because he knew perfectly well that he would not have to carry it out. There is a straight combine in rubber goods, and they are getting into a closer corporation every year. Only a week or two ago I met a traveller for rubbers and he told me that this year there was another advance of 10 per cent in the price. This is the result of this kind of legislation. There was a time when I was a good deal stronger protectionist than I am now. When the national policy was first introduced we were told, and those of us who were young at the time believe it, that you might put on any duty you liked and it would make no difference, because the home competition would regulate the price.

We have lived long enough to see that there is no competition in many of these lines. It is most unfair to raise the duties 5 per cent on boots and shoes. Twenty-five per cent is a good protection in addition to the freight that has to be paid from the United States. And besides you are not really protecting these people because these American goods will come in. There are certain brands of American goods, which everybody knows, which are bought all over the country which are high class goods and will come in despite your tariff. We can manufacture coarse goods just as cheaply as the Americans, but not the finer grades because they have factories that need only turn out two or three lines, since they have such an immense market to sup-

ply. I was under the impression until tonight, because I had not noticed the change in the tariff, that the duty was 25 per cent. I had the assurance of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to that effect. I got some letters about the change, but I said the report could not be true as the minister had told me the duty was 25 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. It was when I told you.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Yes, but you are changeable in your policy.

Mr. PATERSON. According to the hon. gentleman, these goods will come in any how, and so the duty will be collected and this will be a revenue tariff.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But they may not come in in the same quantities, and it is a hardship on the consumer who will have to pay.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. We will make the goods here.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But my hon. friend says the cost of machinery is so great that we shall have to put up with the old style. We cannot have shoes made in Canada like those made in the United States because it costs so much to change our machinery and because it is so expensive to change the lasts and dies. While I am in favour of a reasonable amount of protection, I am not in favour of that increase of 5 per cent because it is a direct tax on the consumer if he chooses to buy an American shoe.

Mr. PATERSON. How would you be off with 10 per cent?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would be worse off. I am sorry I cannot make any impression on the minister. We have the argument made that because you put a duty on sole leather, you should put a duty on the other.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. I think we had better let it go.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. No doubt it will go but I cannot see why, because you put a duty on sole leather, you should put a higher duty on boots and shoes. I am in favour of a reasonable duty on all these things, but it is most unfair, after retail men have placed their orders all over the country that the government should change its opinion and make them pay an additional 5 per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before this item passes I would like to point out that it is abundantly clear that the leather men received an advantage under the tariff as originally brought down. In the old tariff, the item was number 213, and it was as follows:

Skins for morocco leather, tanned but not further manufactured; sole leather and belting leather of all kinds; tanners' scrap leather; and leather and skins, not otherwise provided, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The tariff, as brought down in the latter part of November, 1906, was as follows in respect of this item:

Skins for morocco leather, tanned but not further manufactured; sole leather in whole sides; belting leather of all kinds; tanners' scrap leather; leather not further finished than tanned, and skins, n.o.p., 10 per cent, 12½ per cent, 15 per cent.

Then there was another item, number 606:

Sole leather, n.o.p., 12½ per cent, 15 per cent, 17½ per cent.

So that there was an advance of 2½ per cent on the item I have last mentioned. When the amendments were introduced after the beginning of the year, those two items were amended so as to read as follows:

Skins for morocco leather, tanned but not further manufactured; belting leather of all kinds; tanners' scrap leather; leather not further finished than tanned, and skins, n.o.p., 10 per cent, 12½ per cent, 15 per cent.

No. 606. Sole leather. 12½ per cent, 15 per cent, 17½ per cent.

So that there was in the first place an advantage to the manufacturers of leather in the tariff as originally brought down, and in the amendments introduced after the beginning of the year there was a still further advantage to the manufacturers of leather, because all sole leather was increased by that amendment 2½ per cent in each one of the three tariffs. There can be no question about that. The point made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was that the existence of this combine was perfectly well known to the government years ago and the government took no action. The combine seems to have been a very carefully prepared and effective one. This combine, by private agreement among themselves, allotted to each member of the combine a certain proportion of the Canadian sole leather trade, permission being granted to export any quantity the members might see fit without restriction. But at the same time any members selling in the Canadian trade above their proportion had to pay a forfeit of two cents per pound into a pool which was divided amongst the other members of the combine who had not sold up to their allotted amount. This is information which comes to me from a gentleman who professes to know the circumstances and declares he can substantiate them. He further said:

The Minister of Public Works was one of those who participated to a large extent in the division of this pool. As a matter of fact the Canadian shoe trade has been offered by British sole leather dealers Canadian tanned sole leather made by members of this combine at much less money than it could be

bought for in Canada, and this after paying freight twice across the Atlantic, insurance expenses and a profit to the British dealer. On account of the arbitrary conditions imposed by the combine and the solemn declaration which he was forced by them to make, the Canadian shoe manufacturer was unable to avail himself of this offer.

He could not take advantage of it, because the members of this combine would not sell to any man in the trade unless he bound himself by a declaration, having the force of oath, that he would not, directly or indirectly, by himself or any partner or agent or in any manner by or through any person, purchase leather from any firm not a member of this combine.

That was the condition of affairs when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) became a member of this government. What followed ? This followed, that when the amendment to the tariff was proposed in 1905, the colleagues of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), the gentlemen who were sharing with him in the proceeds of that pool, who were sharing with him in the profits created by this combine and by the restriction of the output and the imposition upon all the shoe men in Canada of an obligation to necessarily buy from this combine—the colleagues in business of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) began to boast of the influence which they had with this government, and to declare, not only among themselves but throughout the country, among the manufacturers of boots and shoes, that this leather industry could certainly get all it wanted whether any other would get anything or not.

Let us look for a moment at one or two of the letters that have been quoted here to-day. Let me say, in the first place, that it is declared by these gentlemen that on three different occasions this boast was made by one of the colleagues in this combine of the Minister of Public Works; I allude to Mr. Beardmore, whose firm is a member of the combine which also includes the Minister of Public Works. He declared to Mr. Ritchie, in Mr. Ritchie's office in the city of Quebec, that he relied, and the boot and shoe men, if they joined with the leather men, could rely, upon the political influence of a member of that combine, the Minister of Public Works. The same declaration, we are told, was made by the same gentleman to Mr. Hagar, another manufacturer of boots and shoes in the office of Mr. Hagar in the city of Montreal. And either of these gentlemen, I am informed is ready to go upon the witness stand and affirm that these statements were true. And on one more occasion, in the presence of at least six manufacturers of boots and shoes, this same declaration was made by Mr. Beardmore as to the influence that the Tanners' Association had with the government by reason of the fact that one of their members held office in this government. Let us look at the correspondence and see whether it bears out the statements which these gentlemen make. I quote from Mr. Beardmore's letter to Mr. John Ritchie, of October 14, 1905.

I expect however it is going to take all the pressure that the leather and shoe industries can bring to bear upon the government to get them to increase the duties.

'All the pressure that the leather and shoe industries can bring to bear upon the government.'

One very prominent man and a very strong supporter of the government who is also most anxious to see a general increase in the tariff, told me yesterday that he feared the government was weak-kneed and would do very little if anything. He further added that they would bring about their own downfall just as the local government in Ontario had through being half-hearted and weak-kneed. This however, should not discourage us for the leather and shoe industry ought to be able to get what they wanted if any industry can do so.

Can any one doubt what the suggestion is in that letter ? And can any one give much credit to the assertions afterward made that no such suggestions as those to which I have alluded were really made by Mr. Beardmore, the colleague of Mr. Hyman, the Minister of Public Works ? The explanation made in a subsequent letter from Mr. Beardmore is not very different in substance from what the boot and shoe men claim. I should refer to the fact that Mr. Beardmore afterwards, in letters to Mr. Ritchie and Mr. Hagar denied—at least, he denied to Mr. Ritchie, and, in terms which I will quote in a moment, to Mr. Hagar—that he had relied upon Mr. Hyman's influence. And Mr. Hyman has decided most explicitly and it is right that I should mention that fact—that Mr. Beardmore, if he did make such an assertion had not the slightest authority to use his name, or to make such an assertion on his behalf. But listen to the suggestion contained in the letter of November 6, 1905, from Mr. Beardmore to Mr. Hagar. He is explaining that he did not allude in any way to the influence of Mr. Hyman as a member of the government in moulding the tariff so that, at least, no injustice should be done to the tanning interests in which he is so largely interested. He says :

Among the members of the tanners' section are several like Mr. Davis, who have been prominent and life-long supporters of the Liberal party. These members joined actively in supporting our demand for an increase of tariff on shoes and leather with a view to increasing the manufacture of fine goods in Canada, and it was these parties that I had in mind in my conversation with Mr. Ritchie and afterwards with you in any reference I may have made to our uniting to bring pressure on the government for increased protection, and I presumed that it went without saying that the Hon. Mr. Hyman in his position could be

governed only by what he considered generally in the public interest, and that no business or personal consideration could have any influence with him.

Now the boot and shoe men state most distinctly and emphatically that Mr. Hyman's name was used, not on one occasion but on three occasions, and on one of these occasions in the presence of at least six people, as an argument to the boot and shoe manufacturers that they would do well to keep in touch with the leather industry because it was represented in the Cabinet by the minister of Public Works who was also a member of the leather combine. That is the assertion; and the explanation is, not that their political pressure was to be used, but that the political pressure was to be that of Hon. E. J. Davis and other livelong liberals. Now, is it a desirable thing that any member of a government in this country should be so associated in his business connection that his name can be used in that way among men who are seeking tariff alterations? That is the consideration I would urge upon the government. There is not the slightest doubt that these boot and shoe men believe that this argument was advanced to them. And what discredit does such an agreement bring upon the government and how does that discredit arise? That discredit arises from the fact that a member is taken in to this government, sworn of the privy council and assigned to a portfolio when he is a member of a combine which has an express agreement among its members to restrict output and which enforces that agreement by declarations having the force of an oath and of the most comprehensive character, which declarations forbid their customers from purchasing leather except from members of the combine. I venture to think that, under the circumstances, there were good reasons why my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) should bring these matters to the attention of the House. And I see no reason why Mr. Hyman's name or the name of any member of the government which may have been bandied about the country in this way with certain suggestions of improper influence should not be brought forward and the whole facts laid before parliament and the people. And I think it will require a little more explanation than any which has yet been laid before the House to convince us that the leather combine did not exercise a considerable influence. The boot and shoe men got no increase in the tariff in the first instance. They got no added protection, though one would suppose that the circumstances were such as to justify increased protection in their case rather than in the other. The leather men pay not one cent of duty on their raw material. The boot and shoe men on the other hand, say that they pay an average duty of a little over 20 per cent. The duty on their goods has been 25 per cent. The leather men were protected with a duty of 15 per cent.

The net protection of the boot and shoe men was thus a little under 5 per cent, if their statement be correct. Then these men having a net protection of a little less than 5 per cent get no advance, and the leather men with a net protection of 15 per cent get 2½ per cent advance, on some lines at least. Well, the minister states that there was not the slightest consideration given to any of this political pressure. How was it then, under these circumstances, that the boot and shoe men, after they cut loose from the leather men, received not one iota of additional consideration under the tariff and the tanners with a net protection of 15 per cent, and with free raw material, got an advance of 2½ per cent on some lines, in the tariff as first brought down? The Minister of Finance has explained the position from his standpoint. It seems to me that it will require a little more than the explanation already given, to account for the fact that there was this discrepancy in the treatment which the two parties received when the tariff was brought down in the first instance.

Mr. PATERSON. I fail to see that the leader of the opposition has given us any information as to how he views the rates that were fixed. I cannot gather whether he is in favour of the rates or opposed to them. What suggestion has he to offer?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have the suggestion to offer that the government of this country should not pretend to be opposed to combines and keep on the treasury benches a man who is a member of a combine.

Mr. PATERSON. But I have asked what rate of duty the hon. gentleman considers should be placed upon sole leather, and what rate should be placed upon boots and shoes. If there has been any unfair pressure brought to bear, it ought to manifest itself in these items.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was no occasion whatever, so far as I can see, for an increase on leather, at least I have not heard any reason given for it. So far as the other is concerned, if these men have less than 5 per cent of net protection. I think the minister will agree, in fact he has already agreed, that that was not enough, because he has increased that by 5 per cent. And if he does not feel competent to frame a tariff without appealing to me, he had better get off the treasury benches.

Mr. FIELDING. Repeated reference has been made to the combine having been brought to the notice of the government by small tanners. I have been trying to recall the facts, and I am reminded of the fact that the small tanners would not have had

their purpose accomplished at all by our putting in force the clause of the tariff which has been the subject of discussion here. The leader of the opposition says, Why did'nt you go on and satisfy them? The reason is that all the tanners were not willing to go on that basis, they would not have had any purpose served by reducing the duties on sole leather. They were not complaining of that, they were complaining of the restrictions placed upon the trade by the larger tanners; but they were not restrictions as to which any relief could be given by reducing the duty on sole leather. It might have been a legitimate subject for prosecution under the Criminal Code, if they had said that a combine existed. But the remedy which is open to the government under this section of the tariff we have been discussing, was not a remedy which would have served them at all, they would have had no relief in that way. There was the reason why they did not proceed further in the matter, they would have had no relief by calling into operation that section of the tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statute does not say anything about small tanners, it does not contain a single word about small tanners. The statute contains words about the Governor in Council, and this is what it says:

> Whenever the Governor in Council has reason to believe that with regard to any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among manufacturers of such article or dealers therein, to unduly enhance the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of the manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, the Governor in Council may commission or empower any judge of the Supreme Court or Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any superior court in any province of Canada to inquire in a summary way into and report to the Governor in Council whether such trust, combination, association or agreement exists.

The Minister of Justice has said during this session in the House that whenever the word 'may' is applied to a public functionary or to the Governor in Council in such a connection, it means that the Governor in Council or the other functionary may do that particular thing and may not do anything else. Now the Minister of Finance has discovered that this government had knowledge of this combine, but they did not exercise their power on account of some interest existing among the small tanners, because the small tanners did not want them to go on. Well, the statute makes no reference to small tanners or to any one else, it makes reference to the public interest ,and imposes a certain duty on the Governor in Council. And although the facts were admittedly brought before the Governor in Council, the Governor in Council took no action except one action, and that was to take into the cabinet, into the Privy Council, into this administration, a member of that very combine against whom this complaint has been made. That was the only action the government took. Now that action is not contemplated by the statute, the statute contemplates an entirely different action. The action which the statute requires, the government did not take, but they did take the action of admitting into this administration one of the very men against whom a complaint had been made that they constituted a combine within the meaning of that section.

Mr. FIELDING. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for the information that the statute does not contain any reference to small tanners. As I did not say that it did, I do not see what purpose he accomplishes by reading the clause to show that there was nothing in it about small tanners. But we were told this evening that this matter had been brought to the notice of the government, it was the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who told us that he had brought it to the attention of the government, and had called attention to the representations that were made by a number of small tanners. Now, although the member for East Grey is not in his place, I suppose I may allude to his argument, as well as to the argument of others. The hon. member for East Grey dwelt on the fact that this representation was made to us on behalf of the small tanners. Now what the small tanners wanted was not that the tariff on sole leather should be reduced, and when their attention was drawn to the machinery provided by the tariff, they saw at once that no good purpose from their point of view could be served by proceeding under that Act. They had a right to proceed under the Criminal Code.

Mr. BARKER. Why did'nt you proceed?

Mr. FIELDING. I will give my hon. friend the answer why. If we had taken up every complaint that was made to us of an informal character of the existence of combinations in this, that and the other line, and if we had attempted to proceed in regard to every such complaint, the hon. gentleman would have been the first man to say that we were trying to persecute some manufacturer, and were taking undue advantage of our position.

Mr. BARKER. Then you will only take notice of the big tanner?

Mr. FIELDING. Of any legitimate complaint that has been made. But the hon. gentleman knows that he and his friends, that everybody who believed that the combination then existed, had the machinery under the Criminal Code to proceed with if they wished, but they did not.

Another method of procedure, that which deals entirely with a reduction of the tariff, would not have served the purpose as to which the complaint was made. That is

why I alluded to the small tanners. The remedy provided in the Tariff Act is that where a combination is established and where the remedy can be applied in the shape of a reduction in duties, that is the machinery contemplated by the Act, that is the machinery we are now discussing, but that machinery would not have provided the remedy for the evil which was alleged to exist at the time to which I refer.

Mr. ELSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister for some information in regard to item No. 1 in schedule A, which provides that horses, cattle, sheep, goats, swine and other animals for the improvement of stock may be admitted under regulations provided by the Governor in Council. Now, it appears that these regulations are very lax. They are not rigid enough in comparison with the American regulations in so far as they admit our stock into the United States. I have heard a great deal of complaint from horse and cattle breeders in regard to these regulations. I do not know what the regulations are exactly, and I would ask the minister for information in regard to them. If the regulations have not been made more rigid than they have been in the past, I would ask if it is the intention of the government to change them and make it a little more difficult for horses and cattle to come in free from the United States as they do for the improvement of stock, when a Canadian apparently cannot export horses or cattle under the American regulations to the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. I can inform my hon. friend (Mr. Elson) that no change has been made in these regulations and that they have been in existence for a long time. The regulations which were adopted many years ago have not been changed, but the Department of Customs is now communicating with the Department of Agriculture to see whether any revision of the regulations to meet our later conditions is necessary, and if any suggestion can be offered by my hon. friend for making them more effective we will be happy to hear from him on the subject. If he will give us the benefit of his views we will give them all consideration.

There are two resolutions, 9 and 10, at page 6, which have not yet been adopted. These simply confirm the schedules that we have already dealt with. As far as I know that completes everything in the way of tariff resolutions. I will be happy if any hon. gentleman will draw my attention to anything that has not been dealt with, but upon making careful inquiry I think that disposes of everything. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, although I do not anticipate there will be any need of it.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Public Works—income—Toronto drill hall—additional accommodation for new corps, $150,000.

Mr. KEMP. I see that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) is not here. There has been quite an elaborate scheme placed before the Minister of Militia in regard to the purchasing of a lot of houses in the vicinity of the drill hall and having a park right adjacent to the new drill hall, part of the cost of which would be defrayed by the city and part by the government. I would like to know if the cost of the drill ground or park is included in this estimate.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works). No, I think not.

Mr. KEMP. The city authorities of Toronto waited on the Minister of Militia a short time ago to promote a scheme whereby a considerable number of houses of a not very valuable character would be torn down near the present drill hall and near the new drill hall. This is partly for the purposes of a park and partly for a parade ground. Is there anything in the estimates to cover the expense of this scheme if anything is being done ?

Mr. FISHER. This item does not cover that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know if the minister is responsible for the apportioning of the money for different purposes in these estimates, but I would point out that there are regiments as good as those in Toronto that have no drill sheds at all. We do not wish to interfere with city drill sheds, but there are many crops representing possibly one quarter of the population of Toronto having no drill sheds.

Mr. FISHER. Of course the drill shed accommodation is based on requisitions from the Militia Department here, and such expense has to be discussed in relation to other expenditures. However, my impression is that the drill sheds in large military centres are being pretty well supplied. I recently signed a contract for one at Peterborough, there are several others under construction and plans for drill sheds in different large military centres are ready for approval. I think the object is being met as rapidly as possible.

Mr. KEMP. The militia force in Toronto is as large, in fact larger, than any other place in Canada, and we are told by the Minister of Militia that Toronto is the point for recruiting for the regular forces. The facilities in Toronto are not yet adequate and I believe that even when these buildings are completed the corps will still be somewhat cramped.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would point out to the minister that although some places are scant on drill halls, there are other places that have no regiments that have drill halls, and I do not know if it is the policy of the government to continue that system of building drill halls where there is no regiment. That condition does not exist in Brantford, but it does in the neighbouring city of Woodstock.

Mr. FISHER. I think they must have a regiment there but I do not know.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I was there a short time ago and was informed there were no troops.

In connection with item 123, public buildings, Ontario, I would ask what the appropriation for the public building at Brantford is ?

Mr. FISHER. It is for improvement in the post office.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Additional inside equipment or addition to the building ?

Mr. FISHER. It is to make provision for completing improvements to the post office equipment and repairs. The total cost will be $11,500.

Brandon drill hall $30,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does this complete the drill hall at Brandon ?

Mr. FISHER. $30,000 it is expected will complete it.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the contract been let ?

Mr. FISHER. No, the plans are not complete.

Mr. BENNETT. Does that include the site ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the site been purchased yet ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, at the corner of 11th and Victoria streets for $3,100

Neepawa public building, $12,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the contract been let ?

Mr.. FISHER. No, the plan has not yet been submitted for tender.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the site been purchased ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, for $3,000, on the corner of Mountain avenue and Cannon street.

Mr. STAPLES. From whom was it purchased ?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Peelhorn.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the population of Neepawa?

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. FISHER. 1,418 by the census of 1901, but it has increased very largely since that time.

Mr. LAKE. What is the meaning of this item in the Auditor General's Report: 'Survey and plan of site, M. McFadden, $167.50 ?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose that was for a survey of the land.

Mr. STAPLES. I might call the attention of the minister to the fact that other towns in Manitoba having a much larger population and being of more importance, have been crying for public buildings, but have not got them. For instance, the town of Carman in my constituency, with a population of about 3,000, has asked for a building, but has not received it.

Mr. FISHER. I will try to look into the claims of Carman.

Mr. STAPLES. It has three lines of railway, and is a very thriving town. I would like to know on what principle these buildings are allotted ?

Mr. FISHER. We try to pick out the most important towns, and try not to give too many buildings to one constituency.

Mr. BENNETT. What does the minister intend to expend on this Neepawa building?

Mr. FISHER. I should think about $25,000, but the plans are not yet prepared.

Mr. BENNETT. All I have to say is that if this government is building $30,000 buildings, including the site, in villages of about 1,400 population, it is about time the people of the country knew it. I can point out towns in Ontario with five times the population that has not public buildings.

Selkirk public building, $18,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the contract let ?

Mr. FISHER. No. The tenders have just been received. The site cost $2,000. It is 58x150 feet at the southeast corner of Manitoba and Main streets. The building will cost about $20,000.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. A year or two ago I drew the attention of the department to the advisability of having no other building within 100 feet of any public building. In the United States no public building is erected anywhere, I understand, within, 100 feet of any other building ; there must be a clear space around it.

St. Boniface public building, $12,000.

Mr. FISHER. The tenders are in and the contract let. The contract price is $20,000.

Winnipeg new immigration building, including additional land, $40,000.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the nature of the addition ?

Mr. FISHER. It is not an addition to the building but is to complete it and pay the balance of the cost.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the total cost ?

Mr. FISHER. $256,000.

Mr. STAPLES. How much additional land purchased?

Mr. FISHER. 66 by 132 at $35,000.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is it used for the housing of immigrants as they arrive, and is there any stated time during which they can remain in the building ?

Mr. FISHER. They are given accommodation in the building until they are distributed throughout the province.

Mr. STAPLES. From whom was the additional land purchased ?

Mr. FISHER. From Mr. Kern.

Winnipeg new post office—land and building, $250,000.

Mr. FISHER. I move to reduce that to $160,000.

Mr. KEMP. How much money has been spent?

Mr. FISHER. To December 31st, $390,000.

Mr. KEMP. Including the land ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes and there is a large amount due on the contract, $163,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who is the contractor ?

Mr. FISHER. Kelly Brothers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are they Canadians ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, of Winnipeg.

Mr. KEMP. Here is a building costing three quarters of a million dollars, which is sandwiched right between a newspaper office and a shop, instead of having it on the corner of a street. It is a most unfortunate location—a magnificent building with a magnificent front, built right between a newspaper office and a shop.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This post office is built alongside the 'Free Press,' the organ of this government in Winnipeg, and was so devised that parts of it were left out in order to afford light to the 'Free Press.' The government were very solicitous for their neighbours but the people have to pay.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the total amount of the contract ?

Mr. FISHER. $529,485.

Mr. BENNETT. How is it it cost $750,000 ?

Mr. FISHER. The site cost $132,350, purchased from Alloway & Good.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Were they the owners or the agents ?

Mr. FISHER. The owners. The name of the agent is Thomas L. Metcalfe, barrister.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is he the same one who was appointed to revise the statutes?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know but very likely.

Mr. BENNETT. That makes a difference of $90,000 simply for the fittings.

Mr. FISHER. Fittings and furniture and boxes, $20,000 ; architect's commission, $10,000 ; contingencies, $9,000.

Mr. STAPLES. When will this building be completed ?

Mr. FISHER. In three or four months from now.

Mr. STAPLES. How long has it been under way ?

Mr. FISHER. The contract was let on the 24th of February 1905—a little over two years.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Winnipeg postal station—north of Canadian Pacific Railway track, $35,000.

Mr. FISHER. Entire cost $60,000 to $70,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the site purchased ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, at $15,700. It has eigthy-seven feet on the Main street and is a corner lot.

Public Works—chargeable to income—rents, repairs, furniture, heating, &c.—Ottawa public buildings, including repairs, ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c., $175,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would like some explanation of this.

Mr. FISHER. This is the usual vote for the maintenance of the public buildings in Ottawa—the usual amount.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would draw the attention of the minister to the fact that, the post office in this building belongs to the ante-diluvian period. A modern post office has boxes where people can go and get their letters when they want them. members of this House have to wear out their knuckles knocking for a clerk to bring their letters. Moreover the boxes should be larger. Will the minister direct his architect's attention to this matter ?

Mr. FISHER. I will. I had not thought of that.

Mr. DANIEL. What about the ventilation of this chamber ?

Mr. FISHER. I explained all that, but I will go over it again, if the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not wish to put the minister to that trouble; but can he tell us when the new system of ventilation will be complete and satisfactory?

Mr. FISHER. I think it is working well now.

Mr. DANIEL. Speaking with the engineer to-day, I asked him when the ventilating apparatus would be complete, and he said that he expected to get at it again when the session closed.

Mr. FISHER. I am told that there is machinery for the exhaust of the air not quite completed but that the exhaust is working, though not with the new machinery.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister give us an idea where, in the name of all that is good, $175,000 a year is spent on these buildings? Does this include wages?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, $82,000 of wages.

Mr. BENNETT. Let us have some data as to these wages.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does this include the men in charge of the lawns, the snow shovellers and the rest?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, all the workers about the public buildings in the whole city.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many men are employed?

Mr. FISHER. The list before me shows 135 men employed the year round, with an extra staff for eight months whose pay amounts to $13,300. The total for wages, as I have said, is $82,000.

Mr. KEMP. Has the minister the cost of lighting as a separate item?

Mr. FISHER. Lighting in this item means material for wiring and so on, not the price of the light.

Mr. BENNETT. How are this staff of 135 men employed the year round?

Mr. FISHER. There are 6 masons and bricklayers——

Mr. BENNETT. What do they do in the winter?

Mr. FISHER. The architect informs me that there is plenty of work for them to do.

Mr. KEMP. It is a pretty big factory that employs 135 men.

Mr. FISHER. Well, this is a pretty big factory. There are 30 carpenters and 4 roofers——

Mr. MARSHALL. What are the carpenters doing now?

Mr. DANIEL.

Mr. FISHER. They are chiefly engaged on fittings and repairs. They have a regular carpenter shop where they repair furniture, make fittings and so on.

Mr. BENNETT. Just to show the absurdity of this matter we have only to point to the fact that though the government has 30 carpenters employed the year round, when they put on an ordinary country porch at the front of this building, it costs $930. The department ought to furnish a picture of that work to every member of this House——

Mr. FISHER. That porch has been talked about a good deal, and I took occasion to examine it. I think that the gentlemen who find fault with the cost have not examined it carefully or have not examined it with much knowledge of the value of work. It may or may not have been necessary to put such a porch there—that is a matter of opinion—but if you look at the design and the details of the work, the quatrefoils at the top and so on, I think you will not be surprised that it cost in the neighbourhood of $800 or $900.

Mr. BENNETT. I have bought too many hardwood doors to think that such a work could fairly cost $930.

Mr. FISHER. I have before me details of the cost of that porch. Take the cost of material alone. There are no less than eight doors in that porch, all cored up and veneered, and finished with Gothic stock moulding; and the lowest price of these doors would be $25 each without hardware, setting or fitting. This makes $200 for the doors alone. I am not saying that it is necessary to have a porch with eight doors, that is a matter of opinion.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon minister wants to buy hardwood doors I can give him the addresses of people in the province of Ontario who will not charge him $30 for such doors as these.

Mr. FISHER. I venture to say that if specifications had been drawn up and tenders called for making these doors we would have found no one to make them for less than $25 a piece. At the same time they were designed in harmony with the general design of the lobby and the building. I fancy that if they were put up to public tender there would not have been $50 saved by competition.

Mr. BLAIN. Who decided that they were necessary?

Mr. FISHER. The architect drew the plans in consonance with the general design of the building.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister would finish reading that account.

Mr. FISHER. It is very long, and I would rather give it to the hon. gentleman to read.

Mr. BLAIN. Whose account is it?

Mr. FISHER. It is a statement made by the builders of the porch to Mr. Shearer, the gentleman in charge of this kind of work. The builders were the Library Bureau of Canada. The main items were: Lumber, $132; hardware, $38; glass, $40; labour, $537. It was a rush job, with the understanding that it was to be finished within a certain time, and consequently a considerable part of the labour was night work for which the men had to be paid extra.

Rents—Dominion public buildings, $120,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What are the buildings in Ottawa and what rental is paid for them?

Mr. FISHER. There is an addition to to the Geological Museum on Sussex street for the storage of specimens, $600. That building is leased partly from Mr. Baskerville and partly from Mr. Johnston. Then there is the French translators' office on Sussex street, $600. The quarters on Queen street known as the Imperial building, $2,250. Coal sheds, Canal basin, $306, rented from the Slater estate. Another part of the Imperial building for the Immigration branch of the Interior Department, $1,750; that is rented from the Pearson estate. Then the methylated spirits warehouse, Mr. Lamb, $1,200. The larger Woods building on Slater street for the Militia Department, $25,000.

Yukon public buildings—rents, repairs, fuel, lighting, water service and caretakers' salaries, $100,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the population of the Yukon?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not counting the troops, neither the officials and their families, I believe the population is about 4,000 or 5,000 all told, perhaps 6,000.

Mr. FISHER. I think they have a population of 5,000 or 6,000.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. No, the census did not give nearly as great a population as the minister says.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the intention to erect a new public building there since the fire?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Will it be furnished by the government or the governor?

Mr. FISHER. I should think by the government.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the minister will not furnish the house as well as the last one was. It seems to have been a most elaborately fitted up establishment and for the benefit of the Minister of Customs I will read how the money of the people of Canada goes in that respect. It is very difficult when you go out on the platform to convince people that such things are done in this country. They will not believe that money is being thrown away by the handful unless you can quote them 'Hansard' and prove it to them. Here are some of these expenditures: One china dinner set, 96 pieces, $100, one water caraffe, $12.50; cupid catches, $8. I do not know whether those are for the fairies that are up there or not. Dinner set—a second one at $80.

Mr. FISHER. That is not very much.

Mr. BENNETT. Then there is one at $35; bowls, one at $30, one at $25, one at $20, one at $14, 2 at $12, one at $9, one at $8 and two at $5; cut glass centre, $24; copper loving cup, $8.50; Indian screen, $20. I should think that a good many perple would want to screen themselves up there besides the Indians. Liquor decanters, one pair $8. Then, when His Honour wants to recline with some person else beside him he can recline on two couch rugs at $20 each and when he gets rested he can go out and enjoy a game of croquet, the set being furnished by the people of Canada at a cost of $17.50. Then, when he is tired of that exercise he can rest beneath eiderdown quilts three of which cost $65 each and one $50. Then there are cushions, costing $7.75 and $7.25; liquor stand $30 and punch bowl $15. Why the governor of the Yukon wants to come out here for two or three months in the year and why the office is going begging when it is provided in this luxurious manner is something that I cannot understand. It is simply disgraceful that the people's money is thrown away in this manner,

Mr. PATERSON. There will be a tremendous amount of freight on that.

Mr. BENNETT. How much freight will there be on eiderdown quilts costing $65 apiece? The Minister of Customs is just as plain and democratic as I am myself. He never saw an eiderdown quilt costing $65 nor did I.

Mr. PATERSON. I never owned one, I know.

Mr. BENNETT. No, you never will for you have too much common sense and I never will if we have to pay for them out of our own pockets. The whole thing is a scandal.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I understand that it cost $13,000 odd for fitting up the commissioner's house last year. The cost for fitting up the governor's house in the Yukon is almost as great as for the Governor General's house here and that too for a little one horse place. The whole population of the Yukon is only about half that of an Ontario town. It costs $13,000 to run that little show every year. The Guggenheims,

of New York, own the whole business, the governor and all, I believe.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, no.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Very nearly, and if they are going to get the benefit of all that goes on in the Yukon the least we can do is to ask them to pay for it.

Mr. BENNETT. I think that with those dance houses up there and those high licenses the country should not be called upon to put up for these cupid catches at $8.

Mr. FISHER. We will have to stop that.

Rideau Hall, including grounds—improvements, furniture and maintenance, $35,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I think I remember seeing in the early part of the winter that a conservatory that was being built on the Governor's ground had collapsed. Could the minister tell us the reason and what has been the result ?

Mr. FISHER. There was just a small section that came down. It was repaired immediately at slight cost. There was no heat in the house, and the snow on the roof did not melt and a portion of the roof caved in under the weight.

Mr. DANIEL. Was it not built strong enough to hold up any ordinary snowfall ?

Mr. FISHER. It would hold snow ordinarily but my hon. friend knows that no snow lies on a greenhouse after it is heated. This was before the heat was put into the greenhouse and the snow accumulated from a higher portion of the house.

Mr. DANIEL. Has it been rebuilt in a stronger manner than before ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, supports were put in.

Mr. DANIEL. Of course it means that it was not built in a sufficiently strong manner at first ?

Mr. FISHER. It was built under the ordinary plans of the men who are responsible for greenhouse construction.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that the architect ?

Mr. FISHER. No, the plans were furnished by men who make a specialty of greenhouse construction.

Mr. DANIEL. Was it built by contract ?

Mr. FISHER. The materials were supplied and then the workmen here put them together according to the specifications which were supplied by the men who make greenhouse construction a speciality.

Mr. DANIEL. Then the loss falls on the government ?

Mr. FISHER. There was not $10 loss altogether.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Post Office—fittings and supplies, $25,000.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What kind of locks do they use in the post offices? In some of the country post offices the locks are very rough and letters and papers catch on them in taking them out. Where are the locks obtained ?

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman refers to an old style of lock that is not used now.

Ottawa public buildings—heating, including salaries of engineers, &c., $95,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How do the government purchase coal?

Mr. FISHER. By public tender.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At what price ?

Mr. FISHER. Different kinds and at different times of the year. There is 6,000 tons of anthracite at $6.07 from John Heney & Co.; 3,000 tons of egg at $6.60; 300 tons of stove at $6.60; 500 tons of bituminous slack at $3.75; 300 tons of cannel at $7.60; 10 tons of blacksmith——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister any means of checking this coal?

Mr. FISHER. It is checked on our own scales by our own officers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not on public scales?

Mr. FISHER. Because our own officers can watch it more closely.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Judging by the record we should hardly be asked to take the checking of some of these officials, we have evidence that the government's own officials are not very particular in the matter of——

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that is a fair statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In some instances. I remember that last year in the case of the coal purchased at Prescott not only the price but the weight was seriously called into question.

Mr. FISHER. There has been no such question here.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Some cars found their way to Ottawa. How did they pass the check?

Mr. FISHER. That must have been in some other department.

Mr. DANIEL. Where does the cannel coal come from?

Mr. FISHER. Some where in Ohio, I think.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there a duty?

Mr. FISHER. There is a duty on bituminous coal and anthracite is free. I am informed this comes under bituminous so under the new tariff there will be a duty on it.

Ottawa public buildings—elevator attendants, $15,000.

Mr. KEMP. How many attendants and how many elevators are there?

Mr. FISHER. Fourteen elevators and twenty-five attendants.

Mr. BENNETT. Do you pay the elevator men in the Woods building?

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes, we run the building.

Ottawa public buildings—gas and electric lights, including roads and bridges, $35,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. From whom does the government purchase gas?

Mr. FISHER. The Ottawa Gas Company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In what buildings is it used?

Mr. FISHER. There is not a great deal used, the Printing Bureau is all lighted by gas.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. With whom is the contract for electric light?

Mr. FISHER. The Ottawa Electric Company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the arrangement?

Mr. FISHER. There are 3,000 lamps at $2.25 a year; 6,887 at $2 a year; thirty arc lights at $85 a year; 150 new lights on the grounds at $2 a year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where are the arc lights used?

Mr. FISHER. At the slides and booms and on the road to the experimental farm.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister know what the city pays for arc lights?

Mr. FISHER. I do not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are you not paying rather high?

Mr. FISHER. We could not get it for any less.

Ottawa public buildings—telephone service, $12,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister explain this?

Mr. FISHER. There is a flat rate of $35 for each telephone. In the city the rate is $45 for business telephones and $25 for residences.

Mr. BENNETT. How many have you altogether ?

Mr. FISHER. Two hundred and ninety-two.

Ottawa public buildings—Major's Hill park, $8,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What is done with the flowers in the conservatories?

Mr. FISHER. There are not many flowers. The conservatories are for the production of plants for bedding out in the spring and also to keep large plants during the winter.

Mr. DANIEL. I suppose that is the only direction in which these flowers go?

Mr. FISHER. The only one I know of except that there are some plants in this building and in some of the departments for a time, and then they are sent back.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. Some of the Bills on the order paper, possibly that of the Minister of Justice respecting electric power and any other Bill except the Land Bill and the Proprietary Medicine Bill, and then supply with the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. KEMP. When does the Minister of Finance intend to introduce the Tariff Bill?

Mr. FIELDING. As soon as the printing can be completed. I would not like to name a day, but we desire to expedite it without delay.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 13, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 111) respecting the inspection of electricity.—Mr. Fisher.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the British American Insurance Company.—Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 114) to authorize the exchange of certain lands.—Mr. Oliver.

THE POST OFFICE ACT.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) to amend the Post Office Act. He said: The first section will correct an error in the printing of the Post Office Act in the revised statutes of Canada by striking out the word 'permit' in the eighth line of section 55 and substituting the word 'prevent.' The second clause is to give us authority to establish a dead letter office at Calgary. The third is to relieve the superintendent of the mail ser-

vice of part of his work. At present he is in charge of the recovery of missing or delayed postal matter. With the vast development of the west and the extension of the railway service and subsidies all over the country, the superintendent of mail service is rather crippled in his work, and we have transferred that part of his work to the inspectors of post offices, who are already empowered by our Act to look after letters lost. We have thought it better in the public interest to put under the supervision of the post office inspectors the work of recovering lost, missing and delayed letters. The other section is to authorize our inspectors and some particularly accredited officers to travel free of charge, when on duty, on railways subsidized by the department to carry our mail matter. This is the rule followed in Europe and especially in the United States. During the past railway companies have always given our own officers the right to travel free when on duty, but of late we have been notified by one of the companies, which is given a large subsidy, that after the 1st of April next our inspectors and officers on duty will have to pay their railway fares. We think we should follow the same custom as is followed in other countries. That is to say, when an official of the department is travelling on duty to look after the mail on board the cars of railway companies subsidized by the department, the least the company should do is carry our officers free of charge.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

THE LORD'S DAY ACT.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

Is the Lord's Day Act, presently in force, being interpreted so as to prohibit express companies from delivering cut flowers arriving at a terminal point, such as Montreal, on Sunday morning? If so, is it the intention of the government that this interpretation be adhered to?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The interpretation of all statutes is for the courts and the government is not aware whether or not any such interpretation of the provisions of the Lord's Day Act as is suggested in the question has been in any manner pronounced.

MAIL SERVICE, DIGBY COUNTY.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. Were tenders called for mail service between Salmon river and Hectanooga, in the county of Digby?
2. What is the name of each tenderer, and what is the amount of each tender?
3. Upon what date was each tender received by the government?

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2 and 3. As the question of the reorganization of the mail service in this district is still engaging the attention of the department, and as the tenders received in answer to the advertisement have not yet been considered or the contract awarded, the department must consider the particulars asked for as confidential.

WATER POWER, OTONABEE RIVER.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Has the water power of No. 5 dam, on Otonabee river, been leased? If so, to whom leased, and the date of the lease?
2. How many horse-power does this dam furnish, and what is the price per horse-power under the lease?
3. How much has been paid each year to the government for the power since date of lease?

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

1. Yes, leased to William H. Meldrum, William A. Stratton and Robert Richard Hall, all of Peterborough, on August 1, 1901, and afterwards assigned to the Otonabee Power Company, limited.
2. Surplus water estimated, 625 horse-power at $2 per horse-power, $1,250 per annum.
3. $1,250 was paid each year up to February 1, 1907.

MILITIA PENSION ACT.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I beg to move that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Militia Pension Act and to provide that its provisions shall extend to officers who are seconded.

Motion agreed to.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I desire to call up the government resolution with respect to the Iron and Steel Bounty, which has been on the order paper, but has not been set down for consideration at any particular time. I move that the House to-morrow consider in the Committee of Ways and Means the following proposed resolution:

1. That it is expedient to repeal chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1899 and chapter 68 of the Statutes of 1903, from and after January 1, 1907.
2. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the following bounties on the under-mentioned articles manufactured in Canada for consumption therein, viz.:

(a) In respect of pig iron manufactured from ore, on the proportion from Canadian ore produced during the calendar years :

1907.. .. .. $2.10 per ton ;
1908.. .. .. 2.10 per ton ;
1909.. .. .. 1.70 per ton ; and
1910.. .. .. 0.90 per ton.

(b) In respect of pig iron manufactured from ore, on the proportion from foreign ore produced during the calendar years :

1907.. .. .. $1.10 per ton ;
1908.. .. .. 1.10 per ton ;
1909.. .. .. 0.70 per ton ; and
1910.. .. .. 0.40 per ton.

(c) On puddled iron bars manufactured from pig iron made in Canada during the calendar years :

1907.. .. .. $1.65 per ton ;
1908.. .. .. 1.65 per ton ;
1909.. .. .. 1.05 per ton ; and
1910.. .. .. 0.60 per ton.

(d) In respect of rolled, round wire rods not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter, manufactured in Canada from steel produced in Canada from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig iron made in Canada, when sold to wire manufacturers for use in making wire in their own factories in Canada, on such wire rods made after December 31, 1906, six dollars per ton ;

(e) In respect of steel ingots manufactured from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig iron made in Canada, on such ingots made during the calendar years :

1907.. .. .. $1.65 per ton ;
1908.. .. .. 1.65 per ton ;
1909.. .. .. 1.05 per ton ; and
1910.. .. .. 0.60 per ton.

Provided that bounty shall not be paid on steel ingots from which steel blooms and billets for exportation from Canada are manufactured.

3. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may make regulations to carry out the intentions of these resolutions.

4. That it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Trade and Commerce shall be charged with the administration of the foregoing provisions.

The subject matter of this resolution having been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General is by him recommended to the favourable consideration of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I do not see it on the order paper.

Mr. FIELDING. It accompanied the tariff resolutions and has been on the order paper for several weeks in connection with these resolutions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand the procedure. I am not saying that it is not perfectly regular, but I do not understand it.

Mr. FIELDING. It was brought down by way of notice of motion some weeks ago in connection with the tariff and will be found in the Votes and Proceedings of the day in which the tariff notices appear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, either it is on the order paper or it is not—

Mr. FIELDING. It is not on the order paper to-day, and if my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) takes that point—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not take that point, I am asking for information. I am not raising any objection whatever, but, as a member of the House, I would like to understand what the procedure is.

Mr. SPEAKER. Strictly speaking it was on the order paper.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, why did it disappear ? Was it through some inadvertence ? I am asking this particularly because I did not understand at the time why we omitted the usual formality when we went on with the tariff resolutions in the first place.

Mr. FIELDING. We never took this up in committee at all, we brought it down in connection with the tariff, thus giving notice of it, and it appeared in the Votes and Proceedings at once, but had not been placed on the order paper. If the point is taken that—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not take any point of objection ; I simply desire to understand the procedure, and I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) the question because, no doubt, he has looked into the matter : Why does this differ from other resolutions constituting the tariff resolution ? Or, does it differ in any way ?

Mr. FIELDING. It deals with a different subject, but still a fiscal subject, and may be regarded as relating to the same thing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is a different procedure applicable ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is a proposal to pay money out of the treasury, and differs in theory from the others. It must be commended to the House with the consent of the Crown.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I raised the point about the whole tariff resolutions, incidentally, that the motion, that they be taken up some other day, should be first adopted. But I was told that it was not necessary. It appears now to be necessary in respect to part of these resolutions. What I would like to understand is why it was not necessary in respect of all ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was not part of that tariff resolution. It was a separate resolution and has not been dealt with. I am not sure but that the fact of it not being on the order paper would justify the objection—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not object.

Mr. FIELDING. Then, if this motion is carried, then the resolution of which I have given notice will be set down in the government orders for consideration in due course.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). May I ask the Minister of Militia concerning the return about the old drill shed property ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). The Deputy Minister of Justice wrote me yesterday that the papers were complete and were on their way to my office. I expect to have them to-morrow.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). I would ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if the returns asked for in connection with the Blairmore town site will be brought down soon ? I am very anxious to have them produced.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I think they will be down to-morrow or the next day. The returns are voluminous and have taken some time to prepare. I have urged expedition and, as I say, I expect the returns here to-morrow or the next day.

BONUS TO IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). In view of the notice given to the Minister of the Interior by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) of consideration of the question raised in the statement in the Montreal 'Star' of the 9th instant, which was read yesterday, I ask if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) is prepared to lay before the House the new contract entered into by his department on the subject of bonus to be paid to immigrants, or to state to the House the terms of that contract the names of the parties with whom it has been entered into, and the date when it comes into effect ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There has been no contract entered into. An order in council has been passed which will be laid on the table to-morrow if my hon. friend wishes.

Mr. BOURASSA. Before the debate is taken up ?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LIFE INSURANCE—EXHIBITS.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Has the Minister of Finance laid on the table the exhibits filed before the Royal Commission on Life Insurance ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Directions were given to have these exhibits placed in the custody of the House, and the Clerk of the House informs me that they have been received.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they not to be laid upon the table of the House as the evidence was ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is.

Mr. FIELDING. The evidence is on the table, and the exhibits are referred to in the evidence. If these things have actually to be laid on the table before us, we shall have to have some able bodied persons to bring them in.

Mr. FOSTER. They are voluminous, are they ?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, yes.

EXPORTATION OF ELECTRIC POWER.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 60) to regulate the exportation of electric power and certain liquids and gases.—Mr. Aylesworth.

On section 4,

4. Subject to any regulations of the Governor in Council in that behalf, the minister may grant licenses, subject to such conditions as he thinks proper, for the exportation of defined quantities of power or fluid where a right to export exists by lawful authority; and such license shall be revocable upon such notice to the licensee as the minister deems reasonable in each case.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). When this clause was under consideration in the committee some six weeks ago, the question was raised—perhaps, as much by the Minister of Customs who is referred to in section 2 of the Bill as by any other member of the House—as to the propriety of leaving the issuing and revocation of licenses in the decision of any single minister as provided in the section we are now considering. Various suggestions were made as to the possibility of referring to the Railway Commission or some other board as a tribunal for the administration of the Act. After consideration, the objection to devolving so important duties upon any single minister seemed one that could properly be remedied, and in the absence of any better tribunal to carry out the provisions of the Act, I propose that the words 'Governor in Council' should be substituted for the words 'the minister' in the two places in this section where they occur.

Mr. HAGGART. Have the provincial authorities any power of preventing exportation by reason of ownership of the soil over which this gas or electric power may pass? For instance, at Niagara there is permission given for the exportation of gas and electric power of which a part runs through what is called the Chain reserve, which is

absolutely under control of the provincial authorities. I have heard that the provincial authorities intend to assert their jurisdiction by preventing the exportation only on such terms as they please.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have not heard any hint of the rumour the hon. gentleman refers to, and cannot say anything as to possible intentions in the province of Ontario or any other province where conditions similar to those which exist at Niagara in regard to the Chain reserve, may obtain. I hesitate to express any opinion—certainly any opinion off-hand—upon the important question which the hon. gentleman has raised. So far, however, as it would be proper for me to say anything at all of the manner in which the question strikes me, I would suppose that any owner of land would have control over his land to the extent of preventing a trespass upon it by its being dug up and pipes laid in his soil unless such pipe were laid with his concurrence.

Section 4 as amended agreed to.

On section 5,—supply of power and fluid in Canada—revocation of license.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I propose to substitute the words 'Governor in Council' for the word 'minister' in the second subsection.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before that section is carried, I wish to submit to the consideration of the Minister of Justice an amendment which I think is necessary. I move to insert after the words 'Governor in Council' in the sixth line of the first subsection, the words :

In which it shall always be provided:

That no licenses shall be issued under this Act unless the licensee shall employ and actually use in Canada during the whole of the term of the license a quantity of power or fluid (not theretofore employed or used) equal to the quantity licensed for export ; also that no further licenses whatever shall be issued when there shall be a less surplus than 25,000 horse-power immediately available.

When this Bill was before the committee at an earlier stage we discussed at considerable length the necessity of protecting Canada as against the United States in the use of this power. Of course our minds naturally incline to the conditions at Niagara Falls, but this amendment applies to the whole of Canada. The principle of the amendment is that this power shall not be exported, and therefore that Canada shall not lose the benefit of having a monopoly as it were, or partial monopoly of the power. I do not know how we could any better protect Canada in regard to this matter than by creating such a condition of affairs as that the manufacturers would be obliged to build on the Canadian side of the line, or at least by holding out greater inducements to them to build on the Canadian side. It is not to be forgotten that arrangements are being made by an international waterways commission consisting of three gentlemen appointed by the Canadian government and an equal number appointed by the United States government, one of the things recommended by that commission being that the power to be produced at Niagara Falls and other places shall be limited in quantity. That is a matter that makes it all the more necessary that some measure should be taken by which the use of that power shall be secured for Canada, and, the enterprises be built up in Canada, so far as we can do so by legislation. Unless we have some provision of this kind, we shall deprive ourselves of some of the advantages to which we are rightfully entitled. It has been said that we must not go so far as to prohibit any export of power at all. I thought that under the circumstances we could reasonably prohibit the export of power, especially in that part of the country. But I have yielded to certain suggestions made by other gentlemen that, while protecting Canada, we ought at the same time to allow people who are producing this power to sell a certain amount of it for export. Section 5 provides that regulations, rules and conditions shall be prescribed by the Governor in Council, and therefore I add in my amendment that such regulations and rules shall always provide that the licensee shall employ and actually use in Canada, during the whole term of the license, a quantity of power or fluid not theretofore employed or used, equal to the quantity licensed to be exported. The effect of that would be that if a certain quantity of fluid was permitted to be exported, an equal quantity would have to be used in the development of Canadian industries, that while we would permit a certain amount to go out of the country, we would do it on condition that the person exporting it should see, either by himself or by the licensee, that there was such development going on in Canada as goes on in the United States by virtue of the export allowed by the license. My object is that we shall have Canada developed by this power by as much as we allow development on the other side of the line to take place by the use of this power. I am not limiting it to any particular place or province. If, for instance, in New Brunswick it was desired to export electric power, this condition would not require that at that particular place there should be an equal quantity developed in Canada, but that at some other place in Canada there should be an equal quantity developed. If in any locality there was an export of electrical energy, the regulation would be complied with if the licensee developed in some other part

of Canada an equal quantity to that for which we might have obtained the license authorizing him to export. I think that the amendment will commend itself to the minister and to the House. It seems to me that some such amendment is necessary or else we are going to permit the whole of the power that we can produce to be exported because we are evidently going to limit ourselves in production by some international arrangement of some kind. We will some day have no power in Canada to develop and we will be sorry when that day comes. I read in the Toronto papers of February 21, a despatch from Niagara Falls, New York, referring to this subject. It is as follows:

Capt. Charles W. Kutz, representing the War Department, held a hearing here to-day in regard to the permits to be issued for the transmission of Canadian power into the United States at this point.

Secretary Taft had directed the chief of engineers and Capt. Kutz to prepare the permits after consultation with counsel for the respective companies. The hearing was an informal discussion of the wording of the permits, and it was decided that the companies shall submit recommendations. As the law provides that only 160,000 horse-power shall be imported, it is likely the government will arrange to measure the power at this border, the method to be determined upon later.

The Electrical Development Company was represented by H. H. McRea, of Toronto; Chief Engineer Walter Pearson, Niagara Falls; Electrical Transmission Company by Frank A. Dudley; Ontario Power Company by Franklin D. Locke, Buffalo; V. G. Converse, this city, and O. S. Lyford, junior, New York. A. Monroe Grier, E. C. Egbert, P. P. Barton, A. H. Vancleve, F. L. Lovelace, H. W. Buck, and L. E. Implay, represented the Canadian Niagara Power Company.

I think this shows that it is necessary that we ought to have the amendment which I have suggested or a similar one for the preservation of our Canadian water-powers. We see that while this Bill has been before this House and that since it was last discussed by the committee of this House, the Americans, alert as they always are to their own interests, are apparently counting on having this power imported into their own country—that is exported from Canada—at the earliest possible moment, and are actually making arrangements for the admission of that power into their own country. Assuming that the Bill is going to be passed they can at once take advantage of our legislation and get their contracts made without fear apparently that we will wake up very soon and insist on doing something to limit the exportation.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has explained and as the language of the amendment plainly requires, is to limit the quantity which any producer of electricity in Canada can export to an amount equal to that which he is using in some work or other in this country. It seems to me, with all deference to the views which the hon. gentleman has expressed, that it would be a very extraordinary policy for this parliament to adopt. We have already at Niagara, to take for the purpose of illustration, the conditions to which the hon. gentleman himself has referred, three companies establishing their works at a cost of many hundreds of thousands of dollars and now ready to dispose of electrical energy which they are in a position to generate. The amount of electrical energy which these three companies among them are entitled to produce if they had a market for it, or will be in a position to produce within a measurable distance of time, is over 400,000 horse-power and there certainly is not at the present time available in Canada a market for—I said on a previous occasion—not more than one-tenth of that amount. That view was challenged by some hon. gentlemen. Let us say double that. There is certainly not presently required in Canada more than one-fifth of 400,000 horse-power. What then is to be done with the remaining four-fifths of the 400,000 horse-power? There is no market for it, no room at present for the consumption of it in Canada and if the views which the hon. gentleman is advocating were to prevail that amount of actual wealth which these companies have by their outlay produced would simply have to go to waste. Is there any reason for that? Why should that be? I pointed out when this measure was under consideration in committee some weeks ago what was apparent to every one and that is that electrical energy produced from flowing water is not like some natural supply of coal, it may be, or other mineral, which, even though it may seem to be practically inexhaustible, must necessarily be limited in extent. The electrical energy which is developed from flowing or falling water, unless used when produced, can never be used; unless used to-day or to-morrow it is gone for ever. The amount which remains or the amount which may be produced in future is not lessened by the disposition and immediate consumption of the amount which may be produced to-day, and literally when we have approximately 400,000 horse-power of electrical energy produced at Niagara and we are not using 100,000 horse-power in Canada the remaining 300,000 horse-power is lost to the producers and to the world unless it is exported to the market which is waiting for it on the other side of the line. No doubt the principal market which the men who formed these companies had in view when they formed them was the United States of America. There was within easy reach of their headquarters the larger cities of western New York. There was an available market there to an extent certainly larger

than then seemed likely to exist in Canada. Now, the purpose, the object of this legislation, as has been explained from the beginning is simply that the government of this country may control this natural wealth of the country and may secure by controlling the export of electrical energy and by the issue of licenses for the disposition of it, the retention for Canadians and within Canada of as much as we need. More we do not want. The amount we need will necessarily vary from time to time as conditions change. We hope it will be a continually increasing quantity. This clause 5 as it is presented to the committee provides for exactly that condition of things. It provides that there shall always be kept by the licensee for distribution to customers for use in Canada power to an extent defined by the license, in other words power equal to the amount which is needed here. As to the remainder, surely it is not a policy which will be advocated or supported by this committee that it should be dead and valueless stock, that it should be waste on the hands of the men whose capital had produced it. Reference was made by hon. gentlemen to what is spoken of as the alert action of enterprising citizens of the United States induced or brought about by the introduction of this measure and the fact that it was pending before the House. But hon. gentlemen of the committee will not forget that the fixing of the amount of 160,000 horse-power as that which might be exported into the United States was a cutting down of the amount, was something which the companies producing the power here resisted very strenuously. That was a very great hardship upon them. The Congress of the United States, not since this measure was introduced but a year ago, by an Act which was then passed, took to itself the power to control the importation of electrical energy into their country and the power to say that not more than a certain amount 160,000 horse-power, as they chose to fix, should be received into the country and used by consumers there from this side of the line. That, no doubt is their own affair. If they see fit to limit the importation those who have the commodity to export from this country and to import into the United States will have to dispose of their wares in accordance with the laws of the country to which they take those wares, but so far as this country is concerned, if we are able to secure, as we think we are and as we think the provisions of this Bill will secure, to the people of this country all the electrical energy they want, all they have immediate use for, to what end is it that we should say the remainder must be wasted beyond an amount equal to that which is consumed in Canada? I can see no necessity for the amendment proposed and indeed it would seem to me to be destructive of the interests of the men who have entered into this enterprise and who now, after the expenditure of a very large amount of money, find themselves about beginning to reap a reward for their efforts.

Mr. LANCASTER. I wish to point out that what the minister says about there being no market in Canada for one-fifth of the present production is no reason why we should not develop a market for it. If there is no power to be sold in Canada of course there will be no market because there is nothing to be bought. If the minister wants to preserve for Canada the possibility of building up its industries the best way would be to keep in Canada a certain amount of power. If all the surplus production over the present consumption is permitted to be exported to-day, we will have nothing left to-morrow to meet the increased Canadian demand.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. We can lessen the amount to be exported to-morrow or next week.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not know how that can be done with any fairness to the licensee. A man making a bargain with this government and taking a license for a certain amount of power would have to be assured that he would get that amount for at least a certain number of years. To interfere with his license in that way would be the clearest case of confiscation. Is it not better to say in the beginning that he must provide for building up Canada by supplying power for consumption in this country to the same extent as he provides it for exportation? The minister says that the power that is developed to-day does not lessen the amount that is going to be developed to-morrow, but if such an arrangement as is recommended by the Waterways Commission is to take effect, he is absolutely wrong in that because they provide for an agreement between the two countries that the amount of water to be withdrawn from the river shall be limited to a certain amount, that neither country shall produce more than a certain horse-power. Therefore, every license to export reduces the amount left for consumption in Canada because you have a fixed and determined quantity that you cannot exceed owing to this international arrangement and therefore there will be no chance for the building up of this industry in Canada. What happened at the Sault. When Mr. Clergue had more power than he knew what to do with he developed industries to use the power. What will happen in Canada if you cannot export this power, if you limit the export of it, if you require that it shall be exported only in equal proportion to the amount required by people here? You are going to force people to come to Canada to build up industries in this country because they cannot get power anywhere else. Is that wrong? Is there anything unjust to anybody who has a license or a charter or money invested in developing power in Canada to say to him: You may have these

privileges, you are working under Canadian authority and it ought to be well understood that you are always going to work for the benefit of Canada, under a Canadian charter, for the reasonable development of Canada, and not having any special clause in your charter that you are to be allowed to export on particular terms, surely it is not unreasonable to say that in so far as it is necessary to protect Canada as a country, we insist that you shall assist us and that while we will permit you to export a certain amount you must furnish an equal amount for the development and industrial progress of Canada. So I say I cannot agree with the minister that by this amendment we would be creating any waste. It would be a waste temporarily until it is used by some one coming here and establishing industries. But this would not be a permanent waste. People must go where the power is and if you preserve the power for use in Canada then the waste—if you use the word 'waste' which I think is a harsh and exaggerated word—would be only temporary. But if this power can be exported the result will be the development of industries on the other side of the line by virtue of their being able to import the power from this country, as they could then carry on the industry as easily there as here. Instead of assisting in the upbuilding of the United States when they have run out of power of their own development we should preserve our electric energy for the building up of industries in this country.

Mr. CARVELL. While this Bill may be all right in the case of Niagara Falls it would work great hardships in other parts of Canada, especially in connection with two water-powers in New Brunswick, to which I referred on a former occasion when this matter was before the House. I can agree with my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) that it would be a very excellent thing if we could force Americans or any other capital to come to Canada and start industries, but I fear the hon. gentleman is prone to make his argument entirely from the conditions existing at Niagara and he is failing to recognize the condition in other parts of the country. At the present time there is a work under construction at Aroostook Falls, New Brunswick, just across the boundary, not more than half a mile from the State of Maine. This work will cost $300,000 or $400,000, and they will develop about 3,000 horse-power. The money has been provided very largely by selling stock to people in New Brunswick and Maine, although they have also bonded their property, and if you attempt to provide that they must employ as much of this power in Canada as they would employ in the United States, you would absolutely close down the industry. There is no question about it. There is very little being sold for power purposes, it is practically all to be sold for lighting purposes in Maine. On the Canadian side, at that particular part of Victoria county, there is a very narrow strip cultivated, perhaps five or six miles, but on the American side there is a highly developed country, there are three towns with a population of 3,000 or 4,000 within a few miles, and the company can sell all this power for lighting in the State of Maine; but if you say that they must sell an equal amount of power in New Brunswick they simply cannot do it and the result will be that the people who put their money in this industry will lose it and the industry will be closed down. The second portion of the amendment provides that there must always be kept available 25,000 horse-power. In such a case, as I have described, where there is only 3,000 horse-power being developed, it would be absolutely impossible to retain 25,000 horse-power.

Another water-power is being developed at Grand Falls further up the same river. There they will develop from 50,000 to 75,000 horse-power. If the electrification of railroads becomes properly developed in the next five or ten years very probably the greater proportion of this power will be used in Canadian territory, but under present conditions, if they develop this power, it is certain that a large amount will have to be exported to the United States; and if they were not allowed to export to the United States they could not develop that water-power. Therefore so far as the Aroostook Falls proposition is concerned, it is certain that if this amendment is allowed to pass, the people who put their money into this will lose it and the business will close down. As far as the other is concerned I have very grave doubts if the Grand Falls Company would be able in the next ten or fifteen years to develop that very valuable water-power if these conditions were included in this Bill, and it seems to me that while this provision may be properly applied to the conditions at Niagara Falls, it would be unwise to incorporate this in the Bill and as far as it concerns the two projects I have mentioned, it would be ruinous to them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. With regard to the amendment of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) I think it would be very wise to limit the amount of power that could be exported. Speaking on this subject some weeks ago I advocated that a reserve of power should be at all times kept on hand so that if a new industry came to any town it could immediately get some power for industrial purposes. If all the power is exported it is evident there will be no surplus at home. The minister in discussing this I think has somewhat lost sight of the fact that there is a field that is not yet covered. The minister will remember that as yet portions of Ontario within a distance from Niagara Falls to which power could be transmitted, have not

yet been reached. Hamilton and Toronto are the only important distant points, as far as I know, that are getting power from Niagara, but the district between Hamilton and London which is appealing for power including St. Thomas on the south and Berlin and Stratford on the north, will require a very large amount of power. The minister will see that if he allows the surplus at the present moment to be exported it will have several effects. One will be that it will retard the running of transmission lines into districts not already served. What is the use of going into Ontario to a remote distance from the Falls if these companies can get a market immediately across the river in the United States? The further argument will present itself that it will retard the construction of transmission lines. That is a very important feature. You cannot sell the power until you get it to the market. It must be evident that if the present market will only use 60,000 to 80,000 horse-power, other places are not yet supplied, as the companies cannot get the power to the places where it is required. Further I understand they have not yet 400,000 horse-power developed. They may have but I question it. The amendment moved by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) provides that a reserve amount shall be at all times held to the extent of 25,000 horse-power for the whole country. Whether that is a proper figure or not is a matter for reflection, but a reserve should certainly be held. My hon. friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) complained that my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) discussed this purely from a Niagara standpoint. I think the minister also discussed it from a Niagara standpoint to a very large degree as these companies of which he spoke as having invested this large capital are all Niagara companies. The companies have these franchises from the country, they got them from the provinces in the first place but since then they have been licensed by the Dominion parliament, and this Bill is to allow them to transmit to that foreign market the surplus power. If the surplus power is exported, it will have the effect first of retarding the construction of transmission lines and next it will have a tendency to keep up the price of electric power at home. I think the minister cannot deny that. That will very seriously interfere with the amount of power required. The moment you get power down to a certain figure where steam or gas cannot compete, you will have an immense market for it as the steam and gas plants will be discarded and industries will turn to electric power. That will immediately open an immense market. But if you allow the surplus to be exported it will have the effect of keeping the price up at home. Now the construction will be very largely regulated by the price at which power can be transmitted to the points at which it is required.

Therefore, I submit that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), though it may not in all respects cover the case, is really one we should adopt from the point of view of a national policy. I think the minister would do well to adopt at least some of the features contained in this draft resolution because they will provide a very wise check and a very restraining influence on the prices these power companies will be in a position to charge. These companies will be obliged to keep power for the immediate use of new industries that may come into the province and are seeking for more power. Further, as proposed by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), I understand that if a unit of say five or ten thousand horse-power is exported to the United States, the same quantity must be used in Canada. That is not confined to Niagara, but may apply to the district of which the hon. member from New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) has spoken or the Rainy River district, or any other district where power is being developed in large quantities and in excess of what is required on the spot. Give cheaper power and furnish the necessary facilities and industries will naturally gather around as bees do around honey. The way to encourage industry is to furnish cheap power. Those localities which are able to furnish cheap power to industrial concerns are the ones which will be selected by these concerns looking for suitable locations. That will be the case in the Niagara peninsula provided the minister does not allow this power to be exported to the other side, and thus keep for our own use one of the finest industrial assets we have. I hope the hon. minister will give the proposed amendment his favourable consideration.

Mr. CONMEE. I think the amendment will not facilitate the attainment of the object which the hon. gentleman desires. I think it would not improve the Bill or make it any more workable than it now is. In some cases it would impose a hardship which would not be in the public interest. I have in mind one instance in a particular section of the country, and a similar instance might occur in many another section. I refer to the mining company on Isle Roy, which is an island in Lake Superior on the American side of the boundary, but very close to the north shore of Lake Superior. That company is looking to the mainland where the streams are for power, not only to operate the mine, but to deal with the ore. The ore is largely copper, and I am informed that electric smelting of that particular ore has proved very successful. But under the amendment of my hon. friend

that company would be shut out because none of the power can be used just now on the north shore, as there is no industry or settlement there requiring it. Doubtless in the future conditions will arise under which some of the power might be used on our side of the line, but surely no good purpose can be served by preventing these gentlemen from coming into that section of the country and investing their money in the developing of power and the employment of the necessary labour to maintain and operate that power on our side. My hon. friend mentioned the Soo, but I think he was mistaken when he said that Mr. Clergue established his works there because of the water-power. That is not the case. No doubt there is a very excellent water-power there and that was one of the reasons why Mr. Clergue selected the Soo as a field for his operations. But it was not because he could not have got water-power on the American side. As a matter of fact, there are about the same opportunities for developing water-power on that side. The Soo was selected partly on account of its water-power, but mainly on account of its location and the certainty that some materials and natural resources could be centred at that point. The same remark would apply to many points where water-power might be procured. I do not think it is a sound argument to say that if you shut off the exportation of power you are thereby going to draw industries into this country, which otherwise might use power on the other side of the line—will be a question of cost. That might be the case in some instances, but very few. The question of location is a question of market and cheapness of production, and it will be admitted that the American user of Canadian power cannot get it as cheap as the Canadian user. Speaking generally, it will cost him more to have it transmitted to his particular locality.

Mr. BOYCE. Is it cheap power at the Soo?

Mr. CONMEE. I was not discussing the question of the cheapness of power at the Soo, but I was saying that generally speaking—take the Niagara peninsula if you choose—the American consumer of power exported from Canada will have to pay more than the Canadian consumer of that same power within a limited distance. The American consumer must take it subject to the condition that it may be taken from him at any time if there should be a demand for it in Canada. Subsection 2 of section 5 provides that the license may be revoked at any time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the American consumer pay more for it because it may be taken from him at any time?

Mr. CONMEE.

Mr. CONMEE. No, but he has to take the license with that alternative staring him in the face. He is handicapped more than that. He has to consider whether the government of Canada might not at some time put an export duty on it. Under subsection 3 of section 10 the government have power to do that, and that they would naturally do if there was a demand for power in Canada and a large quantity was being exported. This section seems to contemplate that action because it says:

> The Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in like manner, exempt from the payment of such duties such persons as comply with the direction of the minister.

If the minister directs that they shall use a certain quantity in Canada, and they do not do that, the minister may come down with an export duty which will be very onerous. I think that that is a good protection and the American purchaser has to take that into account. If he takes the power at all, he takes it because he wants it and is willing to pay for it under those conditions, and those conditions will not affect the Canadian consumer, as there is no danger of our taxing electrical power used in Canada for industrial purposes. If a company build transmission lines on the American side, they take greater risks than in building on our side; the interest of the company will be to extend all they can in Canada. It is therefore reasonable to assume that within the same radius or anything like it, the Canadian consumer will obtain his power under better conditions, if not at a less price—certainly at a less price, than the American consumer. The question is, does the Bill give sufficient protection to the Canadian interests. In the first place it provides that the Canadian market must be supplied.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Where do you find that?

Mr. CONMEE. I think it is in section 5 and in the general powers given by the Bill. Surely the minister will not give a license which will prejudiciously affect the Canadian market. You cannot make a law that will work automatically. There must be somebody to administer it. And I cannot conceive of any minister giving a license to export power to a foreign country if there is a demand for it in our own country. Then, again, it seems to me, the safeguards to which I have already referred afford ample protection to the Canadian people and assurance that their interests will be conserved. That applies more particularly to the water-powers adjacent to the international boundary—whether in New Brunswick or in Ontario. And the hon. member's motion would go so far as to shut out entirely the development of certain water-powers because there is no market for the use of any

of the power just now on our side, as has been pointed out by the hon. member from New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell). It would have this affect in my own district, and I apprehend it would do the same in other sections of Canada. So far as I can understand the provisions of the Bill, it seems to me that the interests of the country are sufficiently provided for, and that it would be better to leave the Bill to its operation than to adopt the amendment which has been proposed.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the hon. member for Rainy River and Thunder Bay (Mr. Conmee) has very little confidence in the ability of the Minister of Justice to advocate the measure which he has before the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) feels called upon to get up and assist the minister, and, to that end, to occupy half an hour of the precious time of this House.

Mr. BRODER. I think this Bill ought to be very carefully considered. I agree that if you allow the export of power from the Canadian side and thereby build up industries in the United States, at such places at Detroit and Buffalo, after those industries have been built up depending upon the permanency of this power, you cannot reasonably take it away from them. I think that is one great difficulty in the way of dealing with this matter in the future. You would have to face the possibility of reprisals on the part of the Americans, to the injury of those in Canada who are using power from the United States. Moreover, it seems to me that this proposition of the minister will lead to so great development that, unless export is allowed to the United States, power may become a drug in the market on our side. But, if development goes on and export to the United States is generally allowed, it would mean that Canadian enterprises would get little or no benefit from these power developments. For these reasons, it seems to me, steps should be taken to obtain reciprocal action on the part of the American people. While it is true that at Niagara there is power on the Canadian side which the Americans want to use, it is also true that further east there are water-powers in the State of New York which could only have an assurance of revenue if they were free to export power to consumers on the Canadian side. Take, for instance, the power at Massena, and then at Waddington, where probably 30,000 horse-power could be developed. In view of these circumstances I think the government should ascertain whether it is not possible to deal with the Americans on a reciprocal basis.

Mr. BRISTOL. The section under debate raises very serious business considerations. While there is undoubtedly fairness in the argument of the minister that, if this water-power is to be used, it must be used now, there are other considerations which, I am sure, the minister is anxious to bear in mind. In the first place, if there is a surplus of power, the effect must be to cheapen power to the Canadian consumer. The minister and the government must be anxious to develop industries with the Niagara Falls power and other water-powers as a basis. I do not like the proposal made to restrict the export to the surplus. If it were to a certain proportion of the surplus —say three quarters for instance—a supply for the requirements in Canada would be better assured and the Bill would be fairer in the interest of the public. I do not want to lay down a hard and fast rule as the amendment does concerning the dividing of the amount, but there should be a reasonable surplus retained for use in Canada. Let us see, as a matter of history, what has happened at Niagara Falls. The original power company, the Rankin Company, was established at a time when electricity was little used for power. The Rankin Company was the chief promoter of industries which eventually used the surplus power in the United States and made it necessary to develop power on the Canadian side. They built the Gorge Railway; they bought the railway on the Canadian side which they supplied with power; they established innumerable industries on the American side. If the minister reserves a substantial surplus in the hands of the Canadian producer he is doing no justice to the producer of power at the present time, and, on the other hand he is furnishing an incentive to the establishing of industries on the Canadian side to use power. As to this question of surplus, I would point out that we have no information before us as to how the decision concerning surplus is to be arrived at. Is there to be a commission to inquire into the needs on the Canadian side? Have we information as to the sources of power throughout the country and what they will produce, so that the minister can say what will be a surplus in the case of each power relatively to all the producers and to the demands of the vicinity? And the licensee may have an arrangement to supply consumers in the United States, as some of the companies now have. The whole power will be surplus, because they do not care whether they sell to Canada or not, for they sell in the United States. As it says in the section:

> Any such license may provide that the quantity of power or fluid to be exported shall be limited to the surplus, after the license has supplied for distribution to customers for use in Canada power or fluid to the extent defined by such license.

The licensee may have no Canadian customers. There is nothing to compel him, and no incentive to induce him, to have Canadian customers. He might come and

say, I have no Canadian customer, why should I not sell the whole of my surplus in the States ? I do not think that is the intention of the minister. The clause requires most careful consideration, and before we determine a matter of this kind we should have more information on this question of surplus. What happens in the United States ? For some reason that I have not been able to ascertain, they have apparently limited the horse-power to be exported from Canada into the United States to 160,000. Now if we had a guarantee that they would keep it at that point, I do not think we would need to trouble ourselves much about it ; because if we have 400,000 horse-power, and if the minister is correct in saying that 80,000 is all we need and if the United States alone will take 160,000, certainly we have no occasion to bother ourselves very much. But these conditions may change at any moment, therefore it is important for us to consider these two facts ; that if there is a certain amount of surplus over and above the needs of the community in Canada, then there is an inducement to great concerns to establish industries for the use of this surplus power as there was at the Soo ; and in the next place, if there is a substantial surplus retained in Canada it is going to decrease the price of power to the Canadian consumer.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. One of the main objects of this Bill is to protect the Canadian consumer of electric power, but there is a question apparently of the best method of doing that. I think this point has been lost sight of, that at the present time the users of power are large concerns who can go to these electric companies and ask for a large quantity of power with some expectation of getting it. But I wish to point out that there is an enormous field for electric power in Canada that is as yet untouched. The small users of power have not yet been able to get it. A man who wants to buy a horse-power cannot go to these large companies and demand it, and if thousands and thousands of men who want four or five horse-power cannot go to the companies and demand it. then these companies have a surplus which, under this Bill, they are at liberty to export. But if the amendment of the member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) is inserted in the Bill, it would be the business and interest of these large corporations to find a market in Canada for as much of their power as they possibly can. because they can export an equal quantity under these terms to the United States. If some inducement of bringing money into their pockets is not held out compelling them to take this course, it will be to their interest to export into the United States in large quantities. and there will never be any surplus of any amount in Canada simply because the small consumer cannot go and ask for it. Now I imagine that within 200 miles of Niagara Falls, the day is not far distant when almost every man, every farmer, will be able to use this electric power in his farming operations. The great development that has occurred within the last 25 years in the use of electric power leads us to expect that within the next twenty-five years this power will be very generally used. That being the case, there will be a demand for at least half the power that can be generated at Niagara Falls under the present charters. Unless some strong company has an inducement to devise ways and means of offering it to small consumers, these latter will never be in a position to get it. This proposal of the member for Lincoln and Niagara will, in my judgment, tend greatly to bring that condition about whereby these small users will be able to have offered to them this power. The Hydro Electric Power Commission has estimated that 5 horse-power can be delivered at about $40 per horse-power. Every farmer knows that it costs him at least $100 a year for one horse-power, and if he can have this electric power delivered to him at a cost of not exceeding $40 per horse-power, he will effect an enormous saving, and this will apply to tens of thousands of farmers who are in easy reach of this power. The same remark will apply to Grand Falls, N.B. It has been said that this amendment will shut out the development of that power. But I believe the province of New Brunswick can easily use all the power within its boundaries, at any rate all the power that can be developed at Grand Falls can easily be used within a hundred miles of that point ; and if this amendment were carried, it would be the business of some company that desired to develop that power, to find means of offering it to those small consumers who are only waiting for an opportunity of getting it at a reasonable cost. For every horse-power that was used in New Brunswick they could sell one horse-power to the United States. There ought to be some provision in this Bill that will permanently protect the small users of power in Canada. If this privilege were once offered and used by great undertakings on the other side of the line, and our government were at any time to cancel the license, it might have the effect of injuring industries, perhaps of wiping out a town or village that had been in the enjoyment of this cheap power for a long time. If the provision of the Bill which enables the government to cancel this right at short notice, were put in operation, it would be a great hardship to these people who had perhaps built up an enterprise at large expense, but who would not have done so if they had supposed it might be cancelled at any time. The United States government would very likely take exception to our cancelling such a contract as that, and it would get us into difficulty. It seems to me therefore we ought to be

very careful in making any provision for exporting this power that will tie our hands in Canada in the future. This power is of such estimable value, especially to the province of Ontario where coal is expensive, and where this power can be obtained cheaply, that we must be very careful how we bind ourselves in the future with regard to it.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps I was not in the House when an explanation was made of clause 4 which says :

Subject to any regulations of the Governor in Council in that behalf, the minister may grant licenses subject to such conditions as he thinks proper for the exportation of defined quantities of power or fluid where a right to export exists by lawful authority.

Then the Bill is confined altogether to the granting of licenses to parties who have power to export by lawful authority. What does the minister mean by that ? Does he mean that provincial legislatures may legislate upon the matter before he can issue a license ? In that case you will need to explain what quantities they may export.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The phrase to which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has called attention is taken from the suggestion of Hon. Mr. Whitney, Premier of Ontario who, referring to section 4, says :

It is suggested that this should be amended by inserting after the word 'fluid' in the fourth line the following words 'where such power of exportation exists by lawful authority.' Unless this is done it might be claimed that the language used overrides the limitations imposed on some companies under provincial statutes and agreements.

It was in that view that he made the suggestion and his suggestion was at once adopted.

Mr. HAGGART. Does it not limit your whole Bill to that ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It would have its operation no doubt upon the whole Bill, but it simply provides that where there is the right to export existing the licenses may be granted. If there is no right to export the license would be useless.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I would be in favour of reserving a very considerable surplus of power over and above our possible present and future requirements. Only a few years ago if any one had told us that Niagara power could have been transmitted for instance, to Toronto, we would have laughed at the idea. The development of electricity, it is said, is only even now in its infancy and it would be very interesting to know, if electricity can be transmitted to points in the state of New York within a radius of 100 miles of Niagara Falls, whether we will not require in the near future nearly as much electricity for similar purposes on the Canadian side of Niagara Falls. If this country is going to grow and develop in the way in which we hope it will, the western peninsula of Ontario, as far east as Toronto at any rate, and north to some extent, will be a great manufacturing centre for the supply of products which will go all over Canada and particularly to our Northwest. We will become as great a manufacturing country in that locality as is the state of New York. Besides that, if it is possible to produce electricity as cheaply as we have been told it can be produced, we cannot at present say to what uses it may be put. The development of electrical railways in that part of the province of Ontario, the possible use of electrical power to some extent on railways which now use steam power, and all those things must result in a largely increased demand for electrical energy. I agree with the views which have been stated here this afternoon in regard to the matter of granting licenses or of prohibiting the export of electricity by an export duty. If you grant licenses and an industry grows up on the other side of the line which is dependent upon this power it will be very difficult afterwards to cut out that industry by preventing the power from going into the United States for the purpose of supplying that particular industry either by putting on an export duty or by refusing a license. My view is that it will become an international affair. It seems to me that whatever licenses we grant we cannot very well revoke, and if we permit electricity to be taken out of the country by the United States we cannot very well stop the export in the future. There is a very large amount of electricity to be developed and I should think we ought to be very careful in guarding our interests on the Canadian side of the line and in seeing that a very considerable surplus over our possible present and future requirements is retained on the Canadian side, and I would therefore be in favour of the resolution of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) or the government expect to hear anything from the provincial government in regard to the Bill. An intimation came to me indirectly which may be unfounded, but it was to the effect that this government would await some further communication from them.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. On the last occasion that this Bill was in committee the suggestion was made that these two clauses particularly had better be referred to the consideration of the government of the province of Ontario as that province was especially interested. That was done. An answer was received from the First Minister expressing his views in regard to these sections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Since the Bill was last under consideration ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes. Then, Mr. Chairman, in reference to the various points which have been suggested in regard to the clause under consideration, let me say a word.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. minister, if he is going to deal at large with the objections to this Bill, kindly permit me to say one or two words and then he may be in a better position to deal with them all. I think it is rather apparent that whether or not the amendment of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) is accepted there should be some amendment to section 5. I recognize the difficulties of the position. It is not an easy matter to deal with. Whoever would undertake to place this subject in a satisfactory condition in so far as export is concerned, would find himself confronted with difficuties of no ordinary character. But the objection to clause 5 is of a twofold character.

In the first place clause 5 does not lay down any principle by which the Governor in Council shall be guided in coming to a conclusion. It simply declares that :

> Any such license may provide that the quantity of power or fluid to be exported shall be limited to the surplus, after the licensee has supplied for distribution to customers for use in Canada power or fluid to the extent defined by such license.

That leaves it absolutely open to the Governor in Council to follow any principle that may seem good to the Governor in Council, and there is no guide, it seems to me, to be found in the provisions of clause 5 which would enable us at the present time to conclude by what rule or by what standard the Governor in Council will control its action in the issue of licenses and in framing the restrictions and provisions which are to be contained in such license.

The other objection is that the Governor in Council is about the worst body that could be found for the purpose of dealing with such a matter. I say that for two reasons ; in the first place, because the Governor in Council is not composed of persons having any special knowledge of the conditions which should control the export. It is composed of men who are very much taken up and occupied with their political as distinguished from their administrative duties. For that reason one would not anticipate that any administration—I am not speaking especially of the present administration—would be a very competent or capable body to deal with a question of this kind. The answer may be that they would be governed by the report of some officer, but when we are confronted by that answer, then, there is another consideration.

That is the consideration that the Governor General in Council under our system is and necessarily must be a partisan body. It represents presumably a majority of the people of this country and it certainly must always represent a majority of the members of parliament. It is a partisan body, it acts as a partisan body and you will have entrusted to the Governor General in Council under the provision of section 5, very delicate questions indeed, questions which concern the material advantage of their political friends, questions which concern the material advantage of their political opponents ; and it does not seem to me that it is wise to entrust so delicate a power as this must necessarily be to a body of that kind. We are rapidly approaching a condition in which the most important legislative powers in this country are being entrusted to the Governor General in Council. We have a proposal from the government, which I refer to only by way of illustration, that they shall be at liberty to put in force by order in council an intermediate tariff which would create very great confusion in the business interests of this country. We have another proposal that the Governor General in Council shall have the power to make the British preferential tariff apply only to goods entering by Canadian ports, another very important power which could not fail to have somewhat important effects upon certain business interests in the country. And now we have this proposal that a control which must necessarily be exercised under unusual and delicate conditions is also to be entrusted to the Governor General in Council. I would think that some alternative could be found for that—and I am assuming in what I now say that the government does not accede to the proposition of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster). If the clause is to be retained without anything more in the way of a guiding principle than it contains at present it would seem to me at least that the power to be exercised under this clause should be entrusted to some other body.

The Minister of Justice referred incidentally the other day to a proposal, an idea which had passed through his mind, that the power of control might be entrusted to the Railway Commission or some similar permanent non-partisan body. I would prefer to do that, I would prefer to entrust the control to the Railway Commission and to reorganize that commission. Already it has outgrown its name and I think the work imposed on it demands that it should be increased in its working power and be reorganized. I think it should properly perhaps be called the Public Utilities Commission or by some name of that kind because it is already entrusted with powers relating to telephones and many other similar matters and already its jurisdiction extends far beyond matters connected with

railways and transportation. It has been said that the Railway Commission is overworked at the present time. That is not an argument, it seems to me, for entrusting this power to the Governor General in Council, but it might be a good argument and would be a good argument if what I am now suggesting should be accepted, that the Railway Commission ought to be reorganized and given a name more in consonance with the extensive powers which are already imposed on it, and that powers of this character should be given to it rather than to the Governor General in Council.

Mr. PATERSON. Would you not prefer the Governor in Council to one minister?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that on the whole I would, yes. But my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) must realize that a great many of the objections which I referred to when we last discussed this measure are equally objections to control by the Governor General in Council. I am sure the minister will realize that. I am not discussing this from a partisan standpoint or suggesting that this government would be any more liable to exercise this power in a wrong direction or by wrong methods than any other government. That is a matter I desire to put aside for the moment and to discuss this purely from a public standpoint. Every criticism I am making in this regard, would be just as applicable to a Conservative administration as to the present administration. I do not think it is a good principle. We know that these matters are disposed of by the Governor in Council, that certain important matters are referred to the party caucus and we know that, sometimes at least, the really important discussion takes place in the party caucus, and not in the House of Commons or in the other branch of the legislature, because under the system which we have in this country it is more or less the rule, and I suppose it has been more or less the rule under all administrations, that those who differ in council come down and support the action of the government because that is incident to the principle of solidarity which controls parliamentary government; and the same principle is carried to a certain extent into the caucus; that which the majority in the caucus decides upon is very often, probably in most instances, supported by the united party in the House. Thus it strikes me that we ought not to extend the principle of government by Order in Council. What is proposed by the Governor in Council will be supported by the members of the Cabinet even although a very considerable minority may not favour the proposal in the first instance. What is proposed by the Governor in Council, or rather what has been done by the Governor in Council—that is an important distinction—is usually supported by the party caucus. The party caucus may take a stand before governmental action has intervened, but when once governmental action has intervened, and the fate of the government will depend on the action which the caucus takes with regard to that particular proposal, the usual outcome is that the party caucus supports the action which has been previously taken by the Governor in Council. For these reasons it seems to be inadvisable that the principle of legislation by Governor in Council should be extended, and it is in that aspect and for that reason that I would be opposed to conferring powers of this character upon the Governor in Council, whether the administration which has to deal with the matter is Conservative or is Liberal.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The general scope of this measure and the purpose for which it was introduced must be apparent upon the face of the provisions of the Bill themselves without reference to the words of explanation or discussion which have been spoken in the House and in the committee with regard to it; and yet the observations which have fallen from some hon. gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon, particularly by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) make me think that the intention with which this Bill has been introduced must have been, at all events for the moment, lost sight of altogether. The hon. gentleman spoke of this Bill as a measure which would have the effect of preventing transmission lines for the transportation of electricity being constructed in Canada and which would inevitably tend to increase the price of electrical energy in this country. Surely that conclusion could not be arrived at if reflection was had upon the existing condition of things as compared with the condition which must ensue if this Bill becomes law. At the present time we have no restriction whatever upon the exportation of electrical energy from this country, we have no control in any way over the market to which the producers of that commodity take it for sale or consumption. They naturally will seek to bring their goods to market with the least expense, with the shortest construction of transmission lines and will naturally seek to get their customers within the shortest possible radius of the place where the electric power is generated. The discussion upon this subject to-day has dealt principally with the conditions existing at Niagara, but we should not lose sight of the fact that this is a measure which, if passed, becomes applicable to conditions all along the boundary between this country and the United States. But dealing with it on the basis of conditions existing at Niagara, it is natural

that the companies which produce electricity there should seek to supply the United States market, where there is a larger demand than in this country. It is but natural that they should seek primarily to supply that market because it is at their very door, and because they have no demand here for consumption to the extent they have it immediately opposite on the other side of the river. Thus if this measure do not pass they will be absolutely free, except to the extent to which they may be controlled by contract, to dispose of their product in the markets of the United States. We propose to control, if we can, and put some check upon them. By the provisions of this Bill some check—whether effective or not remains to be seen—is put upon the unlimited and uncontrolled export of electricity. How then can it be said that this Bill will have the effect of preventing the construction of transmission lines in Canada and of raising the price of electric energy in this country? Quite the reverse. If there be hesitation on the part of the companies now to construct new transmission lines to more distant points in Canada, it is because there is nothing to restrain them from seeking a nearer market in the United States. And it is because we want to remedy that condition of things, that we bring down this Bill. My idea of the way in which this Bill will work out is possibly different from that of hon. gentlemen who have criticised it; but if my idea be correct I cannot see that the measure is open to the objections which have been made or would be in any degree improved by the adoption of an amendment which would limit the export to an amount equal to that consumed in this country. It is provided by section four that any license shall be revocable upon notice to the licensee —such notice as may be reasonable in each particular case. Section 5 provides that the amount which is to be exported shall be defined in the license. A limit is put upon the quantity that may be exported. How is that limit to be fixed? It is to be fixed by referring to the conditions existing at the time when the license is issued. If there be a demand in Canada for electric energy to an extent greater than the amount supplied, those who require electricity in Canada may surely be trusted to make representations to the government on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any provision for public notice of applications for licenses?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No, except that the regulations to be passed under this measure —and which I propose to require to be laid before the House—will necessarily provide what steps are to be taken by any one applying for a license; and no doubt some sort of public notice will have to be given, such as by advertisement in the 'Gazette.' At all events upon application being made, it would be the duty of any tribunal, which had to pass upon the question, to take some measure to inform itself of the conditions existing at the time. Section 5 puts before such tribunal its duty and indicates the extent to which parliament intended the export to be permitted. To arrive at a knowledge of the existing conditions, to ascertain the amount which at that time might be wanted for consumption in Canada, some sort of inquiry more or less public would be essential. And it seems to me that in the practical working out of the measure, those who are interested in getting electric energy for use in this country would make their wants known, and there would be in the hands of the Governor in Council or the minister or whatever tribunal shall administer this Bill, some knowledge, to a more or less specific extent, of the actual needs of Canada at the time. Once that is ascertained, it is the position of the individual producer which has to be considered. There are—looking at the question from the standpoint of the Niagara Peninsula—three companies at present at Niagara; and if the recommendations of the international waterways commission are ratified by the two countries, so that a limit of the user of water for power purposes is agreed upon, we may expect that there will be in the future but three producing plants on the Canadian side at Niagara Falls. If we know, or can ascertain within reasonable limits, the approximate amount required, at the time of the application for a license, to supply the wants of Canadian consumers, we can have no difficulty in fixing upon, approximately speaking, the surplus which may be exported to the United States. That will depend entirely upon the extent to which the different producers supply the Canadian demand—whether or not there is any particular locality or any particular body of intending consumers not being properly supplied at reasonable prices by these different producers. Giving the Governor in Council, or whatever tribunal is to administer this Bill, the intention to deal fairly in the matter, while I admit that there will be necessarily great difficulties in working out the measure, it does not seem to be impossible to work it out equitably. An inquiry being had and the necessary information obtained, it cannot be very difficult—at all events it cannot be impossible—to determine with comparative precision whether or no any particular producer is doing his share to supply Canadian wants. If he is there can be no reason for restricting his business by subjecting him to an export duty or refusing him a license to deal with the surplus energy he has produced, and which must be a waste product on his hands if he is not allowed to export it. When you have dealt with the various individual producers in that way and have secured the whole supply required by the Canadian market at any particular time, it seems to me that you have fully safeguard-

ed Canadian interests. It is said that there is great danger in the provisions of this Bill, because the demand in Canada will necessarily increase as the country develops. We all hope that will be the case, and there is in the provisions of this Bill just that degree of flexibility which such a situation will demand. By section 4 we have the express stipulation put before every licensee that his license is liable to be revoked—not for cause, not by reason of any breach on his part because that is provided for in subsection 2 of section 5—but at the discretion of the minister. Subsection 2 of section 5 provides :

Every such license shall be revocable at will by the minister if the licensee refuses or neglects to comply with any of the conditions imposed with regard to the supply and distribution of power or fluid in Canada.

But assuming he has lived up to all the conditions and requirements of his license, under section 4 that license is still revocable at any time, upon such notice to him as is deemed reasonable. Suppose, therefore, that by reason of some new locality coming into the market or by reason of the construction upon Canadian soil of some new industry, which called for a supply of 20,000 or 25,000 horse-power, there was not available for the use of that additional locality or new industry the electric power they required, their representations to that effect would inevitably come before the license issuing tribunal, and that tribunal would be expected to revoke the license after giving reasonable notice. The licensee, having that notice before him, would have reasonable time within which to make his arrangements with his United States consumers and cancel the contracts he might have entered into on the other side of the line.

Mr. FOSTER. Which licensee?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Any licensee.

Mr. FOSTER. There might be three or four licensees; there should be an equitable distribution.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes. The conditions might be such that it would be equitable only to provide for the new Canadian demand by an equal distribution upon each of the producing companies of the amount which was required for the Canadian market. These are things that cannot be provided for beforehand. Everything would depend upon the share of the Canadian supply which a particular licensee was already undertaking. If he was doing more than his fair proportion, it might be equitable to put the whole of the demand upon others and to relieve him altogether of any increase. These are things which nothing but the circumstances of the particular occasion will ever enable any tribunal to determine. Then, there is the suggestion of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto, that we ought never to crowd the surplus of the Canadian product close; that we always ought to keep something substantial on hand. Well, I do think that I am not unduly optimistic when I say that fortunately there is not at present any actual danger. Consider the conditions which we have. By the international arrangement which the Waterways Commission—so far as it has power to do so—arrived at, there is limitation proposed upon the consumption for power purposes of water on either side of the international boundary at Niagara. So much has been assigned as the limit for the Canadian companies and so much for the United States companies. The amount of horse-power which the Canadian companies under this arrangement will be able to produce when in full running order, and the amount which within measurable time they will be in a position to produce—if they are not fully equipped for producing it at present—is 415,000 horse-power. I will put it, for the purpose of illustration, at the round figure of 400,000 horse-power. Now, at present, according to the best information I have been able to obtain, I am assured that there is not more than 40,000 horse-power being consumed in Canada and there is no existing demand which is not being supplied. Some hon. gentlemen who are in a better position to know than I am, think that estimate is too small. But we will double it, and call it 80,000 horse-power, and we will then have a margin of 320,000 horse-power at all events which is not at present needed in Canada. Granted that the Canadian demand will largely increase in the near future, none the less, at the present time, we have certainly over 300,000 horse-power which we are not needing in Canada at all, and the question is, what is to be done with it? The United States has by its legislation declared that it will for the present receive only 160,000 horse-power, and no matter how much we may license exportation beyond 160,000 horse-power, our licenses would not in the least degree avail the licensees or enable them to sell in the United States, or to take into the United States anything beyond the amount the laws of that country will permit. Under these circumstances, do we not unnecessarily alarm ourselves when we argue here that we ought to provide for keeping in Canada some margin ?—25,000 horse-power is suggested by the hon. member for Lincoln. We shall have not 25,000 horse-power, but ten times that amount of surplus so far as now appears; we shall have much more than 25,000 horse-power for many years literally going to waste, because there will not be market for it anywhere. But if the margin ever does appear to grow smaller, is not that exactly the kind of thing that can be safely trusted to the

tribunal—given an honest-intentioned one—to which the administration of the Act may be assigned?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. minister will allow me: I understood him to say that the total quantity to be generated by the three companies now existing on the Canadian side is 400,000 horse-power, and the United States government, or some other authority, had set 160,000 horse-power as the limit of that to be exported from the Canadian side into the United States. On that point I would like to know is that absolutely set, and, if so, do they do it in order to protect their own powers and promote the generating of electricity on their own side?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Precisely. They are generating in the United States enough to supply their present needs, if they get 160,000 horse-power more from us, and, in order to ensure their own producers an adequate market they limit the quantity that they will take from Canada to the figure stated. If their needs increase and they cannot produce what they want, the quantity taken from Canada may be increased. But, at present, and for nearly twelve months, that is the limit they have put upon this importation of electricity across the Niagara river. The ultimate question of importance here would seem to me to be the question of the power which should administer this Bill, should it be adopted by the House. The leader of the opposition has expressed the view that section 5 is defective, because it contains no principle—or discloses none—for the guidance of the Governor General. Now, I submit, with all deference, that there is a very clear principle indicated upon the face of that section to guide anybody who is to enforce the provisions of this law, and that is the limitation of the export to surplus after the licensee has provided for distribution of power in Canada to the extent defined by the license. The Bill also provides—in a section which I cannot recall at the moment—that this supply must be at reasonable prices and under conditions which the tribunal administering the Act shall deem proper.

Mr. BRISTOL. When I was referring to keeping a substantial surplus, I agreed with the minister as to the present situation. But the important point seemed to me to be the future. We are passing a law to provide not merely for the present but for the future as well. When the tribunal in these matters is considering the question of surplus, there is nothing to indicate to that tribunal that it is to be a substantial surplus, to provide not only for the present but for the future needs of the country. And that is particularly important in a growing country like Canada.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have pointed out what seems to me to be the answer to that objection—that a demand could not spring up so suddenly that there would be no time, by giving reasonable notice to the licensee, to require the licensee to satisfy that demand. We are in a position always to take from the United States to supply Canada; and, under these circumstances, even if there were not any substantial margin maintained, there would be the means for securing for Canadian consumers all that they might require. But I cannot suppose that any right intentioned tribunal would ever allow itself to be put in such a position with regard to the surplus that Canadian interests would be endangered. As I have pointed out there is certainly no danger at the present time. And, in the course of future years, without any alteration in this legislation (if parliament did not find it advisable, in view of the changed conditions, to make alterations in this legislation)—it is a thing scarcely to be imagined that any government or any other board administering the provisions of this law would permit itself to get into such a position with regard to these licensees, that they would ever have no surplus for new Canadian wants, or that the surplus would be allowed to become so small that there would be danger that the needs of this country would not be supplied. Now, a word with regard to the tribunal——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the minister, before he leaves that branch of the subject, to allow me to point out what I mean. The reason I thought there was no principle was this: The amount of export is limited to the surplus, but when you turn to that how do you find 'surplus' defined? It is defined as that which remains after the licensees have supplied for distribution to customers for use in Canada power or fluid to the extent defined by such license. Therefore the surplus depends entirely upon what is defined in the license, and that is entirely under the control and in the discretion of the Governor in Council. It is true, we may assume that they will act according to their best lights—I am not questioning that—but still it does leave it to them to define the principle.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The proportion permitted to be exported will necessarily be different with different producers. In each case it depends upon the proportion which that producer undertakes to supply of the existing Canadian demand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not want to interrupt the minister too often, but I would like to make the point clear. You say that the surplus shall depend upon the amount to be supplied as defined by the license, but there is no principle in the clause which guides the Governor in Council in fixing the amount.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) means that there is nothing upon the face of the Bill to indicate the principle upon which the Gov-

ernor in Council shall allot the proportion of Canadian supply to each particular producer, I fully agree with him. But once you have determined how much of the existing demand ought to be supplied by a particular producer, you have necessarily determined the amount which that producer may be allowed to export. I may say that the practical situation as we know it at Niagara is such, at the present time, that one of the three companies is supplying the principal part of the Canadian present demand. Very possibly that condition of things may continue. The very circumstance that they have their lines built for the transmission of energy will naturally make them inclined to continue the supplying of the Canadian market, possibly in preference to any other. So long as they are content with that situation, so long as they are willing to supply the Canadian consumers, whether they find their customers on this side of the line or the other, there can be no reason why the larger amount of that which is permitted to be exported might not be allotted to other companies. But if there came a time when the company which was supplying the major portion of the Canadian demand complained of that situation, insisted that it was not equitable that it should bear so large a burden, if it were a burden, and that a larger portion of the Canadian demand ought to be assigned to other companies, that would be a matter for regulation by the bureau which was issuing the licenses, and to be determined, I would think, simply upon the principle that equality is equity.

Then with regard to the change which I am proposing, to substitute the Governor in Council for the minister. I have to remind the committee of what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition will recollect, that that was a suggestion made at the close of the debate in committee six weeks ago, I think by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and no doubt it is preferable to substitute the Governor in Council. Now as to the selection of the Governor in Council as a tribunal. If any better tribunal can be suggested, I am certainly not wedded to the proposal that it must be the Governor in Council. The Railway Commission has been spoken of. Now the Railway Commission, it will be remembered, is but the immediate successor of a subcommittee of the council. The Railway Commission deals with questions of fact, and the only appeal which exists from that board, except upon questions of law, is to the Governor in Council. It is in a sense but a branch of the government of the country, and it is unfortunately true that at the present time, at all events, that body has such a mass of work in hand that to increase it would, I much fear, seriously impair the efficiency of the board. There has been however from the outset in my mind, and possibly in the minds of others, the possibility that before long, in the working out of this Act, we might have a permanent board to which this duty could be well assigned. If the present International Waterways Commission becomes a permanent board, international in character, divided into two sections of equal numbers representing each their respective countries, if it became a permanent board to consider and pass upon the great questions arising out of our international waterways, there would seem to be a permanent tribunal to which the duty and responsibility of working out this measure might well be assigned. But at the present time we have not quite reached that stage, and the idea of making that board permanent has not yet taken any actual shape. Just because that board is at present of a temporary character, it would seem not to be practical to refer to it the administration of this measure. In those circumstances it seems that there is no other body available to which the responsibility of the administration of this measure could, at the present time, be satisfactorily assigned. In administering a measure of this sort, depending so largely upon questions of scientific as well as of a business nature, the Governor in Council must necessarily depend upon the report of some officer, not merely of ability and high educational attainment, but of standing and of character. The government, responsible for their acts in this House, possessing necessarily the confidence, for the time being, of this House, would seem the only tribunal that could be selected for the administration of this measure, instead of assigning it to the discretion of any particular member of the government. It does not, I may point out, confer upon the Governor in Council the power to legislate. The working out of this measure, in the powers which it is proposed to confer upon the Governor in Council, is purely administrative. The application of the different sections may rest in the hands of the Governor in Council from time to time, but that I submit is but the administering of the Act. While at the present time it has seemed that there was no other effective tribunal ready at hand to which this work could be assigned, there is not of course any necessary finality about it. The whole undertaking of this measure is experimental in its character. If, in carrying it out, difficulties are found to exist which it will be necessary to remedy, there will at all events have been made a beginning, and there will be ample opportunity to correct our mistakes, if we have made any in the provisions which we are here submitting to the House.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The minister especially objects to two of the points that

I endeavoured to make in discussing this particular section. The first is that he cannot see how it will interfere with the construction of transmission lines in the province of Ontario, particularly. That appears to be a very simple proposition. The works are located on the Niagara river, which is upon the boundary of the United States, practically within a mile of the transmission lines upon which will require to be transmitted to the United States 100,000 or 150,000 horse-power; whereas to distribute it into the parts of Ontario into which it should go would probably require two or three hundred miles of transmission lines to be constructed. I think the minister will be able to see the reason why they will prefer one to the other. Any large corporation would rather sell to a community 100,000 horse-power, than to take 10,000 customers of ten horse-power each. That is a proposition which any business concern would immediately jump at.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I said it was not this Bill that was preventing the building of transmission lines, this Bill has nothing to do with them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I did not say it was the Bill, but I say the export of the power will prevent, on this side, the building of transmission lines. I am not saying anything about the Bill. The minister is licensing a large amount of export. I say if you allow that power to be exported to the other side, it will delay the building of transmission lines on this side, because they do not want customers. They have got them. They have a large customer on the United States side who will take all that our 10,000 customers on this side might otherwise get. They do not wish to go into the details that would be required to serve the small towns and cities of western Ontario and the farmers along the line. That is the reason they are trying to find means of escape to the United States. I see that the hon. minister uses the word 'customers' in clause 5. What does he mean by the word 'customers' as used there? Present customers. Not at all. It should be the policy of the government to give electrical power to every man who wants it, the farmer or whoever he may be alongside of the transmission line. Whoever wants 50 or 100 horse-power or even 10 horse-power ought to be allowed to get it at some price—not always at the same price as a small quantity cannot be sold as cheaply as a large one. We recognize the necessity of having a wholesale and retail business, but what we say is necessary in the first place is to construct your transmission lines on this side. You cannot find out what you are going to do until you are ready to supply power. The hon. minister speaks of 40,000 horse-power. Where does he get those figures? It is very likely that he got them from the companies as that is more likely to be their estimate of the number than a statement of the actual requirements in Ontario. For instance, when I spoke a few days ago on this question I said that Mr. Beck's commission had already applications for upwards of 100,000 horse-power. Some hon. gentlemen may say that that is ample but I do not think it is. I think that if the Minister of Justice lives to as old an age as I hope he will, he will live to see all this power used by private industries and railroad companies. I believe that in a few years all the power that is being developed on the Niagara river will be required in Ontario. I think the time will come soon, and it cannot come too soon, when this power will be required by our great industrial enterprises. It sounds all very well to be told that the United States are not prepared to receive more than 160,000 horse-power. It sounds very much like an agent who is trying to sell Cobalt stocks and who comes to you and says: I will not sell you more than 10,000 shares of that stock. You were thinking of buying 100 shares, but he says that he will not sell you more than 10,000. This Bill is to regulate the export of electricity and it is the first duty of the government, whether it be the provincial or the Dominion government, to see that our customers are first provided for. The Bill speaks of 'customers' but there is no power being supplied at present. Brantford is only 25 miles west of Hamilton and we have not a horse-power in there yet from Niagara. There are Galt, Berlin, London, St. Thomas, Woodstock, Stratford and many other rising towns and cities that are using electricity and there are radial roads that are generating their own energy at present and which should be allowed to get their power from Niagara if they wish. For the minister to say that because we have only enough customers to-day to take 40,000 horse-power and that these represent the requirements of the province is quite absurd. Just let them provide their transmission lines and the requirements of the province will at once become evident.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you against exporting at all?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am not against exporting at all, but I am in favour of the regulation proposed by my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) so that what we require on this side may be reserved. I object to the remark of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) when he says that I am entirely opposed to the export of power. I am not opposed to the export of power but I say that it should only be permitted to a limited degree and that the privilege should be quickly revocable so that if a customer applies for 5,000 or 10,000 horse-power on

this side he may be able to get it at short notice. The river is, of course, large, but you are going to limit, by agreement of this international waterways commission, the amount of electricity that can be developed on the Niagara river to the amount at present being produced. There will be no more of it at any price. It is to be tied up for good and all. It is not to be used again. If the river were still available, if we could count upon planning another works there, if the government or any other large corporation could generate 100,000 horse-power more we would have a reserve force, but according to the arrangement it is proposed to limit it to the point at which it is now developed and we are never to be allowed to do anything further in that direction. Therefore I take it that the construction of transmission lines will be delayed because there is no inducement to build them. It will cost millions of dollars perhaps to put them up in all parts of the province of Ontario where they will be required. I have figures, but unfortunately I have not them here to-day, showing what a transmission line costs per mile. If I had known that this discussion was coming up I would have had them here, because they would show exactly why the company do not want to build these transmission lines. It is true that they have made a little effort in that direction, that they have got as far as Hamilton or Toronto and that they have got some of the right of way between Hamilton and Brantford but they have not done anything more. You want first of all to get them to run their lines into these towns and then when they have done that, if the minister can show us a surplus he will be justified in allowing them to export electrical power to the other side. Our requirements to-day are not our requirements to-morrow because our requirements will vastly increase as soon as these transmission lines are built. We have not been able to get what we require—a cheap economical and continuous supply. When we have currents running through these transmission lines that can be relied on at all times, ample power for every purpose, the amount required will be vastly increased and I think the minister is very much in error when he says that only 40,000 horse-power can be used.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I did not say that.

Mr. PATERSON. Supposing they put it across the river would they simply use the transmission lines of the companies on the American side, or would not they have to build their own transmission lines to reach the consuming centres in the United States the same as in Ontario? I only ask for information. The hon. gentleman has been on the commission and has some knowledge of the facts connected with this and perhaps he may be in a position to answer the question.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That would be entirely a matter of arrangement. I understand that one of the companies operating on both sides have a transmission line on the other side which will be quite sufficient to take the power that they export from this side.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you know if they supply enough on the other side now to supply the needs of all the points reached by their transmission lines?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. My information is that they could sell a great deal more over there if they could get it. However, the fact that they are likely to take a larger amount shows that they are anxious to increase their output on the other side. The United States industries adjacent to this line will be customers for this surplus power that is going from our side.

Mr. PATERSON. Do they generate enough now on the American side to supply all they need at those points in the localities that they reach? If that is the case they would not require this export. Have they not to do precisely the same in the state of New York to find new markets, as our producers would have to do?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. No. They have already transmission lines to Buffalo and Rochester; they contemplate extending these lines to other cities; they do not have to buy more right of way to transmit a million horse-power than to transmit 100,000 horse-power, for they can transmit it over the same lines. My information is, and I believe it to be correct, that the American producers are not able now to supply their requirements on their own side of the river, and hence they are coming to our side, and are likely to become our customers. What I urge on the government is this: provide to keep our own electric power in Canada, and then these industries which need that electric power will have to establish themselves on the Canadian side. Does the minister understand me?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not quite. Do they not now supply all the needs of Buffalo; or, will Buffalo want Canadian produced energy?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The needs of Buffalo are growing daily and so are our needs, and the needs of every growing industrial centre constantly demand more electricity. The minister asked me: How will this increase the price of electricity?

Mr. PATERSON. How will this Bill increase the price of electricity?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. This Bill authorizes the export of the power.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This Bill is to restrict the unlimited export of power which now exists.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. This Bill allows the export of our Canadian power up to a certain point, and the Minister of Justice figured that export at 300,000 horse-power. If the Minister of Justice, as he said, is only going to keep 80,000 horse-power on this side—and he thought 80,000 horse-power was perhaps too large—does it not stand to reason that the price of power will be higher than if the producers had to find a market for 200,000 horse-power on the Canadian side ? If we have plenty of horse-power on the Canadian side, the industries will discard their steam powers, and their gas plants, and substitute electric power for them, always of course provided, that the electric power can be obtained cheaply enough. Electricity is the cheapest and cleanest method of applying power to machinery ; no force is so direct, so instantaneous, and none can be utilized with less waste. When using steam power your plant has to be kept going, and you have to continue to supply fuel even when your machinery is not in use, but, with electricity, the moment a machine is not needed the pressure of a button causes it to stop, and it is not wasting power and not wearing itself out to no purpose. The benefits to be derived from the substitution of electric power for steam power, and power produced by gas plants, must be apparent to the thoughtful mind. I think the minister can see the common sense of the proposition, that if the Canadian producers of electric power have to find a market for a large product, and are forced to extend their ramifications through the Niagara peninsula to dispose of that power, the cheaper that power will be and the better the requirements of our own country will be served ?

Mr. FOSTER. We have the concession from the minister, that the Governor in Council instead of the individual minister, shall decide. Theoretically that is a gain ; practically I am not sure that it is. Some one minister has to be charged with this duty. Every other minister has his time absorbed in administering his own department, and it practically works out in the end, that the minister who is specially charged with any duty, must be the supreme authority whose recommendations should be taken.

Mr. PATERSON. Largely, that is the case.

Mr. FOSTER. Otherwise, the minister would be unfit for his work, and his officers would not be doing their duty if they did not give him the best information, which he has to transmit to council. What happens in practice, is, that the individual minister who makes a special study of the question through his expert officers, finds himself hampered by the necessity of drilling into the minds of thirteen others, who take no interest in it, his particular point of view, based on the information he has received. I warrant you that the minister who has to do that will time and again find that other ministers will take some other point of view, may be a party point of view, and he finds it difficult to have his own conclusions, based on his expert information, accepted by the council. In that respect, it will be found that after all, on a technical subject like this, the substitution of the Governor in Council for the minister is not of such great importance. There are other subjects as to which the Governor in Council is the best body to decide, because they possess general information as to them; but, on a technical, expert subject, the benefit of the decision of the Governor in Council as against that of the minister charged with the particular duty, is not of much practical use.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is your conclusion then ?

Mr. FOSTER. My conclusion is, that as to these questions which are largely technical, and as to which data, and the opinion of experts have to be carefully obtained, the sooner these and all such kindred subjects are relegated to a competent tribunal appointed for that purpose, the better it will be.

An hon. MEMBER. Send it to the Railway Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. That is probably the only tribunal we have at present which could deal with such matters. It would seem to me that the tribunal suggested by the Minister of Justice, which has to do with matters arising along the international line, and which has not to do with expert information as to transport and economics, is not as good a tribunal for this purpose as a public utilities commission would be. Since Governor Hughes has been elected in New York there has been a movement to merge the different boards which they formerly had in the city and state of New York (such as the Railroad and Rapid Transit Boards), and to constitute two great commissions on public utilities, one for the state of New York and the other for the city of Greater New York. In my mind that is an ideal tribunal. That is what we want in Canada. You want such a body which will obtain careful information on all these subjects as to which the aid of experts is absolutely necessary, and then you want to keep it just as far away from party patronage as you possibly can. A public utilities commission properly constituted would be one of the most useful tribunals Canada could have to dispose of all questions such as this we are discussing and such as others which

have attracted our attention of recent years. Meanwhile the Governor in Council is perhaps a broader authority than an individual minister, though practically speaking I do not see much difference in this particular case. Now, the argument of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was a sound one. We are all jealous that Canada shall have the first benefit and the fullest benefit of all her franchises and powers. On the Niagara river, near to an immense manufacturing and consuming population, you have electric power generated by three companies on the Canadian side, and by others on the United States side. The argument of my hon. friend from Brantford was that so long as you make it easy for the Canadian generators of power to sell a large proportion of their product to the American side, you will furnish them with no incentive to extend their lines of transmission through the Niagara peninsula and Ontario in order to supply the demand there. If you were to absolutely prohibit the export of power you would put the Canadian producers on their mettle. They now have facilities for generating a large quantity of power; they would have to distribute it, and that inevitably would set them to work to extend throughout Canadian territory, rather than to easily and profitably sell their power, as they now can do, to the other side of the line. Of course, to say, that just at the present moment we should prohibit the export of power would seem to bear hardly upon those who have plants there and who are looking for returns, and who contend they should be allowed to sell wherever they can find a market. To be arbitrary, and to say to these men, you shall not export at all, is, may be, a little ahead of our time. But I do not think you will find it is very much ahead of the time. I think you will find that within a very short period it will be necessary to keep all the power we have for ourselves. We all know the other side got enough of our territory and enough of our heritage away from us, and if anything is to be got from the great generating power which we have in the Canadian Niagara, let us keep it for ourselves, and let us put fair and reasonable pressure upon the corporations which have these great franchises, that they shall take pains to distribute their product to the people of Canada who are located within the transmission radius from Niagara Falls and elsewhere.

I am in sympathy then with bringing whatever pressure can fairly be brought in order that when this power is once developed it may be distributed into the working channels so far as the transmission area will permit. Then the conclusion is that if it is too arbitrary to prevent all exportation just now, keep the surplus large, and then you will have a double incentive; the man outside in the village, the town, the municipality will say: Well, if we can arrange finances, then there is the power for us if we can get the wires between us and that power; so that we will deal with the idea that there is a surplus of power which we can utilize once we are ready for it, and on the other side it will be an impelling power upon the companies to meet the demand in the country with their transmission lines, in order that they may get rid of their product. That will not be a hardship to the company. Of course the company will sell a large unit and at short distance cheaper than a small unit at a long distance. They will, however, get their profit and costs and charges; the further away from the source of production the more the power will cost so they will have their profits although they will have to exert themselves by multiplying the lines of transmission. The suggestion of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is to bring pressure on these companies to undertake that expansion of transmission in order that the greatest benefit may come to Ontario and likewise to all other portions of our country that are near the developing centres.

I think then if the government would take into consideration the creation of an absolutely efficient and absolutely well equipped public utilities commission, and putting all these technical and expert matters into their hands, it would be a vast gain to the country and it would be a great rest to the Prime Minister and the members of his Cabinet because those things are most difficult, most complicated and most unsatisfactory in the carrying out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Amendment (Mr. Lancaster) negatived.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Minister of Justice whether there was anything in the communication from the provincial government of Ontario which he thinks ought to be communicated to the committee?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I do not suppose there is anything in the letter which the writer would have the slightest objection to having made public and I propose to read Mr. Whitney's latest letter to me on the subject:

Toronto, February 28, 1907.

Dear Mr. Aylesworth,—My colleagues and I find it very difficult to say anything definite with reference to your Bill regulating the exportation of electric power.

Under agreements with three companies, we are entitled to have utilized in Canada, when called for, one-half the power developed by them.

Should any arrangement be made with the United States affecting the quantity of power to be developed on the Canadian side of the Niagara river, or should one or more of a number of other contingencies occur, our position would be a very complicated one indeed.

Some arrangement with reference to the quantities to be exported, and the regulations and conditions of exportation under which the approval of the provincial government would be necessary, might be the means of avoiding some of the possible complications. No doubt great care would be necessary in working out any provision of this kind.

Yours very truly,
J. P. WHITNEY.

There are three other clauses in which the word 'minister' ought to be changed to 'Governor in Council.' Clause 6, in the second line; clause 8, the last word in the clause; and clause 10, subsection 3, in the third line. I also propose that the definition of 'minister' in the second clause of the Bill be struck out as no longer necessary. Then, when the Bill was in committee last, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) suggested that the regulations ought to be laid before parliament within fifteen days. I propose to add a section requiring that any regulations made by the Governor in Council, under and in pursuance of the provisions of this Act, shall be laid before parliament in the first fifteen days of the session following the making of such regulations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would venture to suggest that as the regulations might be made during the session, the provision would read better as follows:

Any regulation made by the Governor in Council, under or in pursuance of the provisions of this Bill shall be laid before parliament within fifteen days after the making thereof, or, if parliament be not then in session, within fifteen days after the opening of the session.

Amendments agreed to and Bill reported.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LAND BELT, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Bill (No. 102) to ratify an agreement between the government of Canada and the government of British Columbia respecting the western boundaries of the railway belt. —Mr. Oliver.—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FOSTER. How much territory have we gained or given away?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There is neither gain nor loss. This is to define what was understood but not sufficiently defined. The British Columbia government has already ratified the proposed boundaries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This has nothing to do with a subject I brought to the attention of the minister a little time ago, concerning the selection of lands.

Mr. OLIVER. Nothing whatever.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 108) to amend the Canada Shipping Act—Mr. Aylesworth—was read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FOSTER. Has this Bill been distributed?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister might explain the Bill, as we have not copies of it?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The Bill is to introduce into section 287 of the Canada Shipping Act the phrase 'at the time of the offence.' This will have this effect: Under the Act as it now stands a seaman or apprentice who deserts, refuses to obey lawful orders or commits any other offence against discipline mentioned in the section, is liable to penalty on summary conviction, provided that he has entered into articles with the ship while she was a registered Canadian ship. In one case which has recently arisen in British Columbia, seamen who deserted or refused to obey orders, when brought before a magistrate for trial, were acquitted because they showed that they had entered into articles when the ship was not a Canadian ship. Articles were signed in Christiania, Norway. These articles contemplated a voyage from Christiania to Vancouver, and then a whaling voyage. But, because they had entered into their obligations before the ship was a Canadian ship, they were able to escape conviction for the offence. What is proposed is that the section shall read:

If a seaman or apprentice lawfully engaged or bound to any ship, registered in any of the provinces at the time of the offence, commits any of the following offences, he shall be liable, on summary conviction:

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

PETROLEUM BOUNTY ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 97) to amend the Petroleum Bounty Act.—Mr. Templeman.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). Before you proceed with this Bill, Mr. Chairman, may I ask if it is printed in French?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The letters indicating that the Bill has been printed in English and French appear on the order paper when the Bill stands for second reading. If it passes the second reading stage it is supposed that the Bill must have been printed in French.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. But is it printed in French?

Mr. BRODEUR. Can my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) state that it is not so printed?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then my hon. friend should have put the question when the Bill was up for second reading. It is too late now.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask your ruling on that point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My opinion is that the objection is too late.

On section 1,

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. When this was under consideration before, objection was taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side, to the words 'special or general.' These are not material and I move to strike them out, so that the section will read :

Section 2 of the Petroleum Bounty Act, 1904, is hereby amended by adding thereto the words 'or to such other person interested as the Governor in Council by regulation approves.'

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

On motion for third reading :

Mr. FOSTER. Before this Bill is read the third time, would it be too much to ask the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if, within a reasonable time, he would have a committee or commission appointed to codify that large and rapidly increasing body of law which is being made by order in council.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps later on.

Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—SENATOR FOR ROUGEMONT.

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

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to call the attention of the government and especially the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) to an article published in 'La Patrie' about the nomination of a senator for Rougemont :

(Translation.)

The Appointment of Senator Dessaulles.

Mr. Girard, the Member from Rouville, vents his Dissatisfaction and Makes Disclosures.

(Special to 'La Patrie.')

Quebec, 12.—The late call of Mr. Dessaulles to the Senate as the representative of Rougemont, though made by the federal authorities, is very much discussed by the members of the Legislative Assembly. The provincial representatives had sent a joint and unanimous petition urging that Mr. Alfred Girard, the member from Rouville, be appointed, and it was expected that this request would be complied with. I have been acquainted with the circumstances of this appointment by Mr. Girard himself. These are his very words:

When Senator Hingston died my colleagues in the legislature, without first consulting me, prepared a petition to Sir Wilfrid Laurier asking for my nomination to the Senate.

When I heard of the movement I said that I could not accept without the authorization of my leaders. This authorization, however, had been accorded in advance. All the provincial ministers supported the recommendation to the federal government, which was taken to Ottawa by the member for Laprairie. Sir Wilfrid replied that the matter was in the hands of the Minster of Marine.

Mr. Brodeur first stated that he feared to open the county of Rouville by appointing Mr. Girard. Hon. Mr. Gouin, however, relieved him of this apprehension by saying that he would be responsible for the provincial election. In the meantime a petition, signed by 210 leading Liberals in the county of Rouville, was sent to Hon. Mr. Brodeur, claiming the position for a man from the county of Rouville, and recommending their local member. Hon. Mr. Brodeur, whom I met in Ottawa, on Tuesday last, gave me to understand that the question was settled.

He spoke to me as follows: 'I will keep the position for myself. I will appoint in the first place Mr. Dessaulles, whose resignation I have in my pocket, to take effect on the eve of the elections when I will take his place and become leader of the Senate.' I declared to Mr. Brodeur that I could not endorse such a scandalous act, and I would not be a party to such affront to the county of Rouville by its own member.

I told him that he could appoint some one besides myself, but it must be some one from the county, which had waited long enough its turn.

Informed of the fact, my friends advised me to appeal directly to Sir Wilfrid Laurier in order to prevent the perpetration of this injustice.

I went to Ottawa and saw Mr. Brodeur, who said that everything would be arranged, that the county of Rouville would have its senator and that it was not necessary to speak to the Prime Minister.

On the faith of this promise I returned. This was on Friday, and on Saturday the Governor General in Council appointed Mr. Dessaulles, of St. Hyacinthe.

I was at Marieville when the news arrived. I received messages from all parts of the county, and you can say that the dissatisfaction is general amongst the Liberals of the county of Rouville.

Those are the very words which Mr. Girard uttered when he knew that they would be held forth.

I understand that Mr. Girard will find means of ventilating this burning question at this afternoon sitting.

Now, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what he has to say with regard to this statement of Mr. Girard.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have to say at the outset I do not believe Mr. Girard has given the interview which has just been read by my hon. friend, because this interview, as reported, is absolutely incorrect from beginning to end. I desire to state before this House that the allegation in this reported interview that Mr. Dessaulles was appointed on the condition that he should resign the

senatorship in my favour is absolutely untrue. No offer of that kind was ever made by me; no arrangement of that kind was entered into with him with regard to the Senate, nor was any mention made of it at all.

DR. SPOHN AND A SENATORSHIP.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). In connection with vacancies in the Senate that now exist, I understand there are three in the province of Ontario, one of which has been held by the Hon. James Robert Gowan, who represented the county of Simcoe. Now, if territory is to be regarded, I would like to ask the First Minister if it is correct that Dr. P. H. Spohn, of Penetanguishene, and who was a member of this House in 1891, has to-day a written pledge from the First Minister that he is to get a seat in the Senate. Before the First Minister replies. I would like to state some of the facts in this connection as regards that riding, and perhaps adduce some evidence in support of the statement that Dr. Spohn does hold a pledge over the signature of the Prime Minister himself. During the somewhat celebrated Cook investigation as to a seat in the Senate, the following among other facts was produced in evidence. Here is a letter written by the Hon. M. C. Cameron, afterwards governor of the Northwest Territories, to Mr. H. H. Cook :

Ottawa, August 27, 1896.

Dear Cook,—The applicants so far as I can find out are 1, Cox ; 2, J. K. Kerr ; 3, Jaffray ; 4, A. P. Cockburn ; 5, James Innes ; 6, Spohn—the latter three are here pressing their claims. Cockburn is the man you spoke of——

There is a blank here. I think the word omitted is 'in.'

—your many elections. I should say Cox is the most formidable. I had several conversations with C. who is sound. I called at M.'s office four times but could not find him in. I will go to his house to-morrow and sound him and let you know, meantime if you pull any string quietly—do it.

There is a letter written by H. H. Cook to the Prime Minister. It is a long one, and I will only read part of it :

Indeed, I am sure that some of the payments made would, if I am rightly informed, be a surprise to you, especially as one of the recipients now wants a senatorship.

He refers there to the expenses, labours and sacrifices of the election in which he had been a contestant in East Simcoe in 1896. Now, I have it on the authority of a gentleman whose word I have always thought was perfectly good and which goes for a great deal in the county, that he has himself seen such a letter, and I have had the assurance of different gentlemen who have been told by Dr. Spohn that he has such a letter in his possession. I would like the First Minister to state whether it is a fact that Dr. Spohn has such a letter in his possession. Now, it will be seen from the letter written by Mr. Cameron to Mr. Cook in the summer of 1896, immediately after these hon. gentlemen came into power, that there was a vacancy in the Senate and that Dr. Spohn, according to Mr. Cameron's letter, was on the ground looking after the position. After the general election of 1896 a number of contestations were entered in the province of Quebec. I had been elected in the by-election of 1892 and my election had been protested. Election protests were about to proceed in the province of Quebec. The one against myself, with two others which I need not mention, were then questions in adjustment between the two parties. As I understood at that time, and as it was currently reported, there was great pressure brought to bear upon Dr. Spohn to withdraw the protest against myself. As to the pressure, I know not, because it was not a matter that would come under my notice. But I do know that the protest was withdrawn on the condition, I presume, that the seat was to go to Dr. Spohn, and I have the assurance of one gentleman that he saw a letter in which the Prime Minister then pledged Dr. Spohn that when a vacancy presented itself, in the event of the Liberal party coming into power, his claim for a senatorship would be considered. In corroboration of that fact is this, that early after the advent of this government to power Dr. Spohn was here pressing his claim for a senatorship, that is, if the letter of Mr. Cameron's is correct, and I assume that it is. Now, I would like to ask the First Minister if the appointment has been made for that district of a successor to Senator Gowan, and furthermore, if it is a fact that Dr. Spohn has such a written pledge in his possessions, or had at any time, from the Prime Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have always thought that I was blessed with a pretty good memory, but certainly my memory is not equal to the task imposed upon it by my hon. friend to-day. He wants to know if I wrote a letter to Dr. Spohn some ten years ago.

Mr. BENNETT. In 1892.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is worse, 14 years ago. I must say that I am not equal to the task.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I assume that Dr. Spohn's statement is correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know what Dr. Spohn has said and I am not responsible for it.

DIVERSION OF IMMIGRANTS FROM ONTARIO.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to call the attention of the government and particularly of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to an article which appeared in last evening's Toronto 'News' which contains a statement made by Mr. Southworth, Immigration Commissioner for the province of Ontario, at a meeting of the Agriculture Committee of the legislature held at the parliament building at Toronto yesterday, in which Mr. Southworth states that the Dominion government is using every means in its power to divert immigrants from the province of Ontario both by the appointment of Dominion agents at the ports of arrival and also by the appointment of some 200 or 300 immigration agents in the neighbourhood of Toronto whose duty it is to endeavour to persuade immigrants destined for that province to leave it and go to the west and who are rewarded by a certain per capita payment for each immigrant that they might thus secure. The evidence of Mr. Southworth is very short and in the words following:

Mr. Southworth briefly outlined the past history and present position of immigration affairs in the province. For the past four years the applications from farmers for farm labourers had averaged about 8,000. Last year there were sent direct to the farms from Toronto 6,500 labourers, not including children or men the farmers had engaged themselves at the depots, nor the large number of immigrants who had not gone to the farms.

The Dominion government had recently appointed agents in the counties around Toronto to divert some of them from the Bureau. This year, Mr. Southworth had been informed that from 200 to 300 agents had been appointed by the Dominion government to have immigrants shipped direct to them, and who would receive a per capita fee for each one placed. Although there would probably be a greater number come over, it was altogether likely there would not be so many handled by the Bureau. He was of the opinion that this action of the Dominion government was unnecessary and harmful, and something should be done to work in unison. The Dominion was also more interested in the northwest, and diverted them at the sea-board from Ontario, and the province had no means of keeping tab on them.

I would like to ask the government if they are pursuing the policy there stated?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This is a question which more closely concerns my hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who deals with immigration matters. But, my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) appealed to me and all I can say from conversation with my colleague and with the officers of the department is that the policy has been adopted of naming agents for the placing of immigrants in different parts of the country. My information is particularly in regard to the province of Quebec with which I am more familiar, but I understand that the same kind of policy has been adopted in Ontario of naming different people in different localities in the older settled parts of the country who would find out where immigrants could be placed to advantage on farms and who would facilitate the placing of them there. That policy, I believe, will contribute to the economical placing of the immigrants where they are most needed and where they will soonest find remunerative and successful employment.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Then the statement made by Mr. Southworth is substantially correct?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot follow it exactly. I have stated what I know of the matter.

Mr. BARR. Would the hon. gentleman give a list of those agents? I have received several letters from my riding asking to obtain information concerning where they would find men to engage on farms. Would the hon. minister bring down that list?

Mr. FISHER. No, I certainly have no list. I have no doubt my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior can give the list if it is required by the House.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. In view of the answer of the Minister of Agriculture in which he says that this matter does not arise in his department and inasmuch as the Minister of the Interior, in whose department the matter does exist, is not here, I would ask the government to have the matter considered and I would expect that the minister will to-morrow make some announcement in regard to the matter.

SENATOR FOR ROUGEMONT.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) propounded a question a few moments ago and read an article from a newspaper in French. As far as I am concerned myself, and I presume there are many other hon. members on both sides of the House like me, I did not understand what that article contained. When the hon. gentleman concluded reading it I asked him to repeat it in English, but I presume he did not hear me. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) gave his reply in English. That I understood perfectly. I have an article here in the Montreal 'Gazette' of to-day which reads as follows.

An angry Liberal—Mr. Girard, M.L.A. for Rouville, charges peculiar arrangement by Minister of Marine—Saving seat in the Senate—Mr. Dessaulles is doing this for Hon. Mr. Brodeur, says the disappointed one.

Mr. Alfred Girard, M.L.A. for Rouville, gives the following interview to 'La Patrie' concerning the senatorial succession to the late Sir Wm. Hingston:

When Senator Hingston died my colleagues in the legislature, without first consulting me, prepared a petition to Sir Wilfrid Laurier asking for my nomination to the Senate.

I presume that the right hon. leader of the government will say whether he received such a petition or not.

When I heard of the movement I said that I could not accept without the authorization of my leaders. This authorization, however, had been accorded in advance. All the provincial ministers supported the recommendation to the federal government, which was taken to Ottawa by the member for Laprairie. Sir Wilfrid replied that the matter was in the hands of the Minister of Marine. Mr. Brodeur stated that he feared to open the county of Rouville by appointing Mr. Girard. Hon. Mr. Gouin, however, relieved him of this apprehension by saying that he would be responsible for the provincial election. In the meantime a petition, signed by 210 leading Liberals in the county of Rouville was sent to Hon. Mr. Brodeur, claiming the position for a man from the county of Rouville, and recommending their local member.

Hon. Mr. Brodeur, whom I met in Ottawa, on Tuesday last, gave me to understand that the question was settled. He spoke to me as follows: 'I will keep the position for myself. I will appoint in the first place Mr. Dessaulles, whose resignation I have in my pocket, to take effect on the eve of the elections when I will take his place and become leader of the Senate.' I declared to Mr. Brodeur that I could not endorse such a scandalous act, and that I would not be a party to such an affront to the county of Rouville by its own member. I told him that he could appoint some one besides myself, but it must be some one from the county, which had waited long enough its turn. Informed of the fact my friend advised me to appeal directly to Sir Wilfrid Laurier in order to prevent the perpetration of this injustice. I went again to Ottawa and saw Mr. Brodeur, who said that everything would be arranged, that the county of Rouville would have its senator and that it was not necessary to speak to the Prime Minister. On the faith of this promise I returned. This was on Friday, and on Saturday the Governor General in Council appointed Mr. Dessaulles, of St. Hyacinthe. I was at Marieville when the news arrived. I received messages from all parts of the county, and you can say that the dissatisfaction is general amongst the Liberals of the county of Rouville.

I would like to inquire of the hon. member for Montmagny if this is the same article that he read in French which I do not understand, and I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the government if he received this petition referred to here in the article I have just read, and if the reply that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave to the hon. member for Montmagny will be the same reply that he will give to the article I have just read.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has already answered. So far as I am concerned I received such a petition.

Mr. TAYLOR. And you made the reply, as the paper says, that the matter was in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I forget what the reply was.

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

Progress reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business may we expect to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up the Land Bill of the Minister of the Interior.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 14, 1907,

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 115) to amalgamate the Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company and the Erie and Ontario Development Company, Limited, into one corporation under the name of the Jordan-Erie Power Company.

INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116) to amend the Interpretation Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose this is of a formal character?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The purpose of this legislation is to correct an inadvertent error in the Interpretation Act by which the Court of Appeal for Manitoba is not included in the definition of a Superior Court.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

SURVEY OF TRENT CANAL.

Mr. WARD asked:

What was the cost of the survey made by E. J. Walsh, C.E., of that portion of the pro-

posed Trent valley canal between Rice lake and Lake Ontario, (1) via Port Hope ; (2) via Cobourg ; (3) via Trenton ?

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

1. Rice lake to Port Hope, survey, $10,-331.19.

2. Rice lake to Cobourg, survey, $11,793.61.

3. Rice lake to Trenton, survey, $14,370.47.

INVESTIGATING COLLAPSE OF TOWER.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

What amount has been paid for investigating the collapse of the tower on the western block, and to whom was the money paid ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Paid : D. H. McLean, $350; A. C. Campbell, $61.95; E. S. Mattice, $155.20; F. R. McNamara, $317.30; A. C. Hutchison, $571 ; E. L. Horwood, $220 ; S. G. Curry, $692.16; total, $2,367.61.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister the total cost of the tower?

Mr. BRODEUR. The question only asks for the cost of the investigation.

LAND GRANTS TO SOUTH AFRICAN WAR VETERANS.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. What steps have been taken by the government to carry into effect the resolution of this House to set apart grants of Dominion lands for those residents of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, who took part in the South African war, 1899-1902 ?

2. If no steps have been taken up to the present time, when is it proposed to take them?

3. What terms and conditions do the government propose in regard to these grants ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1, 2 and 3. A Bill is at present being prepared by the Department of the Interior, with the concurrence of the Minister of Militia and Defence, in order to set apart certain lands in the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan to be given, according to the terms of the resolution of parliament passed this session, as a grant to those who enlisted in the above named provinces and served during the South African war, and action will be taken as soon as possible.

TAXATION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Is the statement correct which has appeared in the public press that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has refused the application of the Dominion to appeal in the cases of the taxation of Canadian Pacific Railway lands, referred to in the answer of the Minister of Justice, given on the 20th February last ? If so, what were the grounds of the refusal ?

2. Will the government lay copies of the papers in this case on the table of the House?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. The application referred to was made to the Judicial Committee on the 27th February, 1907, when their lordships, in view of the length of time which has passed since the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, declined to advise His Majesty to interfere.

2. If the House so directs.

PORT BRUCE HARBOUR.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to do any repairing to the Port Bruce harbour this year ?

2. Has there been any correspondence lately with reference to the harbour ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Matter under consideration.

2. Yes.

CARRIAGE OF COAL ON CROW'S NEST LINE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. Referring to the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the Crow's Nest line of railway, what is the maximum price now being charged for coal, free on board the cars, on that railway ?

2. What steps has the government taken to fulfil the assurances made, if any, by them on the 18th June, 1897, that the price would not exceed $2 a ton ?

3. If the government has taken no steps, when do they propose to do so, and what is their policy in regard to this question ?

4. What are the freight rates now charged on coal delivered at, say, Moosejaw and Brandon ?

5. Are these rates lower than when the railway first commenced operation ? If so, how much lower ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The Department of Railways and Canals has no information as to the price now being charged for carrying coal from the mines, nor is such information in the possession of the government. But I am taking steps to secure the necessary information, and will deal with the matter thereafter.

PETROLEUM BOUNTY.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). As the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) is not in his place, I would like to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when Bill (No. 97) to amend the Petroleum Bounty Act, and which passed this House yesterday, will take effect ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That Bill will take effect as soon as sanctioned, and we expect that sanction will be given it at an early day.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.) I desire to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in what position the boats are at the present time plying between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. One of them has been out in the ice for the past twelve days with over one hundred passengers on board, and these boats only have accommodation for twenty-five or thirty passengers.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). It is unfortunately too true that these boats are now caught in the ice, but the circumstances are exceptional. Instructions have been given to convey all the passengers to Pictou and transfer them from that point to the island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are the people on the 'Minto' able to have communication with the mainland by the Marconi system?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there is communication with the cape by the Marconi system.

AN IMPERIAL COUNCIL.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following despatch which appears in the Montreal 'Gazette' of to-day, and which seems to be a despatch of the Associated Press:

London, March 13.—According to a Melbourne newspaper, J. G. Ward, Premier of New-Zealand, who has been in Melbourne conferring with Premier Deakin, says: At the conference we shall seek a definite understanding from the imperial government as to the position of the colonies with regard to the British treaty obligations. We do not want Great Britain to enter into treaties with foreign peoples that would give them the right to claim entry into the colonies. I am ardently in favour of the creation of a permanent imperial council of advice in London. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in private letters to me, also expresses himself as favourable, and with the help of Premier Deakin, the three of us ought to be able to carry it through.

This is so much at variance with the official correspondence laid upon the table a few days ago, that I am sure the Prime Minister will take occasion to deny this statement that has appeared in the press.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is certainly an error in the despatch. I have had no correspondence whatever of a private character with Sir Jas. M. Ward, the Premier of New Zealand, and whatever official correspondence I have had with him was not on any of the topics mentioned in that despatch.

IMMIGRANTS FOR ONTARIO.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto) I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if his attention has been called to a statement made in the press and referred to by me yesterday that the Dominion government is diverting immigration from the province of Ontario. Before the Agricultural Committee of the province of Ontario, at Toronto on Tuesday of this week, the statement was made by Mr. Southworth, Superintendent of Immigration for the province, that the Dominion government was diverting immigration destined for the province of Ontario, both at the ports of landing, and also by a system of immigration agents subsidized by the Dominion government, who are operating in the neighbourhood of Toronto, to the number of two or three hundred, for the purpose of diverting immigrants who intend to settle in that district, and sending them to the west, each one receiving for that work a per capita payment from the Dominioin government. Mr. Southworth thought that was unfair to Ontario, and so stated in his evidence before the Agricultural Committee, and I would like to know if those statements are correct.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Southworth is under an absolute misapprehension of the fact. There is no intention, no policy on the part of the Dominion government or its immigration department to divert settlers from Ontario either at ocean ports or elsewhere. On the contrary, the Dominion government during the last year made considerable expenditures with a view of securing suitable locations for settlers within the province of Ontario, thereby responding to the demand that has been made from that province for an adequate supply of farm labour during the last few years. During the present year the Dominion government has, in persuance of its experiment of last year and according to the needs of the province as it understands them, appointed a number of agents not only in the vicinity of Toronto but throughout the province; as a matter of fact has appointed two agents in each county on the average for the purpose of locating within the range of their knowlerge such suitable farm labour as may become available from the immigrants coming from the old country, which farm labour is directed or is intended to be directed to these distributing agents from the ocean ports. So far from the agents alluded to by Mr. Southworth being appointed to divert immigration from Ontario to the Northwest they are appointed for the sole purpose of securing suitable locations in Ontario for immigrants arriving at ocean points destined for that province who desire occupation in farm work.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. How are these agents paid?

Mr. OLIVER. They are paid a commission of $2 per head for each immigrant suitably located.

EXPORTATION OF ELECTRIC POWER.

On the order :

Third reading of Bill (No. 60) to regulate the exportation of electric power and certain liquids and gases.—Mr. Aylesworth.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister have any objection to letting that stand ? There were some amendments to be moved on the third reading and last night we supposed that the Land Bill was coming up to-day and we are not prepared for this one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the Minister of Justice to be good enough to give at least one day's notice before moving the third reading. If he desires to bring it up to-morrow there would be no objection.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Probably to-morrow will be occupied, let us say on Monday.

Order allowed to stand.

DOMINION LAND ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 21), to consolidate and amend the Act respecting the public lands of the Dominion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think in view of the importance of the Bill and of the fact that it is somewhat complex in its provisions and introduces a good deal of new matter, it would be desirable that the Minister of the Interior should give us a fairly full explanation before we take it up in committee.

Mr. OLIVER. In moving the second reading of this Bill I may say that the subject of legislation in regard to the administration of public lands has necessarily engaged the attention of the government and parliament of Canada ever since the acquisition of the Northwest. For the first number of years we had provision by order in council for the administration of public lands. That was afterwards replaced by legislation and the record seems to show that we had new legislation from year to year upon the subject. It was natural that it should be so and it was so. We were dealing with conditions which were not understood, which could only be understood by experience, and as experience grew and as conditions changed the law providing for the administration of the lands had to be changed accordingly, so that at the present time, or until the recent revision of the statutes, we had a very cumbersome and very difficult mass of legislation on the subject of public lands. The Lands Act of 1886 was the last revision and from 1886 until the present time it appears we have had legislation on the subject of Dominion lands nearly every year. It goes without saying that the mere revision of this mass of legislation by the commissioners for the revision of the statutes, while their work was no doubt well done, did not touch the main questions at issue. That is to say they embodied in a general revision all the varied legislation that was outstanding on the subject but they did not take into account the changed conditions and the fact that some of that legislation had by reason of the changed conditions become obsolete ; they did not take account of the necessity for other changes to meet new conditions and as a result their revision although well done was not what was required in order to bring the law on the subject of the administration of the public lands into line with the present requirements of the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They consolidated but did not legislate ?

Mr. OLIVER. They consolidated but did not legislate. However, before the revision was made, during the last session of parliament and in the intervening period, the necessity for a revision of the land law was pressed very strongly on the attention of the government and steps were taken to secure a revision and an amendment that would bring the law as it might be said up to date. It will be noticed that in the Bill as it is before the House references are made to the Acts then on the statute-book. These references of course are not now in order because all these old statutes are replaced by the present revision. That however is something that could not be provided against if we were to prepare the Bill for presentation at this session of parliament ; it would have been too late to prepare it after the revision of the statutes had been made. There will therefore have to be some amendments made in the Bill to make it conform to that condition.

The principal change in conditions, however, that made an amendment to the Land Act absolutely necessary, was that arising out of the fact that the time had come or approximately come when the great reservations made upon the Northwest in accordance with the policy of the then government in the early eighties, by which provision was made for land grants to railways by setting aside the odd-numbered sections throughout that whole country might be released. Those land grants had been either earned or practically earned; and as it was not the policy of this government to further assist railways by grants of land, it became necessary to provide for the disposition of the odd-numbered sections then remaining in the hands of the government. It was because of the necessity of dealing with that question that an important amendment to the Land Act had to be made, and it was thought opportune, when dealing with such an important question, to have a general revision of the Act. The

principal differences between the proposed new Act and the present law are, briefly stated, as follows. We have dropped out certain provisions regarding liens on homesteads, patents without cultivation, hamlets, co-operative farms, wood lots, surveys, and recommendations for patents. Although these provisions may have served a good purpose, we think the time has come when they are no longer required.

With regard to surveys, a Bill has been agreed to which takes that matter out of the Land Act and puts it in a separate Act devoted entirely to surveys. The dropping out of the provision regarding recommendations for patents may require some little explanation. Under the present law, when a settler has fulfilled his duties and has had his claim accepted by the government, he receives, not a patent, but a recommendation for a patent, which recommendation is recognized as a security. That provision was made when the lands were administered from Winnipeg and not from Ottawa, and there was a sort of dual administration. There were a commissioner of Crown lands and a land board sitting at Winnipeg who passed upon the right of the settler to receive a patent, but the patent itself was issued in Ottawa. Some years later that land board was abolished and the administration centred at Ottawa, but the provision for issuing a recommendation for patent still remained. Under the present system, it will be possible to issue the actual patent without serious delay to the homesteader. We have therefore dropped the provision requiring a recommendation for a patent, which will do away with a certain amount of delay now existing in the issuing of the patent and obviate some difficulty which occasionally arises, through the negotiation of these recommendations for patents, which cannot, under certain circumstances, be made good by the actual issue of the patent itself. As regards liens on homesteads, there are abuses under these provisions which rather overbalance any advantage that might accrue from them. I may say that in the very complex work of administering the Land Act, it is difficult to meet all cases, and it would be impossible for any legislature to foresee just what changes may be required from time to time. We find that we have in some cases gone beyond the Act by taking action not provided for in it but which was thought desirable for the proper administration of the land. We have, therefore, embodied some new provisions in this Bill which merely confirm the practice of the department. The principal of these provisions are to permit the holding of land for a person over seventeen years of age, to provide for priority of entry at a sub agency to provide for timber licenses on areas of a mile, half a mile and a mile square. At present if a homesteader has a son who is approaching the age of eighteen it is the practice of the department, should the young man want a homestead, to hold a quarter section for him until he reaches that age.

Mr. FOSTER. How long in practice have you held it.

Mr. OLIVER. One year. We sometimes have exceeded that period. We think that the principle is not a bad one, and in order to recognize it and at the same time provide against its abuse, we have provided that it shall be permitted to hold a homestead for one year for a young man who is seventeen years old.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that provided as a right or favour ?

Mr. OLIVER. It has been a matter of favour but we propose to make it a matter of right. Another provision gives priority to an entry telegraphed from a subagency to an agency. This is the practice and we thought it proper to embody it in the Bill. We have some eight or ten agencies throughout the Northwest. It would not be possible to provide for the accommodation of the work of the land department in those agencies. Therefore we would have to either multiply the agencies or provide, as has been done, subagencies. A subagency does not take an entry ; it is simply a means of communicating the entry to the head office. By not leaving on the subagency the responsibilities of an agency, the work of the subagency becomes practically merely clerical in the narrowest sense of the word. The subagency receives the application and the fee of the proposed homesteader and transmits these to the agent, when the agent makes the entry and transmits the receipt. It is frequently found, however, that the person who applies for entry for a homestead at the office of a subagency is cut out by another person who has actually made entry at the agency. Now, in order to preserve as far as possible a reasonable priority to the man who has made his application to a subagency, we have been in the habit of providing that if he saw fit to pay the cost of telegraphing the fact of his having put in his application at the subagency, the agent would hold that land against the arrival of his application. It is merely to give a fair and reasonable measure of priority to the application at a subagency.

Another provision is to provide for timber permits on an area of half a mile or a mile square. As the law is administered at present, we have only the system of putting up timber berths for sale at auction. Any other timber that has to be cut is cut on permits, and it cannot be cut for sale; it can only be cut for the settlers' own use. It is found that in the wooded parts of the country there are frequently small clumps of spruce near settlements ; and if they could be cut up by local sawmills it would be greatly to the advantage of the neighbour-

ing settlers. At the same time, the area of the clump or its value is not sufficient to warrant any person in incurring the expense or the delay of having such a berth put up to be bid for by tender. So we propose that any person shall be able to acquire a berth of not more than a mile square on application, conditional on his actual operation of the berth during the year within which he takes it. We believe that will be of very considerable advantage to the settlers in many parts of the country. It will obviate the necessity of having to put up a timber berth to competition in order to get any timber for sale, and I think will generally work to the advantage of the settlers and the settlement of the country. It is already provided for by regulation, but we thought it was a provision which might very well be embodied in the law.

Amongst the new provisions is one to permit the residence of a homesteader with relatives other than his parents. At the present time a homesteader may reside with his parents on their land, and still be accounted as fulfilling his residence duties on his own. We think it not unreasonable that that privilege should be extended. A great many cases of hardship have occurred by reason of a son living with his widowed mother in order to enable her to hold her homestead, but not able to earn his own because he was living with his mother and not with his father or his parents; and the same difficulty has occurred frequently as between two brothers or between a brother and a sister. So we thought it was not unfair to extend the privilege of residence with relatives to members of the same family, that is, father, mother, brother, sister, son or daughter.

Hitherto we have not defined the distance at which the homesteader might live from his homestead and still earn his patent. This distance has sometimes been unduly extended. We think it well to provide for a definite and fixed distance within which the residence must be exercised.

Mr. FOSTER. What does it matter, so long as you get the bona fide homesteader on his homestead ?

Mr. OLIVER. He is not on his homestead when he is living with his relatives.

Mr. FOSTER. You get him to make the improvements and complete the homestead.

Mr. OLIVER. It is considered very desirable that every quarter-section should be occupied as far as possible. There is a very strong and very natural objection against the holding of land without actual residence; and so, when residence was permitted at a considerable distance from the homestead, it was considered a grievance and an abuse. We wish to grant the privilege as far as we can, but to restrict it within a reasonable limit.

There is a provision for the issue of the patent to the heirs of a deceased person or to the guardian of a lunatic without residence of proxy. Hitherto the law has been very strict, that if a homesteader died his heirs must either reside upon the property themselves, or must provide some other person to reside upon it. Carrying out the principle which I have just laid down of the necessity of some person being actually in residence on the land in order to earn, the widow or the orphan children have frequently been deprived of any value in the homestead from the husband or the parent, because of this requirement. The circumstances may be such that it is impossible for the heir to live on the property or to get some other person to live upon it, and, while relaxing somewhat the requirements of actual residence on the land, we have thought it a fair and not unreasonable concession to those who were bereaved if that requirement were set aside so that the heir of the deceased person might be secure of the patent at the end of the term of three years from the date of entry by completing the cultivation and building duties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You merely eliminate the requirement of residence ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, in the case of the heir of a deceased person or in the case of a lunatic.

There is another provision which relaxes this condition. We have found that in a number of cases the homesteader has suffered physical disability from one cause or another. He may have lost a leg or a foot or his hands or a hand, and is not in a physical condition to complete his residence on the land. While it is undesirable, we fully admit, to forego the requirement of actual residence, at the same time appeals are made so strongly on behalf of those who have been so unfortunate, and these appeals must necessarily touch almost any one, that we have thought it fair and right to make the provision that in a case of such physical disability the residence might be dispensed with on the order of the Governor in Council.

We have also found necessity for some provision in regard to water-powers. The question of water-powers is, of course, more important now than it ever was before, and the existing law has not made any definite provision for dealing with that subject. We have therefore made provision, which will be more fully discussed later on, for dealing with water-powers in the territory which will come under the jurisdiction of this Act.

Another new provison is in connection with the acquiring of timber berths. There is admitted to be a defect or an abuse as it may be called in this connection. A person who wishes to acquire a timber berth goes out or hires some one else to go out and cruise the berth. This involves considerable expense, and after he has cruised the berth and satisfied himself of its value

he asks to have it put up to public competition. It is put up to public competition, and some one else may get the berth perhaps at a very small advance on the bid of the man who cruised it, and first brought it to the view of the public. We are offering for the consideration of the House a suggestion in this connection which is that when a person asks that a timber berth be put up to public competition he is entitled to put in a bill of expenses, of course subject to the revision of the department, which expenses will be added to the tendered price of the berth and will have to be paid by the otherwise successful tenderer. This is rather offered for the consideration of the House than as an amendment to be insisted on but there has been considerable complaint, there has been some confusion and we think it is at any rate a fair matter for discussion——

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose all the contestants have cruised it ?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course that is a question. The position is a difficult one, we want to do something and we possibly may be led into doing harm instead of good. We are putting this in the form of a Bill and if the House is good enough to approve we will take the responsibility.

Perhaps the most important provision of the Bill is that dealing with the subject of pre-emption rights. We believe that the fact that the settler coming from the United States and from eastern Canada has been able to homestead a quarter-section free and to purchase an adjoining quarter-section from the railway company on the odd-numbered section, has been a very great inducement to the settlement of our country so far as it has gone. The belief there is that 160 acres may be a good farm but that 320 acres is a very much better farm, and the fact that a 320 acre farm could be acquired at a reasonable price by locating a homestead on an even-numbered section and purchasing from the railway company on the odd-numbered section we believe has been a very great incentive to the settlement of our country by the best class of people, that is people with means and ability to carry on farming operations on a considerable scale. Now it is a fact that to a very considerable extent the even-numbered sections adjoining the odd-numbered sections which are held by the railway companies have been taken up. There are still of course, it is true, a number of millions of acres, but it is also true that in a very large part of what we may call the railway belt the even-numbered sections are already homesteaded and people are beginning to look in the country which is outside of the railway belt for their homesteads. If we make no provision for their acquiring more than the homestead we believe that the great attraction which brought the better class of settlers to our country will be withdrawn ; that is, if we offered both odd-numbered sections and even-numbered sections simply for homesteading. We believe that by putting as the Bill proposes to do the odd and even-numbered sections in the one class, and offering an adjoining quarter-section at a fair price and on settlement conditions to the homesteader who takes a free homestead, we will as far as we can parallel the existing conditions outside of the territory covered by the railway land grant and thereby we hope to be able to keep up that stream of desirable immigration that has added so greatly to the wealth and prosperity of our country during the past few years.

This I might say is the important feature of the Bill, as it deals with the odd-numbered sections which are now practically released from the control of the railway companies.

Mr. FOSTER. Numbering about how many acres ?

Mr. OLIVER. About 40,000,000 acres, as nearly as we can calculate.

Mr. GREENWAY. Is that surveyed ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, no, unsurveyed, everything. I have some figures here which I will take the opportunity of giving to the House and I have also a map which I shall lay on the table showing the territory to which I allude.

Mr. GREENWAY. Is a portion of this in the semi-arid region ?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Approximately where does this lie ?

Mr. OLIVER. Draw a line at about latitude 52 which is north of Dauphin, across Manitoba, and run it through Saskatchewan and Alberta at about latitude 55. South of this line we have a total area of 175,000,000 acres exclusive of water. There have been of this area alienated or reserved 97,000,000 acres, as follows : for railway land grants, 32,000,000 acres ; for Indian, Hudson bay, school lands, Manitoba swamp lands and forest reserves, 25,000,000 acres ; for homesteads and sales, 40,000,000 acres. The area remaining is about 80,000,000 acres of which, of course, one-half would be odd-numbered sections. The main purpose of this Bill is to declare that the reservation which has hitherto lain on the odd-numbered sections is now withdrawn, and that odd and even-numbered sections stand together for disposal by the government and available to the first applicant. This applies to 40,000,000 acres over which the government hitherto has exercised no control.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These lands are now free from the claim of any railway company or other corporation ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister any computation showing what proportion of these lands are suitable for agricultural purposes ?

Mr. OLIVER. It would be impossible to give a computation of that. All these lands are within the lines within which profitable agriculture is carried on, but, of course, it would be impossible to say just what proportion is now valuable and still more difficult to say what proportion may ultimately become valuable. At present, people are looking only for the best, for that land which can be brought under cultivation without difficulty. But, no doubt, many millions of acres are included in this area which are not looked upon as valuable to-day, but, which in course of time will be made valuable by improvement and settlement as it progresses.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Can the minister state what proportion of the land lies within the provinces respectively ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have some figures here relating to that point, but they do not enable me to give an answer to the hon gentleman's question.

Mr. GREENWAY. Can the minister tell us whether he can designate now the sections that are surveyed ? That is, if a man wants a quarter-section, can the minister tell him whether it is available or not ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES. Can the minister say what proportion of the 40,000,000 acres is surveyed ?

Mr. OLIVER. A very small part. A very large proportion of the country was surveyed many years ago, especially along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in what is called the 'dry country' where there is little settlement. But these surveys are of no value to-day, although the map indicates that the country has been surveyed. The surveys are a very little beyond the boundary of the present settlement. The great part of the country remains to be surveyed.

In dealing with the questions of pre-emption, I might point out, we are dealing not only with the choice part of the country but with all the country. The government, in administering the lands is charged with the responsibility of developing the whole country, not only that which is good but that which is medium and that which is bad. Inasmuch as the railway companies, many years ago, made their selections they, no doubt, took the best. And, their selections having been followed by settlement to a very great extent, we must assume that, however good the balance of the country may be, the best of it, so far as the odd-numbered sections at any rate are concerned, has already been alienated, and a considerable proportion of the even-numbered sections also. When we deal with pre-emptions we are dealing with the question of settling the rest of the country, outside the railway land grants and not within the railway land grants. As I have said it is provided that outside of the railway land grants there shall be the right of pre-emption ; that is, the settler may take a homestead and pre-emption. But, within the land grant, we do not give him that right. Within the railway land grants he takes his homestead as he has always done, and, if he wishes increased area, he buys it from the railway company. This Bill deals with the odd-numbered sections, and, of course, it can deal only with those odd-numbered sections that have not been alienated. We make provision for dealing with the land in the odd-numbered sections where we have them to dispose of, but in the part of the country where they have been alienated, this provision does not apply.

Mr. AMES. What does the minister do about those parts of the country where the railway companies have had the right to select out of a larger area than that which they are empowered to choose, so that when they choose there will be a considerable quantity of secondary land left within the railway belt ?

Mr. OLIVER. The provision in the Bill is that land within the areas chosen by the railway is not subject to pre-emption. So far as the areas which are now held by the railway companies for selection, are concerned, we hope that within a very short time the railway companies will have completed their selection, and the reservation will be withdrawn, and any land that they have not taken will be open to be dealt with under the terms of the Bill. But, for the present, within the limits of railway reserves, the pre-emption does not apply.

Mr. FOSTER. This legislation is not retroactive in any way ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are some sections which are retroactive——

Mr. FOSTER. I mean the pre-emptions.

Mr. OLIVER. I will call attention to any that may be retroactive. Those that relate to the heirs of deceased persons are so worded that they may have a retroactive effect, but otherwise the effort has been to confine the operations of the Bill to the future.

Mr. FOSTER. Your pre-emption provision is not retroactive ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Has the minister any map or calculation showing in what part of the country the railways have selected their land ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly. I could lay the map on the table now if I had an opportunity to go to my room and find it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Has the minister any idea where the greatest selection has been made—in the south or in the north ?

Mr. OLIVER. The bulk of the country which has been selected is in southern Manitoba, eastern Saskatchewan, running northwesterly, and in northern Alberta. But a glance at the map would give the member a better understanding of the situation than I could give in a long talk. However, the selections of all the railroad companies have actually been made, except by the Canadian Northern in respect of their rights as to a Hudson bay railway and as respects the Manitoba South Eastern. There may be some exchanges to a small extent with other railway companies, but of a trifling character.

Mr. AMES. Is it expected that if a Hudson bay road is built by the Canadian Northern the selection of the lands will come in that same belt as other railway lands are to be chosen from?

Mr. OLIVER. The Canadian Northern will, within a very short time, complete all the railway construction which will entitle them to any land grant, and the land to which they are entitled, what they have earned of it, has been selected, but the selection of what they are earning now, of course, has not yet been made, but will be shortly.

Mr. AMES. The minister referred a moment ago to a new land grant that they were entitled to in case they constructed a line from Erwood to Hudson bay. If they construct such a line will they not be entitled to an additional land grant under existing statutes, and if they are entitled to such additional land grant for such construction is it intended to allow them to select it in what is known as the present railway belt?

Mr. OLIVER. No, they are entitled to a land grant for construction as far as the Saskatchewan river, and they are entitled to select the land pertaining to that construction within the reserves that are already set apart. That construction, I think, is within thirty miles of completion ; it will be completed within a few months. Beyond the Saskatchewan river, while there is a provision in the Lands Act permitting the government to give a railway company completing a line to Hudson bay a grant of 12,800 acres per mile, there is no reservation for such a grant, there is no order in council giving such a grant, and so far as I am aware, that is not the intention of the government.

Mr. AMES. Would these lands have to be selected north of the Saskatchewan river?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY.

Mr. OLIVER. Not under the terms of the statute. The statute does not limit the location of the selection. The former order in council did limit the selection, or did limit the location to that part north of the North Saskatchewan river, but that order in council expired by efflux of time, and has not been renewed.

Mr. HERRON. I presume they have a considerable quantity of land in Southern Alberta, in odd-numbered sections, that is not settled on. Do I understand the minister to say that that land is not now going to be thrown open for pre-emption or homesteads either under this new Bill?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know how the hon. gentleman can understand that. I have said that all the odd-numbered sections which had hitherto been held under reserve will not, after this Bill passes, be under reserve, and will be available for disposition by the government according to the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. AMES. I understand that the order in council which permitted the selection of 12,800 acres of land per mile north of the North Saskatchewan river to any railway company which might construct a line to Hudson bay has expired by efflux of time. Now, is there any legislation presently in force which constitutes, as it were, a sort of mortgage on the remaining part south of the North Saskatchewan river which would entitle a company building to Hudson bay to lay claim to lands south of the North Saskatchewan river in satisfaction of their grant?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a question which my hon. friend can answer as well as I can. He knows the terms of the Act and he knows what the effect is. I will recite to the House again, that the Lands Act of 1886 sets out that the Governor in Council has authority to grant to a railway company building a line, or in aid of a railway built from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Winnipeg to Hudson bay, 6,400 acres of land per mile within the province of Manitoba, and 12,800 acres of land per mile for every mile beyond the province of Manitoba—there is no limitation of any kind. That is the authority that the Governor in Council have; it all depends on how the Governor in Council exercises that authority. Up to the Saskatchewan river the Governor in Council has exercised authority, beyond the Saskatchewan river the Governor in Council has not exercised authority, at least the authority exercised has expired. It would be possible to-morrow for the Governor in Council to grant to anybody under the terms of that Land Act 12,800 acres of land per mile for a railroad from the Saskatchewan river to Hudson bay, and to say where that land might be taken.

Mr. AMES. Anywhere?

Mr. OLIVER. Anywhere, so far as I understand it, but it is not the policy of the government to do that.

Mr. AMES. What I desire to ascertain is whether this Act of which the minister has spoken constitutes, as it were, a hinderance or an embarrassment to throwing open the remainder of the non-selected railway lands for settlement south of the North Saskatchewan river ?

Mr. OLIVER. We do not recognize that it is a hindrance in any way. When the Canadian Northern has completed their line to the Saskatchewan river, all rights, as we understand it, to lands south of that river, have been earned and can be dealt with without any question.

Mr. AMES. All obligations have then been fulfilled?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, as we understand it, although we could create an obligation if we desired to do so.

Mr. LENNOX. Making a provision as to a portion of these lands, in section 76 of this Bill, subsection (d), you re-enact that :

The Governor in Council may make a free grant of land not exceeding in extent 6,400 acres for each mile within Manitoba, and not exceeding in extent 12,800 acres for each mile outside the province of Manitoba, in aid of the construction of a railway from some point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Hudson bay.

You re-enact that provision.

Mr. OLIVER. We re-enact that provision because it has been operated under and its operation has not been completed as far as the Saskatchewan river. Had the line of the Canadian Northern now been completed to the Saskatchewan river, we would not have felt bound to re-enact that provision, but it not having been completed to the Saskatchewan river, and until they have received the land to which they are entitled under that Act and the following orders in council, we are bound to keep that provision alive.

In regard to the general policy of the government as to lands, while I do not wish to enter into any controversy to-day, I think it is only fair to give the House some figures showing the result of the policy of this government as compared with that of the former government. I find that from 1870 to 1896 there were alienated to persons or corporations in homesteads 6,500,000 acres of land; there were alienated in sales 3,500,000 acres; in scrip to half-breeds. 1,500,000 acres in those years.

In the years from 1896 to 1906 the homesteads amounted to 20,000,000 acres and the areas covered by sales and half-breed scrip amounted to 1,750,000 acres. There was twice as much land alienated between 1896 and 1906 as between 1870 and 1896. Over three times as much was alienated as homesteads; and only one-third as much alienated in sales and half-breed scrip. The policy of this government has been to administer the land for the settler, and the object of this Bill is to carry that policy to its legitimate conclusion by opening up to homesteaders the odd-numbered sections, some 40,000,000 acres hitherto held under reserve.

The policy which led to this reservation of all the odd-numbered sections was one radically different from that of the present government. In all the years from 1881 to 1896 the policy of the late government was that the west should pay for its own railways with its own land, and this policy was amplified in two important particulars. One was that the Northwest provided the land grant for nearly a thousand miles of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Ontario and British Columbia, and the other that at one time not only was the land of the Northwest expected to build the railways of that country but the Northwest was required to pay into the general treasury one dollar per acre for the privilege of its lands being used for that purpose. When this government came into power in 1896, the Northwest was put on the same footing with all the rest of Canada in the matter of aid to railways. No more land grants were made, and Northwest railways have since been aided in cash or guarantees, as were railways in the other provinces. The object was to secure the general development of the country by railways running east and west, with the immediate or ultimate object of giving the commercial centres and seaports of eastern Canada the best possible connection with the prairies and to give the prairies the best possible outlets to the Pacific coast.

It may be interesting to know that there have been completed in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, under land grant, three thousand miles of railway and in Ontario and British Columbia 918 miles, so that the total mileage of railways built under grants of land in those provinces was 3,918, and the land grants amounted to 32,000,000 acres.

Mr. FOSTER. Which were Dominion lands.

Mr. OLIVER. That was the policy of the late government.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Has the present administration revived any land grants that have lapsed?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but they have carried out in good faith the undertakings entered into by their predecessors. Since this government has attained power, there have been completed in Manitoba, Saskatchewan

and Alberta, without land grants, 3,337 miles of railway. There are now under contract in these provinces without land grant, 1,591 miles of railway, giving a total railway mileage in these three western provinces, either completed or under contract, of 4,938 miles, as compared with 3,000 miles, under the late administration, built at a cost of 32,000,000 acres of Northwest land. So that nearly 2,000 miles more of railway have been built without land grants, under the policy of this administration, than was built with land grants under the late government. Besides these 3,000 miles in the Northwest, there were 918 miles built in British Columbia and Ontario. We have now in the Northwest, either completed or under contract, nearly 5,000 miles of railway which have not cost the Northwest an acre of land.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister allow me? What in the world is he driving at? If he wants the House to consider and discuss the present Dominion land legislation, why does he introduce all this controversial matter, which brings up at once a comparison of policies between a time far back, as the march of events measures it, and a time just present or passing? In such a comparison it would be competent for any one to show the difference between land altogether pioneer and land which is known and settled upon and has come out in the blaze of population and publicity. If the minister wants to have a controversial debate running back over twenty-five or thirty years and involving different policies and changing conditions, he is taking the most approved method of getting it. But in the meantime is he not forgetting that his object in explaining this Bill is to concentrate on it the best attention of the House in order that we may devise the most effective legislation? Let him get through with that and then go into controversial matter afterwards.

Mr. OLIVER. What I wish the House to understand is the importance of this Bill in carrying out the policy of the present government and the bearing that policy has on the welfare of the Northwest. I wish to point out that because of the radical change of policy inaugurated by this government, we have 40,000,000 acres of land in the Northwest open to settlement to-day. Had our predecessors remained in power and continued their policy, those 40,000,000 acres would be now in the hands of the railway companies, and settlers would have to pay the same prices as they are paying for the 32,000,000 acres granted these companies.

Mr. FOSTER. All dependent on two possible 'ifs.'

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Will the hon. gentleman go back a little further and tell us how many acres would have been alienated from the Crown had the policy of the McKenzie government been continued?

Mr. OLIVER. I am perfectly safe in leaving that to the vivid imagination of my hon. friends on the other side.

Mr. FOSTER. That blocks out several days work.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not dealing with possibilities or imagination but with facts, and I think I am perfectly justified in pointing out the advantage of a policy under which it has been possible to bring forward this legislation to-day. Perhaps it may not be out of place to give a little calculation as to what that policy has cost the people of the Northwest, is costing them to-day, and is costing the country at large in retarding development. If we estimate, that, of the 32,000,000 acres of land, 8,000,000 acres have been sold at $3 per acre that will represent $24,000,000. And, if the remaining 24,000,000 acres are sold at an average price of $8 per acre—and that may very well be—the return to the railway companies will be $192,000,000, which the people of the Northwest will have to pay because of that 3,000 miles of railway accommodation. The total charge upon the people of the west at that valuation—and I submit it is a fair valuation, for land which is the pick of the country, and which has the advantage of railway communication and railway development—the total charge upon the people of the Northwest on that valuation is $216,000,000, or, a railway bonus of $72,000 a mile.

Mr. AMES. Does the minister include in the 32,000,000 acres the 9,000,000 (about) which was sold back to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I have charged the Canadian Pacific Railway with a little over 18,000,000 acres on their main line. I will give the hon. gentleman the particulars.

Canadian Pacific Railway main line—

Subsidized in land, 1,902 miles.

Line in Ontario and British Columbia, 900 miles.

Line in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1,000 miles.

Total land subsidy, 18,000,000 acres.

On main line in Manitoba—

Saskatchewan and Alberta, 11,000,000.

Away from main line in Dauphin district—

On Saskatchewan, near Battleford, and in north Alberta, 7,000,000.

Canadian Pacific Railway, Souris branch, in southwestern Manitoba and southeastern Saskatchewan, 220 miles.

Land subsidy, 1,400,000 acres on Manitoba and Northwestern Railway in northwestern Manitoba and north of township 35 in eastern Saskatchewan, on Saskatchewan river.

Canadain Pacific Railway, Pipestone extension of Souris branch in southeastern Saskatchewan, 31 miles.

Land subsidy, 200,000 acres, north of Saskatchewan river in Saskatchewan.

Canadian Pacific Railway, Manitoba Southwestern, 278 miles.

Land subsidy, 1,400,000 acres.

1,100,000 near railway line, 300,000 north of Lethbridge, 600 miles distant.

Saskatchewan and Western Railway in Manitoba, 15 miles.

Land subsidy, 98,000 acres at Quill lakes in Saskatchewan, 300 miles distant.

I forgot to say in speaking of the pre-emption question, that while we have provided for the taking of a pre-emption by a settler who comes in and who takes land outside of the railway belt—or the areas within which the odd-numbered sections have been taken by the railway company; while we have made provision for a pre-emption there we have felt it was desirable to meet the conditions that are consequent upon that provision. That is to say, we are apparently giving this new settler, the man who comes into the country now, a better opportunity than the man who has been in the country for some years. The man who came in a year ago, or who came in last month, and who took a homestead, could only get 160 acres from the government, although he has the privilege of buying from the railway company if he should happen to be so situated. But, there is a possibility that the men who are in the country to-day will feel that they are being to some extent discriminated against in favour of the new settler, by the provisions of this Bill as far as I have stated them. We have thought that the men who have been first in the field, the men who have taken the chances, whose labour and whose capital have developed the country so far as it has gone, are certainly entitled to every fair consideration so long as the public interest does not suffer. And we have thought that it was not an unreasonable proposition, that where a settler who is in the country at the passage of this Bill is not so situated as to enable him to acquire a pre-emption immediately alongside his homestead, that he may have the privilege, after he completes his duties on his present homestead, of taking up a pre-emption elsewhere—the same duties being required of him on the second homestead or pre-emption as are required from the new settler upon his.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is retroactive?

Mr. OLIVER. We do not consider that as retroactive; we create a privilege.

Mr. GREENWAY. That applies to those who will have their patents when the Bill passes.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly. We create a privilege, but we do not think it is retroactive legislation. We have changed the law in regard to one class of people and we have made what we consider fair provision in regard to another.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the third class?

Mr. OLIVER. We have not gone further than the two classes.

Mr. FOSTER. I would point out to the minister that he is still doing a great injustice. He adds this second pre-emption to the man who has not yet completed his homestead, may be by a month, and he does it on the ground that the pioneer must get some consideration. Well, there is a man alongside of him who has just completed his homestead work a month ago; he came in earlier, underwent greater hardships, was obliged to make greater expenditure, and there is just a month's difference between the two. If there is an obligation to go from the absolutely new to the old, there is certainly an obligation just as strong to go a little further back, and a little further back, and a little further back, until you get to the old pioneer; the first pioneer who went in there when nobody else would go; the first pioneer who took his life in his hands and sacrificed the comfort of his family, and made it possible by blazing out the paths that others could go. Are you going to let him lay his grey hairs down without a single recognition from the Minister of the Interior. That is awful.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry my hon. friend has not read the provision.

Mr. FOSTER. I am asking what it is.

Mr. OLIVER. The provision is intended to meet the case not only of those who have not yet received their patents, but those who are in the country and who have enjoyed the right to a single homestead. They are given under the provisions of this Bill what may be called in one way a second homestead.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you go back to the first.

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes. But the difference between that and the ordinary homestead is, that they must pay a price for the land, and they must do extra duties upon it.

Mr. GREENWAY. Has the hon. gentleman exempted those who have got a second homestead?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. GREENWAY. You propose to give these, three quarter-sections?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, if they have been in long enough I think they are entitled to it. My hon. friend (Mr. Greenway) asks, if the people who, under the law as it stands, are entitled to a second homestead, will be excluded from the privilege of buying a quarter-section, and doing resident duties. I say no.

Mr. GREENWAY. The hon. gentleman does not understand me. I asked, does he exempt those who, under the law of July, 1892, obtained a second homestead, if they

had got the previous homestead prior to 1889 ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. Everybody who under the present law has secured a homestead has earned the right to a second homestead. If there is any injustice in this, it is, I think an injustice on the right side.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Can the minister tell me if under the Act the man who has not got his patent for his homestead can pre-empt any other than the adjoining quarter-section ?

Mr. OLIVER. Until he gets his patent, he can pre-empt only the adjoining quarter-section, but after he gets his patent, he may go and pick out any other quarter section elsewhere, and live on it and pay for it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY: There seems to be a distinction between the man who has got his patent and the man who only makes his homestead entry, from the date the Act comes into force. If I understand the provision of the Bill, the man who is living on his homestead, but has not completed his homestead duties, and has not got his patent, can pre-empt only the adjoining quarter-section, so that if that quarter-section should not happen to be available, he could not pre-empt at all.

Mr. OLIVER. No. The man who has only made his homestead entry the day before the Act comes into force may pre-empt the quarter-section adjoining his homestead, if there is one, just in the same way as if he had made his homestead entry the day after the Act came into force ; but if there is not such a quarter-section immediately adjoining, then he cannot pre-empt until he has become entitled to the patent of his homestead. Having become entitled to that, he can go elsewhere and pre-empt another quarter-section, and settle on it and pay for it, and become entitled to the patent of it in three years.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. If there are any left ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, if there are any left.

Mr. GREENWAY. Then every one who has got a homestead is entitled to a pre-emption at some time ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. HERRON. If a new man makes an entry for a homestead, can he enter for a quarter-section in one part of the country, and enter for another at the same time within a nine-mile radius ?

Mr. OLIVER. No. The man who comes in under the terms of this Act must make his entry for his homestead and at the same time his entry for a pre-emption of the adjoining quarter-section. If he does not enter then for a pre-emption of the adjoining land, he loses his right.

Mr. GREENWAY.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Suppose there is none ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is his loss.

Mr. LAKE. Can a man who has obtained his patent and left his farm and taken up some other occupation in the country, make a pre-emption entry ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, he can by fulfilling the terms of the Act. He must reside on it, build a house of a certain value, make certain improvements, and pay a certain price.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to ask one further question on that point. Suppose he has made a previous entry, sold his homestead and left the country and gone to the United States and then returned, can he purchase a pre-emption ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly. The fact of his absence from the country would not make any difference. He would be in the same position as if he had never left.

Reverting again to the railway question, my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames) has already called attention to the subject of a railway to Hudson bay. That is a matter which has been very strongly in the minds of the western people for very many years. It was so strongly in the mind of the government of the day that as far back as 1886, I am not sure but before that time, provision was made on what must be considered a very liberal scale for aid for such a railroad. As I have already stated, there is a provision in the Land Act of 1886 providing for a grant of 6,400 acres for every mile of the railway in Manitoba and 12,800 acres for every mile of the railway beyond the boundary of Manitoba to the bay. By the introduction of this Bill and the policy it embodies, there are no further reservations of land grants being made for railways. This provision, however, remains in the Act, and of course it may be acted upon ; but the terms of the Act are that all lands are open to settlement, and the expectation is that provision will not be made under the terms of this Bill for a land grant in aid of the construction of a railroad to Hudson bay. This government has not hitherto granted any lands in aid of railway construction, and, as far as I am aware, has no intention of doing so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you put in the provision ?

Mr. OLIVER. Because the road is not completed to the Saskatchewan river. To that point the people who own the road have their rights, and we put in the provision simply to preserve their rights until the road is completed to that point. We have simply continued the provision under which they have constructed. There is no doubt that

the subject is one that cannot be dismissed. The people of the west are strongly of the mind that there should be a railway to Hudson bay, and the government could scarcely come before the House and the country with a proposition which looks to the ignoring of the provision already made on behalf of that railway without some announcement to the House and the country in regard to the matter. The government is fully convinced of the propriety of giving the Northwest an additional railway outlet by way of Hudson bay at the earliest possible date. The government believes that with the increase in production of the west now in progress such an additional outlet will be urgently needed as soon as a railway can be built, even if it were commenced at once. At the same time it realizes that public opinion throughout Canada could scarcely be expected at the moment, in view of the great obligations already incurred in connection with railway enterprise to sanction the additional obligation that would be incurred by providing immediately for the construction of a railway to Hudson bay, unless special provision were made to meet that obligation. It believes, however, that there will be no objection from any quarter if the funds accruing from the disposal of pre-emptions in the three prairie provinces, under the terms of the proposed Land Bill shall be considered as a provision in place of the land grant stated in the Act to meet the burden upon the credit of the Dominion as a whole that must be assumed at an early date—if not immediately—if a railway is to be in operation to Hudson bay in time to meet the urgent need that is now in plain sight for an additional and shorter railway route from the prairies to tide water. I beg leave to move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. THOMAS GREENWAY (Lisgar). I have a rather unpleasant duty to perform in reference to this Bill, and I think I might as well get it off my mind at the first opportunity. Nothing that I have had under my consideration for a great many years, has given me so much concern as the Bill now before the House. I shall not go into the details of the Bill, more than to say, that any provision which takes away from the department the jurisdiction to deal with individual cases that may come before it in connection with homesteading, is to be deplored. I believe there is only one way by which you can administer that department to the satisfaction of the people, and that is by considering the individual cases upon their merits. If there is one thing that commended itself to my mind, more than another, it was the administration of my hon. friend the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) in that connection. As has been pointed out by the minister (Mr. Oliver) cases arise that the law cannot provide for, and if there is one department of this government that cannot be run by rule—fixed by law or in any other way that you like to fix it—it is the administration of the homestead law in western Canada.

Now Sir, as I have said, I am not going into the details of the Bill, but I want to present this consideration to the House—and I think the minister's speech will bear me out—that, considering the great interests that are involved, considering that this is an entirely new departure, we should give ourselves plenty of time to think over what it is we are doing. We have had a Dominion Lands Act since 1874, and any material amendment to that Act which occurs to me at this moment, has been rather against the western country than for it. I am sure that my hon. friends from the west, who know anything about the working of the Act which was passed in 1892 and which provided for a second homestead, will agree with me that it was one of the worst things that was ever done for that country. And now, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) astonishes me by saying, that he proposes that those who made their entries prior to 1889 under that Act, and got a second homestead, shall be given a third homestead. The hon. gentleman proposes to give them a pre-emption right under this Act, and they will have received 480 acres of land instead of 320. I have considered the land policy of respective governments for a long number of years, nearly 30 years, and I am one of those who have come to the conclusion that it would have been much better in the interests of the west, if 160 acres, and 160 acres alone were given for a homestead. That is my opinion after full consideration. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) spoke of the sparse settlements. Well, the sparse settlements were brought about by giving large areas in homestead and pre-emption. It appears to me that 160 acres of the good land that we have to offer, is a sufficient inducement to any one who wants to get a farm. I know numbers of people in my own country who have settled down upon 160 acres of that fertile land and who have made themselves a competency in a few years. And Sir, when I look over the record what do I find. I find that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), having presented a beautiful map of the Dominion of Canada to the public and distributed it far and wide as an advertisement, sets out upon one prominent corner of it, that the great inducement which he offers is 160 acres of free land. Let us see how this has worked out. In 1874 we had a land Act which remained for a long time, until the railway regulations came in on the first of August 1879, and the odd-numbered sections were set apart for railway purposes. I may say here now, that I have been one of these who have thought that it would be a good thing if the lands coming back

into the hands of the government in pursuance of the policy which they adopted—and which I think is a good one. I am one of those who think it would be a good thing if the odd-numbered sections of land had been made something special. But Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) gets appropriations for immigration to induce people to come to the Northwest, and that is a praiseworthy object, but I ask him, what it is that he proposes to do by this Bill. He proposes to give to the people who are presently in the Northwest, all the land he has to give away.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GREENWAY. That is precisely what he does. Go through the records, if you will, with me, and let us see how it has come out. On the first day of January, 1890 the law came into force which did away with the pre-emption. Up to that time. there had been taken in 16 years, a little less than 45,000 homesteads. Now, what happened after the pre-emption was done away with. Down to the end of the last fiscal year, 197,000 homesteads were taken from the time that the pre-emption was done away with. Then Sir, I have estimated for the few months since the fiscal year ended on the 30th of June last, that on the proportion of what was done last year, there would be 20,000 homesteads, and so we have had altogether 260,000 homesteads; or, 215,000 homesteads that remain to be satisfied. My hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) last session, went into a very careful calculation of the quantity of land that was still available in the fertile belt. I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) the other day for a copy of his speech, and I find that my own calculation as to what we have really available, what is surveyed, what is ready for settlement, pretty nearly agrees with the calculation of my hon. friend.

The estimate of my hon. friend covers the country up to township 69. If he (Mr. Oliver) had gone a little further north, the figures of his estimate would have been larger. But I am speaking now of the land available for settlement this year, ready for the immigrant to go on to—ready for any one to go on to according to this Bill. We have now about 20,000,000 acres of land. Now, Sir, what does that mean? My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) is offering an inducement to settlers who are presently settled in Manitoba and Saskatchewan to move away from the places in which they are now settled. The man who years ago, sat down upon his land and has seen it rise in value from $1 or $2 or $3 an acre to $30 or $35 an acre is offered a bonus to go west and get another quarter-section in the hope of accomplishing again the same result. The hon. minister is offering a bonus to do what? To take away people from Manitoba and a great many from Saskatchewan and settle them somewhere west. I say that is not in the interest of that country. It is not desirable that there should be the demoralization of the population which this Bill will effect. I know whereof I speak, for I have numbers of letters indicating the way in which this inducement which the minister proposes to offer is regarded. Knowing the individuals as I do, knowing that they have good homes and all the necessaries for good successful farming, I am not willing that they should be asked, as they are by this Bill, to leave the places they now occupy. These people write me asking where one of these quarter-sections is to be obtained. I have numbers of letters of that kind, and I fancy that my hon. friend's department must have many of the same. I have taken occasion to talk to my friends about this Bill, and many of them have said to me: I find the Bill very popular. Popular. If you are going to give a man a quarter-section of land at $3 an acre that, in some cases, is worth $10 or $15 an acre, is it not quite likely that the offer will be popular? But, is it in the best interests of western Canada—that is the question that I would like to see answered. Consider for a moment the interests that are involved. Let me give you one or two figures. Suppose, for instance, that only 60,000 homesteaders avail themselves this year of the privilege offered. Multiply that by 160 acres, and you have a total of 9,600,000 acres of land. And suppose that, through the policy of the government—which is a good one—in inducing immigrants to come in, we get as many homesteaders as last year. Let us say, 40,000—last year it was 41,800, and there is no reason why the number should not be as great this year. The hon. minister proposes to give the newcomer 320 acres. That would mean, for these homesteaders and immigrants this year a total of 22,400,000 acres of land—more land than we have to offer. My hon. friend may get up and talk about the advantages of this Bill, but here is the point not to be overlooked. (His last declaration in reference to the Bill is a good one—the building of the Hudson bay railway—but I do not know that it is necessary to consider that in connection with the administration of the public lands.) The minister's proposal involves no less than 22,400,000 acres of land. Could any greater calamity happen to this country—for the interests of Canada are bound up with the development of the west—than that it should be said within a year from to-day, as I predict it will be said a year from to-day should this Bill pass, that we have not a quarter-section of desirable land to offer the settler? I do not care to enlarge upon this subject, because it appears so manifest to me that we ought not, without more careful consideration, deal with so grave a question. I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) what area of land he

had to offer. He did not appear to have the figures. I think that one thing we ought to have is a very careful consideration of what lands are available and fit for settlement. I asked my hon. friend if he included the semi-arid district, and he said he did. This district, according to figures which I saw years ago, covers 50,000,000, or nearly so. On that point I may say that I fancy there are in that territory, a good many acres of land that are fit for settlement, so that it would be worth the government's while to consider whether it would not be advisable to give 320 acres of land to each settler in the semi-arid region. For the system of farming which has been carried on in similar districts in the United States involves the use of more land than does the kind of farming that we do in Manitoba where all the land is good. I refer to the system of 'dry farming' as it is called, in which the soil is cultivated one year to be cropped the next. Therefore, I say that, in such a section, for instance, as the southwest part of Saskatchewan, where there is a quantity of land that the Canadian Pacific Railway refused to take, this plan might be adopted with advantage. Of course, I do not say that some of that land might not be good for farming in the ordinary way. Nor do I wish to be understood as saying that the area which I have talked about is all that we have left. We have lands in the north the extent of which we do not know. These will be developed by and by, and we shall find there a large area which it will be desirable for us to occupy. These are questions that we must consider so that we may not come to a full stop in the work of developing western Canada. I have already suggested to my hon. friend the propriety of having an expert inspection of such lands as these. I believe that some of them have been alienated, the semi-arid, but a good deal more than half the area still remains. We have trouble with the ranchers. These people say: We have no permanency of holding, and so we do not feel like providing shelters or raising fodder, for we do not know when we may be notified to leave our holdings. My idea is that it might be discovered that some of the lands of which we are talking are only fit for ranchers, in which case it might be good policy for the government to give to the rancher a more permanent right of occupation than he has at the present time—something like the old closed lease, which gave the privilege of purchasing a certain portion.

I do think we ought to take a longer time to consider such a Bill as that now before the House than, as I understand it, we are likely to be afforded this session. The Bill comes down late in the session and proposes a very radical change, to my mind. I certainly hope that this Bill will not be pressed in its present form until we have a longer time and more opportunity to consider what are going to be its results. I repeat that I cannot conceive anything more detrimental to the interests of the people of Western Canada, especially to the province of Manitoba and to the eastern part of Saskatchewan, which I know very well, than to put upon the statute-book such a law as this. I do not need any further evidence than I have in my possession that it is going to be simply cruel to offer people this inducement. A man wrote me the other day, a man who has a beautiful farm, and he said, I have a couple of boys growing up, and I think we will go west, and each of us get a quarter-section of land. Well, I was perfectly amazed to think that that man would consider anything of that kind. But then I know the powerful influence, the desire there is on the part of every one to secure more land, and that is going to be the effect of this Bill. Some one said to me the other day that it was going to depopulate our province. I do not think it will do that, but it will have the effect of taking away from the province of Manitoba a very large number of people whom I would like to see remain.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman on what he bases his estimate that as many as 60,000 people would leaves their homes and go west? Why not 30,000, why not 90,000?

Mr. GREENWAY. Yes, and why not 150,000? I told my hon. friends that I had made the calculation from the report of the Department of the Interior, and that there were 220,000 homesteaders to whom the minister is saying to-day, I will give you another quarter-section of land. Was I not moderate in cutting that into four? I think I was.

Mr. KNOWLES. Again I ask my hon. friend: Is it not true that there are many hundreds and indeed thousands of homesteaders who already have the privilege of a second homestead under the Act, not at $3 an acre but for nothing, and who are not exercising it?

Mr. GREENWAY. I do not think there are a very large number, because that class of people are going to get 480 acres. What excuse is there for that? But my hon. friends tell me: We give one man two homesteads and a pre-emption. That does not look to me like evening things up, to say the least.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be popular for that class of men.

Mr. GREENWAY. Popular to the man who wants the land. But it has been suggested that we have lands in Manitoba. Now, so far as I understand the Manitoba situation, we have no such lands available at the present time, simply because the

old Canadian Northern have not satisfied their land grant, the old Manitoba and Southeastern have not satisfied their land grant, the swamp lands that were going to the provincial government have not been handed over, and there are a great many pieces of land which we have to exchange, and which practically tie up the entire province of Manitoba. So that it is not competent for any one, unless he has exercised the right which my hon. friend gives him in another part of the Bill of squatting upon the land, to go in and get a pre-emption in Manitoba. The only effect it can have there is to take away from Manitoba, as I said before, the people who are there now comfortably situated.

Now, what will happen? I would not wish my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior anything bad. I would not suggest that I would like to see him in trouble, but if this Bill goes through, and the people stampede, as I know they will stampede in the western country, for the purpose of getting a quarter-section of this land, what troubles he is going to have! I do not think he has seen any troubles to compare with what he will see when people begin to run after these quarter-sections, which are limited. There are eight or ten agencies. I fancy if a man went to one of these agencies tomorrow, supposing this Bill were passed, and asked if such and such odd-numbered sections were open for settlement, they would have to tell him that they did not know. At least that is my experience. I had occasion, since I came down here, to submit to the department a number of sections of land, and I found that they had to go through three or four departments of the government before I could get my answer to know whether these lands were available. Now that difficulty and delay will be increased tenfold under the provisions of this Bill.

Now in addition to a remark which I made about the semi-arid district, I want to say that I think it would be a misfortune to induce people to go on the semi-arid lands, unless they are conversant with the mode of farming which has to be employed for the purpose of successful agriculture. My hon. friends from the west will remember perhaps, at least I do, when the Lester Kaye farm was bought from the Canadian Pacific Railway, I think, at $2.50 an acre, very elaborately fixed up, with fences, buildings and everything else, and the purchasers went away satisfied that these lands after all were no good, and abandoned them. That was a bad thing for the west, and it would be a bad thing to encourage settlement upon arid districts, a great portion of which is not fit for settlement, and cannot be profitably irrigated.

Now my hon. friends may think that I am speaking warmly. I am very sorry that I have to take this position, but I consider it my duty to do so, knowing as I do the west pretty well. I am sure my hon. friends will give me credit for not wishing to do anything against the interests of western Canada; that is one of the things that I will not do if I know it. But that being the case, I would say to the government that I hope they will not press this Bill through the House. I have already said that I do not object so much to the Bill, although it was a question whether pre-emption could apply in all districts—I did not object so much to that if it were not for its retroactive feature, and if it did not have the effect of inducing that unrest which we should not have in western Canada. I hope the government will consider these things, and I hope they will give us ample time to consider what should be done in the case of these lands. I have no objection to making some provision. My own idea was to sell the odd-numbered sections, somewhat as my hon. friend proposes, but let any one have them who would do the duties which he imposes. In conclusion I will say that I hope we shall have plenty of time to consider a Bill of this unusual character, constituting as it does, a new departure.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). We have seen the rather unusual spectacle this afternoon of a direct disagreement between the government and one of their most prominent supporters from the west, in regard to one of the most vital questions of their western land policy. The views of the hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) who has for so many years been premier of the province of Manitoba, must be given the most respectful and careful consideration by this House. I have no doubt they will receive such respectful and careful consideration. In the meantime, I beg to congratulate that hon. gentleman, at least, for the courage he has displayed in taking the stand he has taken.

I had understood when we met this afternoon that the House was going to consider the question of a consolidation of the Dominion Lands Acts, and that we were not to enter into a long discussion in regard to the policies of the two parties who have controlled successively the destinies of this Dominion.

I regret very much that the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has entered into such a controversial discussion. I was wondering why a measure of such importance to the country had been kept back so long and had only been brought down in the last weeks of the session, but perhaps the reason is to be found in the speech we have just heard. When the Bill creating the new provinces was under discussion some two years ago, I made the strongest protest I could against withholding the land of those provinces from provincial ownership and control. During that discussion the right hon. Prime Minister urged the necessity of adherring to the idea of

confederation and keeping to the spirit of our constitution; but in no case was the spirit of our constitution more ruthlessly set aside than when its fundamental principle, the principle of the ownership and control by each province of the lands within its borders, was denied the new provinces. One of the hon. gentlemen sitting behind my right hon. friend on that occasion, who is now the premier of one of those provinces, referred to this principle as being the very keystone of the confederation structure. While the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia has each the sole management and control of its public domain, through its own provincial legislature, composed of members directly responsible to the people most intimately concerned, that right is denied our new provinces. This House, with a representation from the western provinces of very little more than half what the west is entitled to with its present population—this House, with less than one tenth of its members responsible to the parties most concerned, has to legislate on matters which should come entirely within the purview of the provincial legislatures. The legislation on such matters, under such conditions, can never be entirely satisfactory to the people of these new provinces, nor can it be expected that the administration of these Dominion lands from a centre thousands of miles away can ever be satisfactory. When 116,000 square miles of territory were added to the province of Quebec in 1898 from lands previously in the possession of the Dominion, the full ownership and control of those lands was handed over to that province. But when the new provinces in the Northwest were created out of the same Dominion owned lands, the ownership and control of their lands was denied the people of these provinces. Apparently they were not considered worthy to be entrusted with such ownership and control. In my opinion, it would have been infinitely better if the government had this session introduced a measure handing over to the three prairie provinces the ownership of their public lands rather than come down with such cumbersome and complicated legislation as the Bill before us. The conditions in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories and parts of British Columbia differ very materially in many respects the one from the other, and legislation which may suit one portion may not be at all suitable for another. What may be good legislation for one province need not necessarily be good for another. But in this Bill we find an attempt to embody in the one measure legislation suitable to the whole of this vast area, extending as it does from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I do not propose to occupy any more time discussing this particular question. The complexion of the House is pretty much the same as it was two years ago; and even if the government realizes, as it must, the mistake then made, we could hardly expect them now to go back on the legislation they then introduced. I only wish to reiterate my protest against the present conditions and I trust that an awakened pubilc sentiment will in the near future bring about a radical change in those conditions. Having entered my protest, I conceive it my duty to make the best of the situation as it exists and to endeavour to the best of my poor abilities, to assist in making this measure as good as possible. No doubt there is pressing necessity for some changes in the Dominion Lands Act, and that being the case, I do not propose to take any objection to the second reading of this Bill. Nor do I propose to discuss at any length its principle provisions, but shall reserve my criticism until the details come up for consideration.

I desire however to offer a few very brief observations. In the first place I take exception to the enormous discretionary powers conferred upon the Minister of Interior. Some of these are new and some have been acquired from time to time by legislation and by order in council. Let me recite a few in order to illustrate my meaning. Under this Bill, the minister becomes the sole arbiter as to the extent to which one class of duties, the cultivation duties shall be performed in order to enable the settler to claim his grant of free land, and that extent may vary in every individual case. The minister may, in certain cases, cancel entries made in good faith, with or without compensation. He becomes the arbiter in disputes between contending entrants and makes an award to one or the other, and from his award there is no appeal. He may grant compensation or not at his discretion for improvements on lands which have been cancelled for the non-fulfilment of the strict letter of the law. He fixes the price that shall be charged for pre-emptions. Should any entrant fail in his duties, the minister may cancel the entry and give back the money or not as he sees fit, and there is no appeal.

Then again, he may sell agricultural lands—and they are not properly defined in the Act—up to 640 acres, under general regulations by order in council, and without restrictions as to the minimum price which is to be charged, and without public competition. Again, he may sell grazing, hay, and marsh lands in any quantities, at any price, without competition, and under general regulations by order in council. In the same way, he may sell lands suitable for irrigation at any price, in any quantities; he can sell lands required for the development of water-powers; he can sell lands containing coal or other minerals, all under general regulations by order in coun-

cil and without any restriction upon him with regard to price, or quantity, and without putting them up to public competition. He may also reserve from entry, or throw open to entry or sale, as he sees fit, vast areas of land without giving any due public notice in regard to them. If it is contrary to the interests of the people of this Dominion, and especially contrary to the interests of the people of the provinces concerned, that the parliament of the Dominion, instead of the provincial legislatures, should exercise powers of administration over the public domain of these provinces, how much more is it against the interests of the people that this parliament should delegate so many of its powers to one man. That man in his office in Ottawa, more than 1,000 miles away from the nearest point of the territory which is to be under his control, can exercise in some instances, more arbitrary powers than have been exercised in modern times by any constitutional monarch. In a sense, the Minister of the Interior is an absentee landlord with practically despotic powers over the people who become his tenants in that western country. I believe that some discretionary power should be given to the central authority which has to exercise the administration of the public domain, but I believe that these powers should be restricted within clearly defined limits, and that in all cases where the rights of individuals are concerned, there should be an appeal to the courts of the land. Such is not provided for in this Bill, so far as I can see. The people who are concerned in the administration of this law, the people who are settling our western lands, should know exactly where their rights begin and where they end. They certainly cannot tell what their rights are under the provisions of this Bill. In the hands of a Minister of the Interior like the present, whose attitude is well known in regard to partisan officials under his control these powers become specially dangerous. In spite of the resolution of this House that civil servants should not take part in active politics, the attitude of the Minister of the Interior has practically encouraged the hundreds of officials in his employ in the west to take part in elections. I need not go into details ; the attitude of the minister is pretty well known and pretty clearly understood by the members of this House. Therefore, if you have the settler without defined rights, and if you have at the same time partisan officials upon whose reports the future of that settler depends, you can imagine what tyranny may be exercised, and what injustice may be done. Such a thing should not be possible in a free country like ours. There should be in the Bill, and I hope to see it incorporated in committee, a provision for more publicity with regard to the standing of all the public lands which are open for entry. A person who desires to make an entry with regard to any parcel of land should know all the details in connection with that parcel. If there is a previous entry he should know when it was granted and to whom ; if others are before him on the list of applicants for cancellation he should know who they are and how many they are ; he should know if there have been any extensions of time for completion of the entry, or any leave of absence granted to the persons in possession. All these details should be completely open and above board ; the records of the land office should be open to the personal inspection of any one who chooses to inspect them. In committee, I shall discuss the details of the Bill, but I wish now to refer to one more matter, and it is a thing which has been prominently brought to our attention during the last two or three months. The coal and mineral areas of the Northwest should be under the control of the provincial authority. The regulation and inspection of mines comes under the purview of the provincial legislatures, but the royalties and the profits to be derived from these mines are retained in the hands of the Dominion. That is not as it should be. The events of the past few months point to the vital necessity for some change in the regulations concerning our mines and mining areas. I would stronly urge that such mining areas as still remain in the hands of the Dominion authorities, should be handed over completely to the ownership and control of the provincial authorities. The people of the western provinces hold very strong views in regard to this matter, and in many parts of that country they have passed the strongest resolutions advocating not merely provincial control of the mines but provincial ownership and provincial operation of these mines. During the last few months we have had a confession of impotence on the part of this administration in regard to coping with the very serious condition of affairs which has arisen in the Northwest owing to the shortness of fuel. The provincial authorities believe that is something they themselves could control if they had possession of their own mines. Therefore, I say that if the Dominion government are not able to deal with such a condition of affairs, but simply make a confession of impotence, let them put the matter into the hands of the provincial authorities, who believe that they certainly could have dealt with it. This would have prevented a state of intense anxiety which existed throughout that country in regard to the fuel suuply during the past winter.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). Mr. Speaker, I desire to express my views very briefly before this measure passes its second reading. I regret that we have not received a fuller explanation from the Minister of the Interior in regard to the working of the different clauses of this Bill than we have had this afternoon. I think it would have been more profitable

if the minister had, in the time he occupied, confined himself to an explanation of some of the very important and radical changes he proposes to adopt rather than in going back and stating the number of miles of railway constructed in the years 1872 and 1874. I propose to follow him in regard to the very few sections of the Bill to which he has referred. I gather that section 27 is the one which embodies the most radical changes in the law. That is the section which gives the right to every man who has his patent for his homestead of taking up another quarter section of land in any part of the new provinces. All he has to do then is to comply with the duties prescribed as to pre-emption. Any homesteader who has not obtained his patent has the right to take up only the quarter-section immediately adjoining his present one. Hon. gentlemen will see how the limitation of that privilege will in a great many cases work a very great hardship. Again, every person who is at all familiar with the surveys in that country knows that in every township sections 11 and 29 are school sections and sections 8 and 26 are reserved for the Hudson Bay Company; so that the homesteaders in a township where the odd-numbered sections around him are taken up or who is next to Hudson bay section, would be practically cut out of his right of pre-emption. Again, there may be a township which is very thickly settled, all the even-numbered sections being taken up, but for some reason the odd-numbered sections are left, but inferior land not selected by railway companies. The man who has his patent leaves that township and goes to another one and pre-empts 160 acres there, under a law which does not require him to live there at all, and is therefore detrimental to the establishment of schools, social conditions and other matters that are desirable for a dense settlement of the country. Do these considerations not indicate to us the error which this government committed two sessions ago in retaining under their control the administration of the lands in the western provinces? We have heard to-day a gentleman who I suppose knows as much about the present condition of affairs in Manitoba as any other hon. member of this House, stating that in Manitoba 160 acres is all that a man required to make a good living, though there may be people who think that in other provinces 160 acres is not enough. I also understood him to say that under this new law people who had exercised their right to pre-emption under the old law, could come back and get another 160 acres, or in all 480 acres; and the same man may have bought another section from a railway company. Is such an Act which brings about such a condition of affairs going to propose a dense settlement? But if this Bill must pass this House, then I consider it to be my duty to make any suggestions I can to make it more workable than it is at its present shape. If it is going to have the effect, as stated by the hon. gentleman, who was formerly Prime Minister of Manitoba, of doing away in a couple of years with all available land in the country, then I have only to express my regret that the Minister of the Interior has not seen fit to reserve certain portions of land for the purpose of encouraging higher education in the new western provinces. The hon. minister states in the notes to his Bill that the price he has put upon the lands is not for the purpose of profit to the country. Then, surely, if the provinces are not to have the administration of their own lands, we should at least save from the wreck a small portion in different parts of the country for the construction and maintenance of provincial universities. Such a provision has been adopted in many of the States of the Union.

I find that in Minnesota and in many other states they have some such law setting aside land for that purpose. May I ask the Minister of the Interior, before this Bill gets into committee to reconsider it and adopt what has proved to be a wise policy in so far as our school lands are concerned, by setting aside certain sections for the purpose of assisting higher education in that country. There is no necessity for my discussing the advantage of any such grant or of pointing out what a worthy thing it would be for the minister to set aside a portion of these lands, which he admits he is going to give away, for the purpose of promoting higher education.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. When you left the chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to point out that although the Bill is intended, if some of the arguments we heard this afternoon were correct, to alienate practically all the remaining lands in that country, there was no provision for retaining any portion of that land to assist in the construction and maintenance of provincial universities. I also pointed out in that the section referring to the school lands, apparently, the old idea has been abandoned. Apparently, it is not intended, in that section of the country known as the Northwest Territories, that is, the territory outside the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, to continue what seems to me to have been a most admirable provision in the Dominion Lands Act, the setting aside of certain sections for school purposes. This is the change that is proposed, if I read this Bill correctly, and if my interpretation of it is not correct, I would like to be set

right by the Minister of the Interior. I was also discussing section 27 which gives the right to pre-empt quarter-sections under certain conditions. I obtained the information from the minister—I must confess it was with some difficulty that the section of the Act could be interpreted—that the man who has his patent to his land before this Act comes into force can obtain another quarter-section under the conditions of the Act anywhere in the territory which the Bill governs. I suppose it would not be necessary that he should even live in the same province. But the man who only has his homestead entered at the time this Act comes into force, although he may have been on the land three or four years, not having got his patent by complying with certain conditions, can only select land adjoining his quarter-section, and then only under certain conditions. I tried to impress upon the minister the fact that this could not but work out in great hardship in many cases. I tried to point out that the man who, for some reason or by some chance, had made his homestead entry next a section of land retained by the Hudson Bay Company would necessarily be limited in his selection of a pre-emption. There are two such sections in a great many townships, sections 8 and 26. So, the man who has entered his land adjoining the Hudson Bay Company's land, is obliged to take a much more limited selection and, in many cases, will be unable to pre-empt at all until he completes his homestead duties and gets his patent three or four years hence when, if there is land left under the operation of this pre-emption clause, he stands on the same footing with the man who has his patent to-day. From the perusal I have been able to give the Bill it seems to me that the man who went into that country with his money and bought a quarter-section of school land or railway land, or, Hudson bay land, has no right to pre-empt any land or get additional land under this Act. If I am wrong in that, I would like to be set right. But if I am not mistaken, then it is plain that there is a discrimination against the man who came in and bought his land for money. That is to say, the man who went there and bought his land gets nothing, but the man who went in there and got his land for nothing has additional rights conferred upon him. Section 27 as it stands cannot be worked except with great hardship upon certain individuals and serious discriminations against them.

When I point out the objections to the Bill that occur to me, I am not necessarily opposing the principle of the Bill, which would give to the people in certain sections of the country the right to acquire some land, nor do I want to be so understood. It is realized in that country, in certain sections—and I take this information from people who have had more practical experience in the business than I have had—

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY.

a man requires more than 160 acres of land. Therefore I do not speak of the whole country. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) is more familiar with the condition prevailing in the province of Manitoba, and possibly he was speaking from the standpoint of his province, or possibly he was speaking from the national standpoint and wanted to allay the feeling which a scramble for the acquiring of additional land might create. But I am not opposed to the principle, so far as Alberta or Saskatchewan are concerned, which gives the right to a man to acquire more land. And I approve of any principle which will settle up the odd-numbered sections which have been lying idle. These odd-numbered sections should no longer be withheld from settlement. The government, up to the present time, have carried out a rather strange policy with regard to this land. The ordinary settler would apply to buy the odd-numbered sections, and the answer would come back that the policy was not to sell. But certain people seemed to be able to get that land when occasion demanded, without much difficulty. Therefore, I welcome the change in the law which will tell the people in what way the odd-numbered sections are being held by the government. I do not oppose the principle of the Bill which will bring these lands into such position that they can be occupied. But I would point out that section 27 as now prepared will create great contention, and, as it stands, I doubt that it can be worked at all. This is one of the few sections the Minister of the Interior referred to this afternoon. In this Bill of 52 pages, a very cumbersome piece of legislation, so far as I was able to follow the minister this afternoon, he only referred to, or gave explanation of three sections. He may excuse himself on the ground that some of the provisions are old, but, to my mind, that is not an answer, because the conditions have changed very much since some of these conditions were inserted. It will be my privilege to discuss some of these questions when the Bill is before us in committee; at present I will refer briefly to the sections of which the minister spoke this afternoon. If I recollect well, he said he was putting into the law what has been the practice for some time—that is, allowing the heirs of a deceased homesteader to go on and complete the settlement duties and get the patent, even though they lived in a foreign country. That may or may not be wise. But it seems to me that the same end would be attained if the land were sold on settlement conditions and the money realized handed over to the estate of the deceased homesteader. This would put the matter practically in the same position as winding up an estate and would be just as advantageous to the heirs, while the advantage to the country would be that you would probably get an actual settler into the country who

would not only fulfil the settlement conditions but would remain, instead of one who, though he completed the settlement duties and got his patent, might only be speculator and would hold the land for speculative purposes. The hon. minister referred also to section 15 which gives the Governor in Council the right, in case of physical disability on the part of the homesteader, to dispense with the homestead conditions. That may be a very excellent provision, and I hope that nobody on this side of the House will oppose it if the government is going into the charity business. You might go a step further, and say that if a man has gone up there and got land under an agreement with deferred payments, if he becomes ill, or accident overtakes him and he cannot make the balance of his payment, why should not the minister extend in his favour the operation of the homestead clause ?

Now, I have a few observations to make with regard to one of two other sections of the Bill. When the Autonomy Bills were passed by this parliament the reason assigned for withholding the lands from the provinces was that if they were given to the provinces they would be administered for the sake of the revenue, that settlement would thereby be retarded. But I find that even under this Bill, by section 32, the minister reserves the power to sell the lands in blocks of 640 acres, and at a price not mentioned. The old Act I think fixed the minimum value at $1 an acre. That provision has been struck out, and the Minister of the Interior, whenever it suits his purpose, can turn round and sell 640 acres of land at whatever price he chooses. It does not say that the applications have to come in singly, a syndicate of ten persons can get together and acquire large blocks of that land. To proceed I submit that in passing this Bill we should be careful, to satisfy the settler in that country, that his rights are clearly defined. His rights should not depend on the good will of any official. He should know that his right to a patent depends on a statutory law and not on political favour. I think that the less politics are mixed up in the administration of our public lands, the better for the development of our country, no matter which party is in power. Now look at these wide powers given to the minister or his officials. For example, come back to section 27, subclause 4, which says that the minimum rate payable for land under this section should be $3 an acre. Why not make a special provision to sell land to the settler on easy terms and at a low rate ? Why should the minister have the right to say, it is $3 an acre for you, $5 for somebody else, $10 for somebody else. It seems to me that if the minister fixes a minimum rate under this section, a maximum rate should be fixed also, and that the great powers given to the minister under this section should not be sanctioned. Take also section 13. A man who acquires a patent for his homestead has got to fulfil homestead duties. Among those duties, he has to cultivate a certain amount of land, and the minister can say whether he has cultivated enough land or not. It is absolutely in his power, or in the power of an official, to say to a man : You are entitled to your homestead, I do not care if an acre of land has not been cultivated. There is nothing defined, nothing to point out what should be done. It is a loose way of doing business to put it into the hands of the minister to treat people as he pleases, and for his own political purposes. Section 80 will leave it to the minister to say whether the lands are fit for agriculture or not. You speak about agricultural lands, and at any time the minister may make up his mind, on the report of an official, he can withdraw a certain area of land from homesteading because they are not at present agricultural land. There is that great power reserved to the minister under sections 7 and 80, that a man who has got his homestead entry is liable to have it cancelled upon a report of an official to the Minister of the Interior. The minister upon that report has absolute power to take away the title of that man to his land.

There is another point. It is apparently the intention of the department to continue that iniquitous policy which they have heretofore continued of making the work of the land offices a matter of secrecy. What is the reason ? When a man goes into that country and obtains a title to land for homesteading or pre-emption, why cannot the title to that land be searched just the same as if the land was held under freehold ? People are continually going to the land office and saying, I want to know whether such a homestead is vacant. Nobody is on the land, there are no improvements and they are told that it is covered by a prior application. When they ask for the name of the prior applicant, they are told that it is against the rules to reveal the name ; and they cannot do so. The result is that people suspect that they are being injured far more by the administration of these land regulations than by anything else that is done. Nearly all the correspondence we get on this side of the House from the west is from people complaining that they cannot find out anything about a certain quarter-section that has been vacant for years. I think that the records in the land offices in that country, in order to satisfy the people that they are being fairly dealt with, should be open for inspection, and something in the nature of an abstract should be provided when a man wishes to search out the title of a picee of land, or the land adjoining. If the department has not got enough officials to give applicants the information, or an abstract, to show who was the first man to enter upon that land,

when the homestead was cancelled, or who else is applying for cancellation, then I say that a greater number of officials should be provided for by charging a small fee to each applicant for the search, and I am satisfied that a great many people in that country who have gone to a great deal of trouble will be glad to pay a small fee for the information. The Act also deals with lands which are not fit for agriculture except they are irrigated. Well, it seems to me that after the experience we have recently had this session, when these lands are available and are sought after they should be put up to public auction; they should not be handed out to a few friends like what was done in the case of the Robins Irrigation Company, which was recently under discussion in this House. This in another section on which I shall have more to say when the Bill gets into committee; and I shall also have something to say on other sections of the Bill.

Mr. G. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). I wish, Mr. Speaker, to add my protest against the giving of the great powers which, by this Bill, are to be granted the Governor in Council and the minister. I am aware that the trend of our legislation of late years has been to vest a great deal more authority in the Governor in Council than formerly, but this Bill goes to the extreme in that direction and grants more power to the minister than is at all necessary. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) has mentioned some instances. I wish to refer to subsections (a) and (b) of section 7, under which the minister has the power to cancel homestead entries at his own pleasure or discretion. If he thinks there is any merchantable timber on a homestead or that it can be of any use for the development of a water supply, he has full liberty to cancel the entry. And there seems to be no arrangement made to compensate the person whose land is taken from him because there is merchantable timber on it although there is compensation provided in the case of land being taken on account of its being needed for water purposes. This may be an oversight, and in any event is very unfair.

Section 27, to which my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) has referred is very serious in this respect. It also gives extraordinary discretion to the minister. Under subsection 4, the minimum rate payable for land is fixed, but the minister is given the power to charge as much more as he likes. In fact all of these clauses give the minister, should he feel inclined—and I am not making any personal reflection—the opportunity to show favouritism and sell lands to his own friends at less prices than to others.

Section 32 gives the Governor in Council the authority to sell agricultural lands practically as he may think fit. The section provides:

Agricultural lands shall only be open for purchase, under regulations made from time to time by the Governor in Council, and there shall be no sale to one person, under such regulations, of an area of land in excess of one section without a special order of the Governor in Council.

This is a very extraordinary provision, especially under present conditions in the Northwest when lands are scarce. It seems to me that this power is not one which the Governor in Council should ask to have placed in his hands. Section 34 also gives great powers to the Governor in Council with regard to lands which are unsuitable for cultivation without the aid of irrigation or which are required in connection with any system of irrigation. This section provides that such lands may be sold or leased in such manner and under such terms and conditions as may be fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council.

So the Bill goes on giving the minister great powers and giving him the right to exercise them as he may think fit. Under section 80, he has the right to set aside and reserve from entry for homestead or from pre-emption or from sale as agricultural land any Dominion lands which he considers to be unsuited for cultivation without the aid of irrigation. He is thus to be the judge as to how much need there is of having these lands irrigated.

I wish to refer specially to the clauses dealing with licenses and permits for the cutting of timber. Section 51 provides that the Governor in Council may from time to time make regulations for the disposal by public competition of the right to cut timber. What is public competition? I do not know of any legal definition of the phrase, but under this section the Governor in Council, and the minister himself in fact, is able to give to these words whatever interpretation they may please. Last year on the 17th May, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), speaking in this House, page 3577, said in reply to an interpellation regarding the sale of timber berths:

There is no sale or disposition of timber berths except by competition. The application is considered in the department, and if it does not conflict with some other berth and some other interests and is approved of, notice is given by advertisement in what is supposed to be the nearest newspaper, and printed slips containing the same information as in the advertisement are distributed as widely as may be to persons interested in tendering for timber limits. The advertisement runs on an average, I think, about six weeks before the tenders are opened.

In other words six weeks would be sufficient notice that these limits were to be put up for public competition. Let me take this opportunity of stating from personal knowledge that for a purpose of t six weeks notice is absolutely inadequate.

When timber limits are advertised for sale by auction in this city, there are often six months given for people to examine the limits. I have never known of a successful sale in which there was less than three or four months given. I remember a sale which took place in this city some years ago, after only six or eight weeks' notice, and it was an absolute failure as far as the sellers were concerned. Only one or two people were able to form any estimate of the value of the limits in the time put at their disposal. To give only six weeks notice of the sale of a timber limit in the Northwest territories, miles away from any city, is really tempting Providence, as far as the Dominion is concerned, because it is practically certain that bids will not come in sufficiently numerous to bring a proper price. That must be evident to any one who will take the trouble to consider the question. In the first place, we have not all of us got men at our disposal to send and examine the limit on the moment. When notice is given of the sale of limits, it is necessary that an intending purchaser should arrange to have a good man go out and examine it. After we have got that arranged, we must get our supplies together and then it takes a man weeks to examine the limit properly so as to be able to make a report on which we may base an offer of purchase. Should the examination be an insufficient one it is manifest that the buyer must make a very low bid in order to be safe. I am positive that a short notice of the sale of timber limits is practically certain to bring about a sale at far less than their value. This section 51 further provides that the berth shall be awarded to the person who offers the highest bonds therefor. With such a short notice, I can well understand that often there is only one applicant for the limit and I can well understand how it has happened that many times in the department there have only been one or two applicants. Under this provision the department is bound to give the limit to the highest bidder. No effort is made by the department to have a survey and report of the limits in order that the minister may be in a position to judge whether the price is a proper one or not. This is not the way they do things in Ontario. Before the Ontario government decided to sell limits, they always have them examined on their own account and then put an upset price on each limit based on the report of their own confidential explorer. Consequently if the limit is worth $1,000 a mile and only $100 a mile is bid, they do not sell. But under this provision in this Bill, the minister would have to accept the bid of $100 a mile for a limit which might be worth $1,000 or $10,000 a mile. He would have no means of knowing—he apparently does not want to know—it is not proposed that he should take any means of ascertaining the real value of these limits. The minister told us in his speeches of last year, that it was customary to insert the advertisement in the nearest newspaper. This practice may quite easily lead to fraud. For instance, if a limit were to be sold near Prince Albert, the advertisement would be published only in the Prince Albert newspapers and there is no provision to have it published in newspapers in Ottawa, Winnipeg, Toronto, or other large centres of population.

I compliment the minister on section 53 of the Bill. On the 17th of May last there was a debate in the House on the system of licensing timber limits and the orders in council regarding them, and it was shown that this government had passed, on the 14th of April, 1903, a very extraordinary order in council, under which, the limit owners would have the right to renewal of the license without any increase in the dues or change in the regulations. By section 53 of this Bill it is provided that we shall practically go back to the old law which was passed by the Conservative government, and which remained in force until changed by the Liberal government on the 14th of April, 1903. The suggestions which were made from this side of the House last year, were paid no attention to in the House, but a short time afterwards the government experienced a change of heart, and decided that after all the Conservatives were right.

Mr. BERGERON. As usual.

Mr. PERLEY. As usual. And on the 23rd of July, 1906, the government passed an order in council stating :

> Whereas by the order of the Governor General in Council of the 14th April, 1903, amending the regulations governing the granting of yearly licenses to cut timber on Dominion lands in Manitoba, the Northwest Territories, and within the railway belt in British Columbia established by order of the Governor General in Council dated the 1st of July, 1898, as amended by subsequent orders, the following section is enacted as section 3 of the said regulations :

I need not read that section ; it is the section put in force by the order in council of April, 1903, which we found fault with last year. Then this order in council goes on to say :

> And whereas there is some uncertainty as to the effect of this section.

That uncertainty was apparently brought about by the debate in this House for there does not seem to have been any uncertainty in the mind of the minister before that :

> Therefore, the Governor General in Council, in order to make the intention clear, is pleased to order that the said section 3 shall be and the same is hereby amended, by adding to the first sentence thereof, immediately after the words 'the area licensed,' the following : 'provided, however, that such renewal shall

be granted subject to any changes which may have been made in the regulations increasing or altering the rental or dues to be paid or otherwise varying the terms and conditions under which the licenses are granted.'

That order in council was passed on the 23rd of July last, and it restored the conditions which had been in existence previous to the extraordinary order in council of 1903. Now, this last order in council has been followed out almost exactly in section 53 of this Bill, and to that extent the section is quite satisfactory to me, as I understand it. I notice, however, that although this order in council provided that the government should go back to the old arrangement with regard to the dues and regulations, no change was made with regard to allowing settlement on the lands under license, or, as to allowing the homestead settlers to cut the timber they required for building purposes and for fuel. It will be remembered that previous to 1903, the licenses to cut timber, contained a provision that the minister could, on 60 days notice, sell lands out of these limits if he thought it desirable to do so. I think this was a proper power to give the minister, except that the notice should have been longer than 60 days, which was so short that it was hardly fair to the lumbermen. At the same time it is always usual to have a clause of that kind in timber licenses. I notice that last summer, when the government were setting right one part of these regulations, they did not do anything with regard to restoring the power to the minister to sell lands out of timber limits. The right of the homestead settlers to cut timber for building purposes and firewood must have been a great benefit to them, and I am much surprised that the present minister has not seen his way to insert that provision in the licenses, in order that the homestead settlers should have liberty, under his authority, to cut timber for these purposes. Now, taking section 56, I must say that I do not understand subsection 3 of that section. It says:

The provisions of this section shall apply to all timber berths heretofore disposed of under any Act respecting Dominion lands as if they had been contained in such Act when it was passed.

It would seem, that this subsection 3 is limited in its application to section 56, but surely it is intended that all the provisions of this Act shall apply to all the limits heretofore licensed. If you restrict the provisions of subsection 3 to section 56, it would by implication, seem that it was not intended that the other sections of this Act should apply to limits heretofore disposed of. I said a moment ago, that I was satisfied with section 53, but if it is not to apply to licenses heretofore granted I am certainly not satisfied with it, and I would urge that subsection 3 of section 56 be broadened, and made a separate section in some way, so that it shall apply to all the sections of the Act, and not to section 56 alone. The licenses which have heretofore been granted should most certainly come under the provisions of this Act, as well as any licenses to be granted hereafter. That is always the custom in such matters, and I hope the minister intends to have section 53 apply to licenses heretofore granted, when, by implication, subsection 3 of section 56 would seem to provide otherwise.

Section 59 is a long and curious section. It provides for the granting of permits to cut timber, and entirely under the authority of the Governor in Council, which practically means in this instance the Minister of the Interior. I infer that this section is not intended to cover lands included in timber limits, but I question very much whether it is right and proper that the Minister of the Interior should have authority to grant permits to cut timber for all the purposes mentioned in that section. It seems to me to be an extreme provision, under which a chance might be given to a Minister of the Interior, who did not wish to do his duty as the present one does, to grant permits to people for political purposes and to use discrimination and favouritism in granting those permits. In order that I may show why I feel that way about it, I wish to refer to two orders in council passed by this government during the past year, one on the 19th of February, 1906, and one on the 16th of May, 1906. The one on the 19th of February reads as follows:

The Governor in Council is pleased to order that the order in council, dated 1st July, 1898, establishing the regulations governing the granting of yearly licenses and permits to cut timber on Dominion lands in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and in the railway belt in the province of British Columbia, and amended by subsequent orders in council shall be, and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following clause:

In the discretion of the Minister of the Interior, permits may be granted without competition in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta to sawmill owners to cut over a definitely described tract of land not exceeding fifty square miles in extent on payment of Crown dues at the rates fixed by section 11, clause (a) of the regulations established by order in council, on the 1st July, 1898, as amended by subsequent orders in council. Permits of this class shall become null and void in the event of the permittee not operating upon the berth described herein to a reasonable extent during the continuance thereof.

Under that order in council the minister in his absolute discretion could grant permits without competition to sawmill owners to cut timber, not on a few acres of land, but on fifty square miles, and he could give them that right at such prices as he

chose and without asking for tenders or competition of any kind. That shows to what excess the Governor in Council may go in making these regulations, which he is permitted to do in clause after clause of this Bill. Under clause 59 the Governor in Council has power to issue permits to cut timber for seven different purposes without any limit as to the area in which it may be cut. Under subsection 2 of that section, for certain other purposes the area is limited to one square mile. I am glad to say that the order in council of the 19th of February, 1906, was altered on the 16th of May, 1906, and the rights and powers of the minister in respect to the granting of these permits were very much reduced. I quote this order in council of the 19th of February, however, to show how far the Governor in Council seems to be prepared to go in granting extraordinary powers to the minister to deal with lands and other properties in the Northwest. Now, on the second reading of this Bill I do not propose to say anything more. I simply mention these matters of general interest to show the extraordinary powers given to the minister in almost every clause of this Bill.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of entering into a lengthy discussion of the various clauses of this Bill, but merely to refer to some clauses that have been specially dealt with by the Minister of the Interior, and I will try to avoid repeating the criticisms which have already been made by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. There is one feature of this debate that strikes me as somewhat peculiar. We have heard what was in my opinion a very strong speech this afternoon by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). It is not often that that hon. gentleman voices my own sentiments, nor am I going to say that I am in harmony with all the views he has expressed to-day ; but I am willing to concede that the hon. gentleman's experience is very much greater than mine along this line, and I would attach a great deal of importance to the opinions he so strongly and so confidently expressed. The hon. member for Lisgar has occupied a very prominent position in the political affairs of our country. When he first went to the Northwest, I think he was engaged in taking out settlers. In that work he took charge of numerous excursion trains, and he therefore knows the inducements which were held out at that time to people who left the older provinces of the Dominion to enter upon their new homes in the province of Manitoba. Having been the premier of that province for eleven years, he has followed the trend of public events and the development of our land laws, and is I think a competent authority on this particular subject. That being so, I would have felt a little more satisfied in my own mind if some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—and there are a number of them in their places, who listened to the speech of the hon. member for Lisgar to-day—had attempted to controvert the statements made by that hon. gentleman, if they were susceptible of being controverted. I was somewhat surprised that the Prime Minister did not himself consider that even scant courtesy to the hon. member for Lisgar at his hands would demand a reply of some kind to that speech. Time was not very long ago when that hon. gentleman's opinion had great weight in influencing the opinion of the Prime Minister on other matters. How have the mighty fallen when so little attention is paid to that hon. gentleman's utterances as have been paid to his remarks of to-day. The Minister of the Interior has a great task upon his hands in formulating a Bill that will meet the requirements not only of the people now resident in those provinces but also those who are about to make their homes in the far Northwest during the next few years, and I think a great deal of this trouble has been brought upon him by his own action because, as a representative of the west, he had the key of the situation in his own hands prior to his entry into the government. If he had then valiantly stuck out for that which he declared should be given to the provinces prior to the passing of the Autonomy Bills and had insisted on his colleagues handing the lands over to the provinces in order that the local government might handle the lands to the best advantage, he would have avoided his present difficulty, but it seems that through some influence or another the hon. gentleman succumbed to the blandishments of his colleagues who were not of the same opinion and as a result there is now great difficulty in drafting a Bill that will meet the wishes of the people of the Northwest.

There are many clauses of this Bill with which I am in entire sympathy. With the principle of the Bill there is little fault to be found, although it is drafted in such a manner that a great many details are open to very serious objection. One clause to which I might refer with commendation is that relating to the acquiring of a homestead by a young man approaching 18 years of age. Hitherto as a matter of privilege he has been permitted to hold land for about one year ; under this Act it is permitted as a matter of right that he should hold land in this way. That is right and proper because under the provisions of the existing Act as administered I feel convinced that it could be utilized and has been utilized for preference and discriminating in the interests of certain individuals. This clause, making this a matter of right, is one which I think will receive the endorsation of members of this House.

Another clause to which the minister re-

ferred is a commendable one so far as it goes, that is, the provision that where an application is made for an entry through a subagent that application can be made (at the expense, I believe of the applicant) by wire, to the agent of the land district; but I think it might go a little further than this, because it might happen that under the provision of this Bill, if it stops there, the agent might act in collusion with some friend of his, possibly in the locality where the land office is situated, and give him a tip that an application had arrived by wire, so that the friend could rush in another application, forestalling the distant application through the sub-land agent. The applicant who makes his application through the sub-land agent is supposed to send in his formal application by mail but before this application arrived at the land office, this manipulation to which I have referred might easily take place so in my opinion it would be a wise provision to have a return wire as well, stating whether or not a prior application has been made. This I think would do away with a great deal of the objection on this score that I have just urged.

The minister referred to subsection 3 of section 8 which provides:

> The minister may reserve for one year any area of agricultural land, not exceeding one quarter-section, for any male of the full age of seventeen years who lives on a homestead with his father, mother, brother, sister or guardian.

Why limit this to residence on a homestead with a relative. Suppose the father or mother resides on land that has been purchased from a railway company or from any land corporation or from the government, why should the boy not have the same right? Why is it so very particular that this son, if he happens to be a son, should only be allowed the privilege of making entry if he resides upon a homestead owned by the father, mother, brother, sister, or guardian? I think that could easily be amended so as to refer to any agricultural land or any land upon which reside the relatives with whom he is living for the time being. My judgment, after a cursory examination of the clause, is that that would be a wise amendment to that particular subsection.

As the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) has stated this afternoon I think that this particular Bill is not going to be of any great benefit to the province from which I come, Manitoba. I asked the minister this afternoon if he could give us approximately the amount of lands that would be thrown open by this Bill in the respective provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I do not know whether or not the minister had that information in his possession this afternoon and did not care to allow the members to see it, but I think if he furnished that information it would be seen that but a comparatively small portion of this land lies in Manitoba. Manitoba is a small little province, much smaller than I hope to see it in the very near future—particularly after the verdict last week in that province, largely on that line—but I think that even with the extended boundaries but a small portion of those lands will fall within the area of Manitoba and it is therefore in my opinion an attempt of the hon. minister (Mr. Oliver) to boom his own province, and possibly a portion of Saskatchewan, at the expense of the little province of Manitoba. With the views expressed by my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) I am quite in accord, I do not see that it is going to work to the benefit of Manitoba. Manitoba may be and very likely will be injured by this Bill through the drawing away of some of the splendid settlers we already have who will be only too eager and anxious to receive free land grants by going farther west and living there while getting the benefit of the increase in the value of the lands.

The power that has been vested in the minister is a most dangerous one. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) ran over a long list of powers that have been vested in the Minister of the Interior which I think will certainly place a very great lever in his hands in connection with the operation of this Bill. The Minister of the Interior, both present and past, has been in the habit of securing by order in council or some means at his command, year after year, more power and more authority, and this centralized power has been exercised for political effect, I have no hesitation in saying from my own exeprience; and it could be used as a powerful lever in connection with the incoming immigrants to that western country. This is something to which I most strongly object. In this connection I might refer to an order in council passed several years ago whereby the then Minister of the Interior took power to permit parties to cut timber over a district of 50 square miles without competion by mill owners. This authority was abused, it was only open for six months, and some friends of the government having availed themselves of the powers conferred on the minister by the order in council secured 50 square miles without competition by mill withdrawn from others, the order in council was rescinded but not until some of the political friends of the government had secured a large portion of timber limits in their hands. At the same time other applications for timber limits made by trade rivals of those who had secured this privilege were denied. In connection with those timber limits, in addition to what the last speaker has said, I may say that there is a well grounded suspicion, I feel convinced it is more than a suspicion, it is a deep rooted conviction in the public mind to-day,

that the manner in which the opening of tenders and the granting of timber licenses has been conducted has not been an honest and faithful discharge of duty on the part of officials of this government; the licenses have been manipulated. I understand that in years gone by those tenders were always opened in the presence of three officials. Of recent years that has been abused, and I understand that now the tenders are opened by one official only. I think that in a matter of this kind, the government should avoid the appearance of evil and not leave to one gentleman, no matter how high in authority in the department he may be, the duty of opening those tenders, not in the presence of other officials of the government. It may be answered that this should be provided for by regulation. It seems to me that it should be set forth in the Bill itself that tenders for timber licenses shall be opened by at least three reputable officials of the government and not, as I have been informed they have been, by one alone.

Now, the Minister of the Interior, when everything was sailing along most beautifully this afternoon could not resist his old time proclivity to throw a bone of contention into the debate by harking back a quarter of a century and attempting to compare the policy in vogue then with that of the present time. I asked the hon. minister what I thought a very pertinent question, and one that I think was particularly pertinent if he attempted to make such a comparison. For there can be no basis of comparison between the conditions existing to-day and those that existed when the contract for the Canadian Pacific Railway was signed. Had the hon. gentleman desired to be fair, he would have compared the policy and conditions of 1881-2 with those of 1874-6 when the Mackenzie government attempted to secure the opening up of that country by a transcontinental line by means of large cash bonuses and large land grants, and failed. But, when the hon. gentleman takes a time when the land was practically valueless and compares it with the conditions of to-day which were rendered possible by Conservative statesmanship which led to the opening up of the country with what it is to-day, it is simply child's play. If it was an extravagant bargain from the country's standpoint to give 25,000,000 acres of land to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway line—and many of the hon. gentleman's friends do not regard it as extravagant in view of the development which it has accomplished—what shall we say of the action of the preceding government, which, no doubt, the hon. gentleman supported in offering a land grant twice as large to secure the construction of the line? And yet they failed in their object. This is not imagination on the part of the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) as the hon. minister insinuated at the time, for, if the hon. gentleman will look up the statutes of 1874 he will find the record to be as I have stated. However, if the hon. minister had been in the province of Manitoba during the past two weeks and could have heard the argument put up against the present provincial government in reference to the assisting of railway lines in that province, he would have found a ready answer to some of the arguments he has used here to-night. What is the case? Those opponents of the Manitoba government have been going from platform to platform trying to make capital against the government of the province because of what they call the contingent liability that the province has assumed in guaranteeing bonds for the Canadian Northern to the extent of $10,000 a mile, $2,000 of which is to go for equipment. But this contingent liability which is held up as a great bugaboo for the electors of the province was exceeded by this government in the case of this same Canadian Northern, for they guaranteed bonds to the extent of $13,000 a mile, not a dollar of which was to go into equipment, and this for a prairie section of the line to be constructed for 750 miles to Prince Albert and Edmonton, the Erwood extension and the Grand View. So, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) will not find any particular consolation in comparing the policy of the Conservative government with the policy of the present government so far as the land policy is concerned, or so far as guarantee of bonds is concerned either. Now, I do not think it is even yet too late for the members of the government to retrace their steps and my advice to them is, to avoid the difficulty which the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) who is an authority, states is looming up in the future if the Bill is put through in its present ill-digested form and without the people having an opportunity to investigate its provisions, and even this session, bring down legislation handing over to the several provinces the control and administration of their lands. That is the recommendation I would make as being a far more advisable step than the introduction of this Bill. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) stated that, under this Bill the government are taking authority to give any person going into that country 320 acres of land—a homestead of 160 acres, entirely free, and the adjoining quarter-section at the nominal price of $3 per acre. I do not know that you can go to any other country in the world and find such liberal provisions to induce immigration. And I do not think it is necessary to have such liberal provisions in order to induce immigration to our Northwest. Canada has been so well advertised throughout the world that people have their eyes turned in this direction and the best immigration agent, as the hon. minister

well knows, is the contented settler. Those that have settled in the country are already attracting to themselves from their several countries many immigrants. I do not think it necessary at the present stage of affairs of our develpoment to hand out extra inducements in the way of giving up our public lands, particularly as they are so limited in extent. I do not think it in the best interest of the country that such a provision should be incorporated in this Bill. Not only has the new settler the privilege of securing 320 acres of land, but, if he has already had a second homestead and has not already secured a pre-empt, he has the opportunity to secure 160 acres as a pre-emption, making a total of 480 acres that he may acquire in this way, besides what he may purchase from railway corporation or any other. Why is this provision made? Surely, as the minister says, he is not doing it for the purpose of raising revenue or accumulating a vast sum of money for any purpose, even in order to build the Hudson Bay Railway. He candidly admits that he is not introducing this Bill and providing these pre-emptions for the purpose of deriving a large revenue therefrom. What, then, is the reason? It cannot be to encourage dense settlement; because, when one man can go in there, if he has already homesteaded and can acquire a total of 480 acres, that will be productive of sparse rather than dense settlement. I do not know why the minister is doing this unless it is to place the disposition of our public land in his hands to be used by himself and those in authority under him as a lever to his own party advantage. As has been said by the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames), we have but a limited area of land to be drawn upon and it will soon be taken up. In two or three years we shall see practically all the land taken up. Certainly, that will be the case if this Bill goes through in its present form. I do not say that it is not a commendable thing to have this land taken up. It is a commendable thing if we have a reasonable number of settlers on the land, but it is not desirable to allow one man to secure to himself 480 acres of land, whereas, if he goes to any other country where immigrants are received, he is only allowed a quarter-section. Again I say I should feel very much more convinced of the wisdom of this Bill if somebody on behalf of the Prime Minister and his colleagues had reviewed the arguments of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). Why is it that hon. members on that side have not attempted to make any reply to that hon. gentleman? He has made a series of strong statements, and I think they are worthy of some attempt at refutation, if refutation is possible. I would feel much more confidence in passing judgment upon this Bill if some attempt were made to refute these statements, or any portion of them. For myself, while I am quite willing to endorse certain provisions of this Bill which I think will redound to the advantage of the country, there are many others which, in their present form, will not be to the advantage of the country, and as a whole will especially prove detrimental to the province from which I come.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I share the view which has been expressed by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. W. J. Roche) that in a Bill of this importance, and dealing with such a valuable asset, it would be conducive to good legislation if we could mingle our wisdom and express our own opinions, and give to each other the benefit of our information and our experience. It does seem strange to me that under these circumstances we do not find any collaboration on the part of supporters of the government with us on this side of the House who have the interest of the country equally at heart in this legislation. There is no attempt at collaboration or assistance in getting at an understanding of the question in the west with reference to these lands as it is affected by this Bill. It appears that we are coming to the condition in parliamentary evolution when the caucus is to reign supreme, and in the House we are not to have the benefit of the experience, the information and the ability of the members who are sent here. If it were a trivial question, and under certain circumstances, the government might say: We do not want to waste the time of the House, we are anxious to get through. But neither of those excuses avail at the present time, and emphasis is given to this odd condition of things by the fact that one of the most experienced members of the House from the Northwest has voiced his sentiments with reference to this Bill in a very decided way. Those sentiments were strongly opposed to the Bill in its principal provisions, and he made almost a piteous plea to his friends on that side of the House not to urge through the measure in this headlong way to the detriment and confusion of the interests of his own part of the country. Now that statement of a very experienced man from the west emphasizes the suspicion that a conspiracy of silence seems to exist, and that not a word should be spoken from the government side of the House, that this legislation shall be pushed through, and that we shall not have the benefit of the experience and information of members from the west who are presumably favourable to this legislation. They simply rest back seeming to say: Let them have their little talk, we will turn down the old and experienced member who has voiced strong sentiments with reference to this Bill, and when it comes to the vote, we will ring the bell, we will vote the clauses through and

the Bill through. Is that a healthy development of parliamentary institutions, or is it not? We are coming pretty nearly to the case when we might just as well let the caucus do the whole business, for all the benefit that we get from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House on a Bill of this importance.

Now so far as the general idea of the lands is concerned, it was my opinion at the time the charters to the provinces were going through this House, it was also the view of many people besides, that these lands could better have been given over as an endowment to the different provinces. I went to the trouble of making what I thought was a pretty well reasoned calculation to prove that if the lands were left in the hands of the provinces, fairly well administered, and with a view to revenue as well as to immigration and settlement in the end the financial returns to each of the provinces would have been far greater than the subventions given to them in their ascending scale by the legislation which was passed here. But two things seemed to rule. The provinces wanted ready money, and were not willing to make financial arrangements in connection with their lands which would give them less at first but a great deal more afterwards; and this government seemed disposed to keep the administration of those lands in their own hands for their own purposes, and one of these purposes seems to have been pretty well developed during the one-sided discussion that has taken place this afternoon. I believe that each of those provinces has varying areas of land, varying conditions of settlement, and that it is pretty well nigh impossible to make a general law which will satisfy them all. If each had the administration of its own, it could suit the legislation to its own peculiarities of soil, of climate, of population, and could do it much more satisfactorily than we can do it by making one flat rule for all. The only way out of that flat rule of restriction, and of injury in many cases, is to have recourse to making the minister a little less than an arbiter of how the lands shall be sold, at what prices they shall be sold, and to whom, giving him a power which, in these democratic days we do not think, many people at least do not think, ought to be given to a single minister. But if these lands were handed over to the people who have a direct interest in them, do not the representatives of the province of Saskatchewan have primarily the greatest interest in the kind of people who are coming in there to become settlers and citizens, and is it not presumable that they, being upon the spot, would be the best judges of the way these lands should be administered on behalf of the incoming settlers, and would they not be the best administrators, if they are fit for responsible and independent government, as we thoroughly think they were and are? That however has not been acceded to and the Dominion carries on the work of administering these lands.

Now, I take up another point. The Minister of the Interior thought that he was getting along too well, that there was not fire enough in the contest, and that he would launch out into a comparison of the land politics of the two parties over a period of thirty or thirty-five years. That has been alluded to by my hon. friend behind me, but there is no use arguing with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). He will go back to the same old assertions and the same old line, however often they may have been disproved; but whenever he does he lays some one on this side under the disagreeable necessity of making a reply so as to keep people's minds and memories active and prevent their being misled by wrong information and misrepresentation. Does any thinking man for one moment believe that it is fair to take two periods in the development of the Northwest thirty years apart and make a comparison between the administrations in those two periods from any point of view? That question, asked and answered as it must be by any one, is really a sufficient answer to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). But if he wants other answers, may I ask him whether he thinks he has more knowledge, acumen and breadth than the late Alexander Mackenzie and his colleagues, who from 1871 to 1874 administered the affairs of this country? My hon. friend lives in 1907; they lived in 1871 and 1872. Translate the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) back to the time and conditions of 1872, would he have been much wiser than were then Mr. Mackenzie and his confreres? Would he have done very much differently? Would he have done as well? Then you had a country whose capabilities and possibilities no one knew, a country almost uninhabited, unexplored, almost unknown, crying out for means of egress and ingress, and a country, the necessary transportation building in which, in the language of the statesmen of that day, we were not able financially to undertake. One of them is on record as having said that it would take all the resources of the British empire to build a railway through that country and sustain it. Another statesman of that day, with as strong mental a grasp as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), equally as full of a variety of information, declared that though you might build that road you would not get profit enough out of it to pay for the axle grease on the wheels of its cars and locomotives. These were the statements made thirty years ago in the conditions then existing, and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is trying to judge what was done thirty years ago by the conditions of thirty years later. Mr. Mackenzie then thought, and so did his col-

leagues—and there it is in the statute-book —that if they could get a road built from North Bay through to Vancouver by giving 20,000 acres of land and a bonus of $10,000 a mile and a guarantee of interest for twenty-five years upon a sum to be fixed over and above that, they would be doing very well. And they made that offer and put it on our statutes. What did that offer mean? It meant $25,000,000, cash, plus a guarantee of 4 per cent interest for twenty-five years on a sum not stated, which would have added many millions to that amount, and in addition 50,000,000 acres of land. That is what these foolish men were willing to do thirty years ago, and they have been strongly criticised by this wise man of 1907. But then and now are as absolutely different from each other as it is possible to conceive. Make the calculation—land 58,000,000 acres, the people's land, the land of the Northwest, and multiply that by an accretion of $6 an acre and you have hundreds of millions of dollars. Multiply it by $8 an acre, which was the accretion the minister mentioned, and that will give you still more which the Northwest to-day would be paying, had Mr. Mackenzie got any one to take up the offer he spread upon the statute-book. But we do not see any sense in reasoning like that. We have to translate ourselves back to the time and circumstances and ask ourselves what we would then and there, in view of the great necessity and general poverty, have been willing to give out of the Dominion land assets in order to get that country opened up. And whatever Mr. Mackenzie gave or could have given, and whatever the government of the late Sir John Macdonald gave to open up that country, was well given and is repaying us more and more every year, because it was owing to that expenditure that transportation routes into the Northwest were opened up and the Northwest made habitable and explorable and the coming home for millions.

Now as regards land laws, what infinite contempt the Minister of the Interior has for all attempts at land legislation in the past. Well, I dare say the advanced school teacher of to-day looks back upon the methods of fifty years ago—not with contempt if he is wise—but with the idea that they were far behind what they are now, which would be true. But at the same time those were the methods which led to the improvements of to-day, and it ill becomes us to find fault with the methods of fifty years ago because they were not as good as those which time and circumstances and improved financial conditions have enabled us to develop. So it is with your land laws. These laws had to go through their course of development. They had to go through many experiments, made with the honest endeavour to get at what was best, and then to find, through the advantage of experience and experiment, that improvements could still be made, so that on that line again there is no ground for comparison, and we might just as well give our fathers and forefathers credit for having done about all that could be expected under the circumstances. We have no occasion to plume ourselves on having made improvements because, with the better facilities at our hands and the information and experience we have gained, it would be very extraordinary if we had not improved to some extent.

My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), in his speech to-night, with most of which I agree, said that this country gave a princely donation when it offered 160 acres of the best land in the world to any settler who would make his home with us. It is a princely donation. It has brought population into this country, and you can go from one end of the west to the other, and you cannot find any plea that the poverty, and hardship, and disturbance, and difficulty of the settler, makes it necessary for this country to say to him: We will give you another large addition by way of benefice; we will add largess to gift. There is no crying need in the Northwest, asking this country to add to the already princely inducement given to settlers to make a happy and prosperous home. Is the reason of this largess, that you want to add to your settlement? It cannot be. Cannot the Minister of the Interior see that change of population is not increase of population. If you say to 220,000 homesteaders already in various parts of the west: We will give each one of you, in a certain area, a brand new homestead for a nominal sum; I grant you will effectuate a very large change in population, but at the same time you will put a bar against the increase in your population in these western provinces. You have your homesteaders living there now; take 60,000 of them, or 90,000 of them, or one-half of them—which will probably be the least that will take advantage of this offer in the course of time—and grant your 8,000,000, or 12,000,000, or 16,000,000 acres of land to them. When you have done that, you have not added one soul to the population of that country. You have simply vested a benefice and a large one, in a certain class—no, in a certain section of a certain class. That is all you have done. You have not added one soul to your present population, but you have disposed of 16,000,000 acres of land which you might have given to outside settlers and so increased your population. I would invite careful consideration on that phase of the question, because it is very important. The hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) emphasized more particularly the disturbance, and confusion, consequent upon adding some prize, to induce change of population. He gave it as his matured opinion that it would work inestimable disadvantage and inestimable injury, not to say any-

thing of the confusion and the trouble. I believe with him in that to a large degree; but, he did not emphasize the other side of the question; that you have filled up the spaces, which if you had reserved for immigration would have added materially to the population, and you have done that without increasing by a single individual the population you already had when you started. Now, I want to call attention—and I believe it ought to be called attention to—I want to call attention to the principle of this legislation. Have the governmen thought it over? Have the gentlemen on the other side of the House all thought it over? Have we all of us thought over what this means? Those lands that are left there are either Dominion lands or they are not. If they are not Dominion lands, hand them over to the provinces. They ought to have them. Let them be called provincial lands to be used for, and by, and among the people of these provinces, and for them alone, and for their benefit alone. But we have had the jury decide and the judge give his opinion on that. They are not to be provincial lands for the use of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba. The judge and the jury have decided they are to be Dominion lands, in trust for the whole people of the Dominion, and to be administered for the good of the people as a whole. They are an asset of this Dominion, just as much as if you had their equivalent in money in the Dominion treasury. I would like to see the legislator who would come into this or any other Anglo-Saxon parliament, and propose to take hundreds of millions of dollars out of the treasury and give it as a bonus to a section of a class in the country. With, whatever power of voice, and of earnestness I have, I want to press that home upon the government, and I want to press it home upon this country. Do we really see what is involved in this proposal? Your agriculturist is just as good a unit of the population and just as good a citizen of Canada, in Ontario, as he is in Saskatchewan or Manitoba. And one of his assets is his share in the public franchises and the public property of this country. Yet, you propose to go to the treasury, and to take out of it millions of dollars, out of which you give him no benefit at all and you give it only to a section of his class, a favoured few (so far as this goes) who reside within a certain area in the country. If those lands that you propose to give as largess, as bonus, to people who are outside of the area of need, not weighed down by poverty, not encountering difficulties, but so peaceful and happy and prosperous in the enjoyment of a princely gift of 160 acres of good land—if those lands which you propose to give to them were transmuted into money, and that money were put into the treasury of this Dominion, it would be just exactly what it is now, though in a transmuted form. The transmutation of it does not change its essential character, does not make it any the less an asset of this country, in which every citizen has his share; and what do you propose to do? You propose to legislate out of the grand treasury of this country, for a few people in one section of it, millions of dollars of value, making them a present of that, and giving to none of the rest of the people of this country any share in the usufruct. You put the case straight, and you put it strongly, when you put it exactly where it ought to belong, as though it were value in the treasury of this country, and the proposal were to make a distribution of a bonus of that kind. Therefore I say the principle of this legislation seems to me to be well worthy of the attention of this parliament and of this country before we carry it out.

Now, I am not disposed at all to quarrel with the idea of giving to the settlers who come into that northwestern country their 160 acres free, as we have been doing, and if in the interest of the immigration and settlement we think it well to add to that the privilege of buying 160 acres more at a reasonable price, that is something I am quite willing for my part to discuss, with the idea of doing what is best for the general good of this country. Let no one say I have gone back on my own argument in taking out of the treasury in that way something that the rest of the people get no share of; because under my plan you would be getting a new stock of citizens to help to bear the burdens of this country and to add to its wealth. By the proposal of the government you block the incoming of new citizens to help to bear our burdens and add to our products; you actually bar that kind of thing and give the bonus to those who are already in that section of the country and making up a part of its population. I do not know whether the Minister of the Interior and the Prime Minister have looked at this matter from all sides or not; but I ask them to point out any legislation which has gone that far, and any example on any scale that can be gleaned from the legislation of this parliament during the thirty-seven years of its existence, based on a principle of that kind. There must be some overwhelming necessity which would drive us to go against the acknowledged fair and equitable principle in this kind of legislation. What is the necessity? I could well understand if we had induced settlers to come in by a gift of 160 acres and put them on sandy plains and imposed upon them some unfavourable conditions out of which they were vainly trying to extricate themselves, and could not unless they got additional lands; but such a state of affairs does not exist.

So much with reference to that. Now, with reference to this Land Act generally, the Minister of the Interior is a despot, as he was before. He is the boss of all of us—parliament, the council, everything. He can make another Robins deal to-morrow; he

can give to a member of parliament to-morrow, as he did to Adamson, a valuable privilege, and rob the treasury of the amount of money that was its due in giving it to a member of parliament. He can by order in council vary his leases and let some favoured adherent into a grazing lease, and then shut the door so that nobody else can get in, and enable him to make hundreds of thousands of dollars out of a franchise that did not cost him, comparatively speaking, a mere dollar. He has done it before ; he can do it again. He can stand up now, as he stood up last spring, and pledge his honour as a minister that there are no sales nor transactions of a certain kind going on, and whilst his words are warm in our faces he is putting through an order in council which carries out the very thing he declares he is not going to carry out. He can at his own sweet will sell Tom Jones, who promises him his vote, 640 acres of land for $3 an acre, prime land which is worth $15, or he can say : If John Brown is a Tory, he has to pay $8 an acre, it is well worth that, and he shan't get it for less. There is infinite power for deviltry and harm in the broad powers that you give to the Minister of the Interior. They have been used for deviltry over and over again, and some less strong man than the present incumbent they may lead into deviltry again. Put not temptation in the way of the Minister of the Interior. For his own sake does he not think he would rather be hedged about with principles and regulations approved by parliament and sanctioned by legislation, than to be allowed all these powers ? What to-day can the Minister of the Interior say to the friend who whispers in his ear certain pleasant things —that he is a great administrator and that the applicant is a great supporter, and that there are certain interests that are needed somewhere, and that if he will just give him fifty miles to range over, he will go in and get the timber and sell it to people for a consideration. He can let James Brown have fifty square miles and refuse another man five. That is all in the hands of this despot of the Interior.

Should it be so ? Water-powers, timber berths, permits, everything is in the hands of the minister. Should it be so ? These are the public franchises of the country, Have the government so far lost sight of the principles that they acceded to and that they pressed upon the people when they were in opposition, as to believe that these public franchises now are simply the perquisites of the party in power, and to be farmed out or given at the irresponsible will of any one, and for any purposes whatever ?. Oh, if the sorry story of the administration of the public lands in the Northwest for the last ten years could be written in full it would be a story that none of us would very much like to read and that few of us would care to have published. From the head of the department down to the smallest administrator in the Northwest—the Northwest people know it well—the colonist knows it, the settler knows it,—every breath that they draw until they get their patent secured beyond the powers even of a government, is drawn at their peril if they do not draw it favourably to the administration. Your settler goes to a sub-land office in the Northwest, he comes into the country from a place a thousand miles distant. He wants to make his stake in the Northwest, he wants 160 acres of that land that the government gives away and he goes to a sub-agent and wants to know if such and such a quarter-section is free for homesteading. Can he find it out ? It is practically impossible for him to find out, and it is practically possible for the men behind the scenes to see that he does not find it out until all their own friends are cared for if they want to be cared for with reference to that particular quarter-section or any other. Instance after instance of that occurs and I have known of men who have been bandied from pillar to post over large areas of that country seeking homesteads and finding none until, disheartened and pretty well shorn of their scanty means, they have left the country in disgust and have gone to other places to seek their lands. Why in the world should there not be definiteness with reference to these lands? Why should it be possible for any understrapper of the government in the Northwest to have it in his power in the slightest degree to thwart or hinder or to deal with these applications for the country's lands when they are made by people who wish to become bona fide settlers ? In that Bill I look in vain for any amelioration of this condition. Why should there not be a record, fair and clean and legible, of every application at every station where men apply for free homesteads in the Northwest ? Cost a little more ? When did the idea of cost ever enter into this government's head except it be to increase expenditure ? Cost ? No matter what it costs, the people in this country who want homesteads have the right to a straight square deal and have the right to go into an office and find a record that they can search as to what lands are open to homesteading and what are not, to get every application in its right place and to know exactly the situation of their applications. I look in vain in this Bill for any amelioration of past conditions in that respect, I tell the minister that as we go through these clauses, we propose to ask him the reason why these things cannot be corrected and made plain and made straight in these land dealings in the Northwest.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend has endeavoured to give the debate a turn which nothing that has taken place would warrant. He

stated with some dramatic appearance of truth to ask if we had formed a conspiracy of silence on this side of the House, if we were not at all to discuss this Bill and if all that was to be done was simply to ring the bell and call the members in to vote. I ask my hon. friend, upon a Bill of this kind, at the present stage and after the discussion that has taken place, why ring the bell at all? Who asked the bells to be rung? Who wants to divide the House upon this Bill? Not my hon. friend who has spoken half an hour on this Bill; he never intended to say and never said that he found fault with the principle, and yet he wants to have the division bell rung and have the members called to vote. Neither my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) who spoke before him, neither my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) who opened the debate on that side of the House; neither my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), nor my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley)—no one upon this occasion wanted to divide the House. There is no occasion therefore for the dramatic display made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) or to say that the matter has been cut and dried in caucus and all that is to be done is to vote. We are all unanimous on the principle of the Bill. My hon. friend himself does not object to it, all the discussion that has taken place this afternoon, whether on this side or the other, has been simply on certain features of the Bill. Therefore the thing to do is not to condemn the Bill in advance in some parts but to go into committee and discuss its different features, since there is cause for honest difference of opinion as to certain features of it, and as we proceed in the discussion of the clauses we will come to the points of difference. There are, as far as I am able to find in the discussion, only two points of difference upon this Bill. There may be some slight differences of opinion here and there, but the main points of contention, the main points of discussion which have been brought up by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, are confined to two points. First, comes the question which my hon. friend has elaborated in his closing remarks: Are the provisions of this Bill too elastic or too drastic. My hon. friend says the provisions of this Bill are too elastic, they give too much power to the Minister of the Interior. They put it in his power to become a tyrant and make it possible for him to use his powers for the purpose of cheating this one or that one. My hon. friend did not use the word 'cheat' but he implied it and went perilously near the expression itself. He at all events said that the minister had it in his power to favour a friend and to injure an enemy, to favour a Grit and to injure a Tory. My hon. friend (Mr. Greenway) who spoke this afternoon with some authority, who is one of the most experienced members in this House in all things connected with the Northwest, and who for once in his life received encomiums from hon. gentlemen opposite, for which I am not sorry, on the contrary, he deserved all the encomiums passed upon him.

The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) stated that one of the objections he had to the Bill, and one of the reasons why we should pause before adopting it, was that under the Bill the Minister of the Interior had shorn himself of powers that he has under the present law. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) stated in so many words that the only way to administer the lands of the Northwest effectively was to give such power to the minister that he could deal with each case individually and upon its merits. He objected to having the land of the Northwest administered by law and wanted it administered rather by regulation. At present, I do not argue that point with the hon. member for Lisgar; he may be right or he may be wrong. Not being a member for the Northwest, I approach this whole subject with a good deal of diffidence and with the intention of listening to the discussion and forming my judgment as the matter goes along. Naturally I side with my colleague who has given this matter a great deal of attention, who comes from the Northwest, has had great experience and on whose judgment I am prepared to rely. The Minister of the Interior has stated already that he knows of amendments being proposed to his Bill. He says that this is not a cast-iron measure, but that he is prepared to receive suggestions. I do not know what suggestions he is prepared to accept, but at all events, this is a matter on which there may be an honest difference of opinion and a good deal of discussion.

The second point made by the hon. member for Lisgar, and a point upon which he spoke with great force and feeling is as to whether he should allow, as is proposed under the Bill, right of pre-emption to the homesteader. On this point, the hon. gentleman is at total variance with the Minister of the Interior whose opinion is that the homesteader should have a preference over a stranger or a newcomer. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has stated that this is a clause which should be rejected. He says that we have made a princely gift to the homesteader in giving him 160 acres of fertile land. I agree that we have treated him generously, though I do not know that I would say that the gift is a princely one. The hon. gentleman asks: Is there any parliament on earth that would give to a man another largess after giving him such a princely gift? Well, Sir, yes, there is. And that parliament was the parliament of Canada at a time when the hon. gentleman was one of those responsible for its policy. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that in 1889, when we had

the homestead system, the government of which he was a member allowed a second homestead to the settled? My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was guilty of that, if guilt it be, which I do not admit. But the hon. gentleman will see that the whole argument which he built up with great eloquence was as to the rights of the community and the farmer in Ontario who is deprived of this valuable asset which is given to the men of the Northwest alone. The hon. gentleman is guilty of the same thing himself, so that if the Minister of the Interior has made a mistake, he has made it in following my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). At present, I do not say whether he is right or wrong, that is a matter for discussion.

I followed the hon. member for Lisgar with great attention, I do not know that he made a full case. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) says that granting this right of pre-emption to the old settler will depopulate the old settlements. He told us that he had received a letter from a friend who is the possessor of a good farm in Manitoba and is in good circumstances and ought to be satisfied, to this effect: I am the father of two sons; I am going to sell out and move northward and take a homestead pre-emption. Does that mean depopulation for the old settlements? Well, the gentleman says he is going to sell, and, as it takes two to make a bargain, that would mean that somebody else will take over his farm and he will be able to buy another. It simply means, not depopulation, but that somebody else will take hold of the farm in Manitoba, while the present holder will go to the new country, take a homestead and pre-emption, and settle his boys beside him. Will the country lose or gain by that? There is much to be said on one side and much to be said on the other. My own judgment is that the thing to do at the present time is to allow this Bill to pass its second reading, and then take up a discussion of these various questions in committee. I appeal to hon. members on this side, who come from Ontario, Quebec or the maritime provinces, are they prepared, after the scanty discussion we have had, even though that discussion has been taken part by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to say that the proposal of the Minister of the Interior to allow homesteaders to have the preference over everybody else, is wrong and that the other system ought to be adopted? For my part, I think that a man would be presumptuous, coming from the older provinces, who should say that one system or the other is to be condemned. We ought to hear argument on this subject, and for my part, I want to hear arguments, especially I want to hear the views of the hon. members from the new provinces, and, I hope that when the time comes, they will discuss these questions fully. There is a good deal of information to be had on these matters, and it would be preposterous for us with the scanty information we have to say that this principle should be adopted. I think the hon. member for North Toronto went too far when he said that the man from Europe who comes to find a home is to be repulsed and prevented from having a homestead. It is not pretended that the homesteader will take all the pre-emptions or that all the homesteaders will exercise their privilege. It seems to me that we cannot tell at the present time whether this legislation is right or wrong and the only thing we have to do is to invite discussion. And when we come to this clause we will discuss it and find out what it involves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) It certainly is a remarkable thing, that after a Bill has been introduced by the Minister of the Interior not only consolidating the law with regard to the lands in the Northwest, but introducing some new principles, after that Bill has been, presumably, passed upon by the government, the Prime Minister should arise in parliament and declare that he really has no opinion about the thing one way or the other. That is a new theory of parliamentary government and of Cabinet solidarity. However, if that is the idea of the Prime Minister as to the manner in which the government business should be brought down and debated, I suppose we must make the best of it, and go on and discuss this clause in the committee.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was pleased to pause in his speech and express his horror at the policy of building the Canadian Pacific Railway which was proposed and carried into effect by the government of which Sir John Macdonald was Prime Minister. It did not seem to be particularly relevant to the matter the minister had in hand, but he could not avoid doing so. The principal point that he made was that the land grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of building the road through that country which he and his friends were describing at the time as a wilderness, would, at the present average value of lands in the Northwest, be worth $216,000,000, and that that amounted to a bonus of $73,000 per mile upon all the road constructed under that arrangement. Now I almost hesitate to paralyze my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior by pointing out to him that the government of which his own leader was a member offered land which, at the same valuation, would be worth to-day $464,000,000, and that would amount, not to a bonus of $73,000 per mile, but to a bonus of $160,000 per mile, and this was in addition to a cash subsidy of $25,000,000 and a certain guarantee. I trust that some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will hand a glass of water

to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to help him recover from the horror which must be inspired by that which his own political leader of to-day was willing to support thirty years ago. However, as my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has stated, this is not an unusual eccentricity of the Minister of the Interior, in the midst of serious debate, and we must make some allowance for these eccentricities and pass on to the real business before the House.

We urged two years ago, we urged not only by speech but by resolution in this House, that these lands in the Northwest should be handed over to the ownership and administration of the people of those provinces. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior opposed it, every member from the Northwest sitting on the government side of the House, opposed that proposition. For what good reason? Could one of them tell us to-day for what good reason? Are the men whom they represent in this House of Commons less capable of administering their own lands than are the people of Ontario, of Quebec, of the maritime provinces? Is that their reason? Is it less convenient to administer these lands in Saskatchewan than at Ottawa, so far as they lie within the province of Saskatchewan? Is it less convenient to administer the lands of Alberta at Edmonton than at Ottawa? Are the people of Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba less capable of determining the methods by which their lands should be administered than the people of eastern Canada? What is the result of it to-day? These very gentlemen who stood up in this House and aided to defeat that proposal which was moved from this side, have been bemoaning, during the present winter, the lack of coal supply in the Northwest, and we have the statement of their political friends, the statement of the provincial secretary (I think that is his office), Mr. Motherwell, in the province of Saskatchewan, that if these coal lands had been available to them as part of the public domain, the difficulties from which the people of those provinces have been suffering might have been and would have been obviated. After the experience we have had of the results of the coal strike at Lethbridge, after the object lesson which has been placed before the people of this country by the action of the President of the United States, who has withdrawn from sale the coal lands in the United States which formed part of the public domain, and has declared that they shall be available for emergencies such as these, after that object lesson we have had a scheme maturely thought out, presumably well considered, brought down to this House, and not one single line in that measure from beginning to end which could be expected as likely to afford to the people of the Northwest any such relief in the future as might well be afforded in this legislation.

What further? We have a Bill brought down for the administration of those lands over a territory comprising I suppose about 800,000 square miles, extending from the eastern limits of the province of Ontario into British Columbia, because there is, as we know, a considerable area of Dominion land in British Columbia. Now the Prime Minister himself, when defending in this House, during the session of 1905, the dividing line as proposed between the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, took the ground that he had so fixed that dividing line as to create the eastern province of Saskatchewan with agricultural resources and lands in some measure different from the western province of Alberta. The very argument which the Prime Minister made in that regard would lead us naturally to the conclusion that what might be a good system of administration for Saskatchewan might not be a good system for Alberta. Then you have an area further west in the province of British Columbia, and the government of this country proposes by an omnibus Bill of this kind to provide for conditions which are to suit the varied conditions of each one of these provinces, the varied uses to which the lands in each province might be put, and thus one province or the other must in the end suffer from the fact that these lands are not left to the local administration of the people themselves.

My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) spoke this afternoon to some extent, no doubt, from a Manitoba standpoint. The conditions in the province of Manitoba would naturally appeal to him more strongly than those of Alberta or Saskatchewan. What might be a proper homestead allowance to give to a man in Manitoba would not necessarily be a proper homestead allowance to give to a man in some part of British Columbia. What might be a proper homestead allowance in one of these provinces under certain conditions might not be a fair and reasonable allowance in another province under other conditions. I suppose that would strike any of us at first blush as the probable result of that inquiry, and investigation, and information which the Prime Minister told us we are to have upon the discussion of this Bill in committee. Now I am content, so far as the pre-emption clause is concerned, to leave it to that discussion which is promised to us by the members from the Northwest who, as the Prime Minister says, intend to consider that clause thoroughly when we reach it in the committee stage. There are some considerations which could be very strongly opposed to the view which the member for Lisgar put forward, but there is one consideration which he did not put forward, and I

am speaking entirely from the standpoint of the settler, and not from the general standpoint of the whole country. Would not 160 acres of land in a province with a population of 500,000 be as good to the settler as 320 acres in a province with a population of only 250,000? As I understand it and as the Minister of the Interior has argued, if you double the population of Saskatchewan or Alberta, you make every acre in it worth more than it would be if the population were to remain stationary the next five years. I would think that every one would agree with the argument which my hon. friend made on that point when we were discussing this very question in 1905. The main reason why the government declined to hand over these lands to the different provinces, the only plausible argument made on that side against that proposition, was this, that if you handed them over to the provinces, the provinces would utilize them in such a way as to check immigration and thus affect the value of the land. Well, have hon. gentlemen opposite anything to say to the argument of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) in that regard this afternoon? The right hon. the First Minister has not said much; the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has said nothing. Every member from the Northwest on that side has remained silent. If you admit the checking of immigration, which my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) has said will result from this measure, and its effect on the future value of land in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, you will have to consider very seriously the different clauses in committee and give to each the best results of that consideration.

But leaving that general aspect of the Bill for the moment and coming to one or two matters which might be described as detail, I may say that I concur entirely in the view expressed by several hon. gentlemen on this side, namely that the right of the settler should be made a statutory right and not be met at every turn by some discretion to be exercised by the Minister of the Interior under political pressure and upon political grounds. I do not think that any government which desires to exercise its powers honestly and to deal fairly by the settlers would wish to extend its power in that regard one iota beyond what is absolutely necessary. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) knows as well as I that the moment he undertakes to exercise his political discretion with regard to the rights of any man in respect of homesteads, timber limits, minerals or anything else, at that very moment he will be subjected to pressure by his political supporters. He will not venture to challenge that statement. Is that a position in which any honest man, whether Conservative or Liberal, would desire to be put beyond what may be absolutely necessary for the efficient administration of this Bill. I say not. The first necessity is that the right of the settler should be made absolutely secure and the least possible discretion given the Minister of the Interior or any of his officials so far as those rights are concerned. For that principle, when we reach the committee stage, I certainly shall contend with all the energy in my power, because I believe it is the right principle, not only from a public standpoint but in the interests of every present and future settler in the Northwest. Another principle I would stand for, and which does not seem to be very well safeguarded in this Bill, is that to all the dealings and transactions of the Department of the Interior or any of its officials respecting lands in the Northwest there should be given the fullest publicity. I have never heard of any such system elsewhere as that which has been pursued in the Northwest. I have not carried my researches very far, but I know that in Nova Scotia, where we have a public domain consisting for the main part of mineral land, under both Conservative and Liberal administrations it is the right of any man to go into the mines office and look at every record and every letter addressed to any minister of the Crown in charge of that department. He has the right, on the payment of the small fee of twenty-five cents, to look at the books of record in the office and to ascertain exactly how the title to any claim stands. Will the Prime Minister inform me of any reason why every man in the Northwest should not have exactly the same right? I can see no good reason. Why should a man going to the land office in the Northwest be told that, although he is a citizen of the country, interested in the public domain, he has not the right to examine the public records with regard to that domain. What reason can be assigned for refusing him that right? The possibility of claim jumping was advanced by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) on one occasion. Well, I believe it would be infinitely better to run any danger of that kind—which I think rests more in the imagination of the minister than anywhere else—than to have it suspected and believed as it is to a very large extent, that the lack of that opportunity to examine the records, has been productive of fraud and that men have been deprived of their rights simply because they were not allowed to examine the public records with regard to the public domain. The Minister of the Interior went so far on one occasion in this House as to declare that public documents relating to the public domain were private documents which not even a member of parliament should have the right to inspect. Private documents—private documents of the Liberal party, I suppose, re-

lating to the public domain—and these forsooth are not to be examined by any citizen of this country, not even by members of parliament.

Then there is one further matter I would urge on the attention of the government and that is with respect to tenders for timber limits. I do not know what area of timber limits remains in the Northwest at present, but people who profess to be well informed say that they are practically all now held—not by this government in trust for the people of the country—but by certain favoured friends of this administration who, under the guise of tender, have acquired practically everything in the west in the shape of timber limits. I do not know if that be true, but we shall endeavour to get some information later on.

But, look, how, under the guise of public tender and competition, these lands have been so extensively acquired. A friend of the government sends out his cruiser, his servant, accompanied by perhaps half a dozen others. These men spend six months or perhaps eighteen months thoroughly cruising and exploring a particular district in the west. What follows? They send notice to the Department of the Interior that they would like to have these lands put up to tender and public competition. What follows? The lands are ostensibly put up to tender and public competition, as my friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) has said, but as a matter of fact there is no competition about it, because there is no opportunity afforded any other person to make an effective examination of these lands, and they go to the man, the favoured friend, who has acquired that knowledge which should have been acquired in the first instance by the government. And so these lands are knocked down, without any upset price, for perhaps the one hundredth or one thousandth part of their real value, and they go to swell certain enormous fortunes which have been recently accumulated in this country. Since these timber lands in the Northwest, within the last eight on ten years, have acquired their enormous value, why has not the government of Canada adopted the reasonable and business method of exploring these lands themselves, and of putting an upset price upon them in order that the people of this country could be assured of their reasonable value from the successful tenderer. There is no good business reason against that proposition from the standpoint of the people of this country, and yet, within the last four or five years these timber limits have enormously increased in value, and, greatly to the detriment of the people in Canada, no ordinary business precaution has been taken by this administration in regard to their disposal.

I would like to have seen in this Bill, some definite statutory provision in regard to the way in which these tenders should be received and opened. There is no doubt about it, that the methods in the past have been extremely lax, and the government might as well know it now as at any other time, that there has been a great deal of suspicion and even scandal created because these methods have been so lax. When we come to that provision in the Bill, I will insist so far as my power will permit me, that reasonable provisions—such as my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) pointed out are in use in Great Britain—shall be inserted, so that these tenders shall no longer be dealt with in the extremely lax and irregular method which has hitherto prevailed in the Department of the Interior.

Now let me say a word as to the remarkable provisions in this Bill with regard to the discretion of the Minister of the Interior. The Prime Minister declared that in the opinion of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) this Bill is not sufficiently elastic in that respect. Well, if the member for Lisgar is not satisfied with the amount of discretion conferred on the Minister of the Interior by this Bill, he must be remarkably difficult to satisfy. I find that there are 24 sections in the Bill which confer upon the Minister of the Interior discretion in respect of matters, some of immense importance and some of minor importance. There are 24 different sections under which the minister is given the right to deal with the settler's interest; to say that the settler shall or shall not do this or that; that he shall or shall not hold his homestead, that he shall or shall not receive a portion of the public domain. In addition, there are 12 sections of the Bill which provide for regulation, or power of control, or exercise of discretion by the Governor in Council; and there are one or two other sections which give certain very important discretionary powers to officers of the Department of the Interior. If that be not a sufficiently elastic Bill, so far as the discretion of the Minister of the Interior is concerned, I do not know what the member for Lisgar would desire. I think that a great many of these sections ought to be amended, so that discretion should be given to the Minister of the Interior only in cases of absolute necessity. I admit that there must be some such cases, and that the granting of a discretionary power may be right in order to prevent injustice to the settler in some instances, but I would cut that discretionary power down to the very lowest limit. Above all, I repeat, that the right of a settler to the public domain of this country in the Northwest should be made a statutory right, just as far as it is possible for this parliament to make it. The Minister of the Interior seems to be amused at that idea—well, it may be amusing to him, but I venture to think the people of this country will not be amused at the violation of that principle. There is no reason why any man in Canada should be at the

mercy of the whim of any Minister of the Interior, whether it be the gentleman who now holds the office, or, that Conservative successor who will fill the office in the early future. I speak of this without regard to the man who fills the office for the time being; I speak of it because I believe that the principle of conferring a discretion which is likely to be exercised—which in many cases must be exercised under political pressure—s not a good principle, and I hold that its application should be minimized to the very greatest possible degree, in this or in any other law. It has been pointed out by hon. gentlemen on this side, that this power may lead to very important results; that the Minister of the Interior, under this Bill, could give away to his political friends, at any time, for a more trifle all the remaining lands in the Northwest, just as enormous areas of such lands have been given away in the last eight or ten years to political friends of the administration. We may have, under the provisions of this Bill, another Saskatchewan land deal at any time, and one million and a half or two million dollars may flow into the fortunate pockets of some gentlemen who are strong supporters of the occupants of the treasury benches. We may have another Robins deal; and land may be withdrawn from settlement; an irrigation scheme may be put forward, and all these deals may be put through by the Minister of the Interior in his private office, after consultation with a few of his party friends, behind the back of parliament, behind the back of the people of Canada, and without giving to any man or to any group of men in Canada, the right to offer better terms to the people of this country for these concessions. That is not a good principle to act upon; it has been acted upon in the past to the infinite discredit of this government. So far as this Bill is concerned, it should be the united action of members on both sides of the House to see that the application of that principle is reduced to the very lowest limits.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2—interpretation,

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. In section 7 of the Bill we have the mention of agricultural land, merchantable timber, water supply and various minerals. It seems to me that these expressions should be defined. As far as I have been able to ascertain, from looking at the Bill, the Minister of the Interior is to decide whether lands are agricultural lands or not.

Mr. OLIVER. I would be very willing to accept a suggestion from my hon. friend of a definition of agricultural land. For myself, I find it rather difficult to give a definition in words that will apply under all circumstances.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How are you going to determine it?

Mr. OLIVER. It would depend on the merits of each case. It is very difficult to give a definition that would apply to all conditions throughout that extent of territory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is to decide it?

Mr. OLIVER. The minister of course will decide what is to be considered agricultural land.

Mr. LAKE. Under what conditions would he consider a certain body of land to be agricultural land at the present moment?

Mr. OLIVER. It would be land of such a character and so situated that the growing of crops could be successfully carried on.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Will the minister be guided in forming his decision by the reports of his inspectors?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, he has to be.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. We know what that amounts to from the experience of the past. In the discussion that took place in this House a couple of weeks ago it was shown that the minister's inspectors had reported that certain lands which were to be granted for a grazing lease were not fit for agricultural purposes, while later on the settlers located on those lands petitioned the minister to have them withdrawn from grazing lease and thrown open to settlement, as they were splendid agricultural lands and were already located on—different from the reports of the minister's inspectors.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend is at sea. My remembrance is that there was no such statement as that they were splendid agricultural lands.

Mr. LAKE. Is it not a fact that some of those lands were recently sold at $10 an acre by the men who obtained that lease?

Mr. OLIVER. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. LAKE. It came out in the discussion on the Robins grazing lease.

Mr. OLIVER. If I am able to read the documents connected with that matter correctly, I think my hon. friend is under a mistake.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to call attention to subsection (f.) It says that homestead means land entered for under the provisions of this Act. It seems to me that homestead includes lands heretofore entered for as well.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the repeal clause at the close of the Bill makes all necessary

provision to give effect to the existing Act so far as it affects homesteads. This Act only presumes to affect what comes under its own provisions. It does not presume to alter the effects of the Act which it is intended to displace.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not exactly the point, as I understand it. It is true, there is the usual repealing clause at the end of the Bill; but the point of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel), and it seems to me a good point, is that you have a definition for a homestead in respect to future entries, but you have no definition of homestead in respect to entries in the past.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that the definition of homestead as it exists to-day is either expressed or implied in the Act as it exists to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be implied? I do not know how it would be implied; what is the explanation of this?

Mr. OLIVER. There is either an express definition of the word 'homestead' in the Act as it stands, or else in the administration of the Act a definite conclusion has been reached as to what constitutes a homestead, which comes to the same thing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it defined in the existing Acts now being consolidated?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say off-hand that it has, but the result is the same as if there was an express definition in the words of the old Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It might lead to confusion, but if the minister is satisfied—

Mr. LENNOX. Taking the different parts of section 27, and the definition of the word 'homestead' as the land entered under the terms of this Act there would seem to be difficulty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If you use the word 'homestead' anywhere in this Act with the intention of including a homestead which has been entered for before the passing of this Act, then you cut this out by the definition here given, for this seems to confine it to homesteads entered after the passing of this Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I am willing to accept the judgment of my hon. friend.

Mr. LENNOX. The definite meaning acquired would apply all right if there was not a specific meaning applied to it here, but when there is a specific meaning I think it would govern.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The section might be made to include homesteads under the old Act.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I still suggest that the term 'agricultural land' and merchantable timber' should receive some definition in this Act. It will appear as we proceed to discuss the Act why this will be necessary. Section 7, for example, points out what lands shall be open for homestead entry, agricultural lands. The minister says he is unable to define it and possibly it would be well to let the section stand to see if some definition can be given. For example, would the minister consider land with timber on it, which in the ordinary course of events would have to be cleared, agricultural land? He speaks of land not fit for cultivation without the aid of irrigation. Are these agricultural lands? Take land covered with boulders which would have to be cleared before it could be put into a state of cultivation. It seems to me that it is important that these words should receive some definition. The minister has suggested lands being fit for settlement. Can he place a more clear interpretation upon this expression than that?

Mr. OLIVER. The point raised is very well worthy of consideration. In the case of land in which there are boulders; in a certain condition of country with a certain value of land and certain facilities for farming, that land would not be agricultural land, but the same land in a changed condition, where values had increased, where facilities had improved, would be agricultural land. That is a sample of the difficulty that would occur in putting a definition as to what should be called agricultural land in print in an Act of parliament.

Mr. PERLEY. Subsection (h) refers to lease or license. There is another form under the Act called 'permit' under which fees are charged, and I suggest that that word be included there, lease, license or permit, I suppose that is the intention?

Mr. OLIVER. I shall agree to the amendment suggested.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 6,

None of the provisions of this Act respecting homesteads or tender shall apply to the Yukon territory; but the Governor in Council may from time to time make such regulations in respect to homesteads and to timber in the Yukon territory as he deems suited to the conditions of that territory.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Is there to be some provision for the publication of these regulations that are made from time to time? They should be published in the 'Canada Gazette' and in some paper in the Yukon that the people there may know what these regulations are.

Mr. OLIVER. I think there is provision now for the publication of all regulations

relating to the Yukon and also for placing them before parliament for ratification.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Under what statute ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suggests that it is probably the statute concerning the Yukon territory. I know at any rate, that there is a law governing that point.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The publication in the 'Canada Gazette' and in a Yukon paper ?

Mr. OLIVER. Only in the 'Gazette,' I think.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Have not all regulations of the government to appear in the 'Canada Gazette' ?

Mr. OLIVER. All Orders in Council do not appear, but regulations for the disposal of public lands, of course, must always appear in the 'Gazette'.

Mr. LAKE. I presume that there is a Yukon official 'Gazette' and the regulations should be published in that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that they are published in the 'Territorial Gazette', but they are published in the 'Canada Gazette'.

Mr. LAKE. Could not provision be made to have them published in the Yukon 'Territorial Gazette' ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. As a matter of fact, they are published. But I think that, perhaps, it would be a mistake to require by law that they shall be published, because should there be an accidental omission of publication, I presume, the regulation would be invalidated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statute to which the hon. Minister of the Interior alludes was passed about 1903, and the provisions he refers to was inserted by the then Minister at my instance. But speaking from recollection, I do not think it provides for regulations made under any other Act than that in which it is embodied. But why should the minister deal with timber in Yukon by regulation ? Why is it not done by statute ?

Mr. OLIVER. The timber throughout the country generally is dealt by regulation. There is, of course, in the statute, very general provision, but it is believed that it is necessary to have the provisions made by regulation rather than by statute. It is believed that the conditions in the Yukon are so different from what they are in other parts of the country that it is desirable that there should be special privilege of regulation of timber there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know how valuable the timber in the Yukon may be, but unless it is of very trifling moment I would most earnestly suggest that the parliament ought not to delegate to the Governor in Council the absolute and unqualified right to legislate with regard to it. If this part of the public domain is worth legislating about at all, it seems to me, that parliament is the proper tribunal and not the Governor in Council.

Mr. OLIVER. There is of course, a good deal to be said in favour of that view, but the subject covers the scope of the land Bill in connection with the administration of the natural resources of the country in all parts. If it is intended to deal with all this by legislation, it will certainly make the Lands' Act a very cumbrous measure, and the necessity or advantage of this has never been demonstrated. So far as the placer mines in the Yukon are concerned, the conditions having become established, removed them from being dealt with by regulation and provided for them being dealt with by statute. And, so, I presume, if conditions become settled in relation to the timber and if the timber interests become important, we might provide a special statute or amendment to the present Bill to deal with timber in the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. What kinds of timber are there, and how are they dealt with now ?

Mr. OLIVER. At the present time the timber in the Yukon is not set out in berths as it is in other parts of the country and as it used to be there. It was considered that, owing to the character of the timber, and the purposes for which it was required, and all the conditions, it was better to deal with it by permitting any person who wanted timber to cut it within a certain area and pay certain dues.

Mr. FOSTER. And the permit is confined within certain limits ?

Mr. OLIVER. It applies only to a certain area, and lasts for one year or less and does not convey any right in or control over the land to which it applies. In the Yukon, where there is a possibility of mineral development anywhere, it is not thought desirable that there should be a partial ownership of the surface areas by the holding of timber limits.

Mr. LAKE. Wherein do the regulations in respect of homesteads in the Yukon differ from the ordinary homestead regulations set forth in the Dominion Lands Act? And have many entries been made ?

Mr. OLIVER. Regulations were passed last session. Up to that time no special provision for homesteads in the Yukon had been made, and the provisions applicable to the rest of the country were not applicable to the Yukon, because the country was not surveyed, and, of course, our homesteads law refers to surveyed territory.

Therefore, provision had to be made for taking up a homestead on much the same principle as a mineral claim. It would be staked out presumably on a river, with a frontage of not more than one-half mile and running back not more than one-fifth mile. I have not the figures at my fingers' end, but residence duties are defined in a rather different way, so that residence is expected only in the summer months, whereas in other parts of the country it may be any time of the year.

Mr. LAKE. Have there been many entries ?

Mr. OLIVER. No. It was to allow any person who wished to take up land to have an opportunity to do so. The intention was to make a survey afterwards just as mineral claims are surveyed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not satisfied with the construction advanced by the minister. It seems to me that if you are to retain the public domain in the hands of the Dominion, it should be dealt with on more general lines. The subject is of sufficient importance to call for a timber Act, as you have a mineral Act. I do not say you should have a special timber Act for the Yukon, but you should have one which would make any exceptional provisions for the Yukon that may be necessary. I protest against the abdication by this parliament to the Governor in Council of the right to deal absolutely with all the timber interests in the Yukon. The Governor in Council deals with the matter without any public discussion, the matter is dealt with by men who are sworn to secrecy as to their deliberations. All through this Bill there is the principle and the tendency of delegating to the Governor in Council legislative powers of a very wide scope. I think the Bill goes altogether too far in that direction.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the minister will leave this section over, and consult with his officers to see whether so large a territory as the Yukon cannot be included.

Mr. OLIVER. I would be willing to hold the section over, only I am afraid I cannot improve it to the satisfaction of my hon. friend. His suggestion that there should be a general timber Act, as there is a Yukon Mining Act, or other special Acts, is a very good one. But as I have pointed out, the conditions in the Yukon do not lend themselves to a satisfactory holding of timber berths. We could embody in an Act provisions which would appertain to the granting of timber permits in the Yukon, but the importance of having provisions in regard to permits inserted in the Act is not as great as in the case where timber berths are held. I think the hon. gentleman will agree that in the case of the Yukon, and under present circumstances, there is no serious departure from the principle which he lays down by acceding to this provision as it stands. If he desires it particularly I will reserve it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it should be reserved for the purpose of providing that these regulations should be published and laid before parliament, and approved by parliament. At my instance, the Minister of the Interior made that provision under the general Act relating to the Yukon Territory. As I have already said, I do not think that provision would apply to any regulations made under another Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I recollect the fact the hon. gentleman alludes to, and I am willing to add that provision of this section.

Mr. LENNOX. We have about twenty sections in this Act dealing with timber lands, and those sections probably could not apply to the Yukon. Then, beginning with section 59, we have permits to cut timber, and following that down to 72 there are various provisions in reference to timber lands. I would ask the minister whether we cannot make the timber provisions of this Act apply generally to the Yukon, excepting the section from 51 to 58 inclusive.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not like to make those apply to the Yukon ; the conditions there being so different, I do not think it would be sound policy.

On section 7,—Disposal of lands for homestead, proviso as to timber as to water supply, and mineral rights.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What quantity of merchantable timber would be necessary to cause the cancellation of an entry ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is something impossible to define in a Bill. The amount of merchantable timber that would warrant the cancellation of an entry would vary with the class of timber and the conditions of the country. In a prairie country, a comparatively small amount of timber would warrant the cancellation of an entry, because that timber, even if it were only poplar, might be of great value to the surrounding settlers for fuel. But in a partially wooded country it would be entirely improper to cancel an entry because there was a considerable amount of practically valueless poplar upon it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is there not some declaration that an applicant for a homestead has to make in regard to the quantity of timber that is upon the place ?

Mr. OLIVER. There is some such declaration, but we find that in practice it does not work out, that is to say that if we insisted on compliance with the terms of that declaration a very large part of the country which is unquestionably suitable for settlement would be held from settle-

ment, because there is timber upon it. In a partially wooded country, if we applied that provision, settlers would simply be kept off the land.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. It would all depend on whether it is brush or whether it is timber. Scrub is not timber ?

Mr. OLIVER. If it was a small island of timber in the open prairie it would be merchantable. But in that country where there is an immense quantity of that kind of timber it has no particular value.

Mr. LAKE. I presume all timber has some value. Can the minister give us a definition of what he means by merchantable timber ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give a definition that will cover all cases. My hon. friend says that all timber has a value. In that I must differ from him. In the part of the country where I live the more timber there is on a man's place the less valuable it is—that is of a certain kind of timber. Yet that same timber, in that part of the country my hon. friend represents, would be considered merchantable and very valuable.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This is one of the most objectionable clauses in the Bill. There would be very much less injury if you would have, as in the old law, twenty-five acres, rather than give this discretion to the minister. He has not only discretion as to the particular locality but also as to the particular holder. And the minister can exercise that discretion in an arbitrary manner to the detriment of the holder. There would be much less objection to having a stipulated amount, say twenty-five acres. I have never heard that any great disadvantage resulted from that to the settlers. While there might be something in what the minister says with regard to the different values of timber in different localities, this discretionary power may be exercised so as practically to confiscate the lands of those who may not agree with the minister or his government.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see why you need this provision. Careful administration would prevent any necessity for it. Section 5 provides that no land shall be open for entry for a homestead or for sale until the same has been surveyed in accordance with the provisions of the Dominion Land Surveys Act. The land having been surveyed, the minister would have a report of the survey, embodying the general features of the land. If so, I do not see why any reservation should not be made in time to prevent homestead entry. I submit that it is not necessary to have this at all, but if we must have it we should have something definite, as has been suggested. Further there ought to be a distinct provision for compensation to the man who has been disappointed through no fault of his own. In subsection (b) of section 7 we find there is compensation, but not such as there ought to be. The compensation ought not to be left to the discretion of the minister. But I submit that this section is not necessary if proper precautions be taken. The minister should be advised whether land was open for homesteading or not ; and once it is opened for homesteading, the government should stand by it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Under the old Act the homesteader could not get the water-power or anything of that kind, but this Bill is so worded that if a person would homestead a piece of property with a stream running across it, he could develop the water-power on that stream and you could not take it from him.

Mr. OLIVER. The trouble with the old section was that while it assumed to reserve the land controlling a water-power, it did not effectively do so. If a man secured an entry for land controlling a water-power, there was no right to deprive him of his entry, except by arbitrarily depriving him of it without the authority of the Act. We propose that if a man does get an entry for land, he does not get the water-power. His land, however, would command that water-power to a certain extent. We provide that such part of that land as controls the water-power may be taken from him and compensation given.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose a person wishes to build a dam, a man who has homesteaded land two or three miles above the dam might have his land flooded. Would he have to get off his homestead ? Under this section he would.

Mr. OLIVER. No, this section does not confer any right at all. It merely provides that if a person acquires land by homestead which controls a water-power, that part of his land which may be required for the development of the water-power may be taken from him. He takes his chances when he takes his land.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Here is a stream with a little rapid on it where a dam might be constructed and water-power developed. When the dam is constructed, it floods land three miles further up which has been homesteaded by another party. Under this section that land which is flooded may be taken away and that man loses his homestead.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not read it that way. He would lose his homestead as a consequence of the development of the water-power but his land was not necessary to the development of that water-power. Whoever developed the water-power would have to settle with him for the damages.

Mr. ALCORN. Under section 7, in the case put by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes)—if the lands were located above the point where the dam is put and if it was necessary for the development of the water-power at that spot that the lands above should be taken, the minister would have the power to take them. Under the wording of the clause, in the case cited by the hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes), the minister might arbitrarily cancel the homestead two miles above the dam.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not read the section that way. My idea is that the land necessary for the development of any water-power is the land which would carry the two ends of the dam. After the water-power was developed, if any other settler suffered damag, he would have recourse against the man who built the dam.

Mr. ALCORN. On the contrary, I would think that the word 'development' would cover the right to flood.

Mr. LENNOX. Certainly.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where a stream passed through a man's property, if he was to place a dam across that stream, he would own that water-power under subsection (c). He might place a dam across the stream, and any other person who wanted to use the water could not go where this man's dam was, and the water-power would practically be spoiled at any other part of the river. In my opinion subsection (c) gives to the homesteader the absolute control of the water-power. If there is any place along any of these rivers where there might be a valuable water-power, I can see no reason why, after this Bill is passed, a person cannot acquire so much land on each side of the river and then he would absolutely own the water privilege if he constructed a dam. The first man who would put the dam across would have the water-power on the river.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to know whether my hon. friend wants the homesteader to have the water-power or not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have no objection to the homesteader having the water-power on his own property, but he has no right to shut it off from the man who has a homestead above.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend from Grenville thinks the settler should not have the power, and as a matter of fact this clause is intended to meet the views of both hon. gentlemen. We let the settler keep his homestead, but we take from him so much as is necesary to build a dam and pay him compensation for it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The clause does not say that.

Mr. OLIVER. We may have wrongly stated our intention, but that is our purpose. The ownership of the water-power is dealt with in section 35 as separate from the land. I will have an amendment to that section which goes very fully into the matter of dealing with the water-power.

Mr. J. D. REID. I wanted to know if it was thoroughly understood to whom the water-power belonged.

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I draw the attention of the minister to subsection (c), and I put to him this case: If there is a lake of 60 acres in the midst of a homestead of 160 acres, surely the homesteader should have some right in that lake. Under this section he would appear to have no right at all.

Mr. OLIVER. If the lake is defined by survey it is excluded from the homestead. If there is no definition of the lake, and a patent is issued for the 160 acres, of course the man gets the lake.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the man gets his patent for his homestead and the lake is included in that homestead, surely he is entitled to the lake.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but we say we have no right to require that this man shall take 50 acres of water intead of 50 acres of land. We therefore survey the lake, and we do not require that the lake shall be considered as part of his homestead. If he wishes to consider the bottom of the lake as part of his homestead he is welcome to do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are cases in that western country where these lakes should be reserved. In some places water is scarce, and these lakes should be reserved for the general benefit of the community.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If I have 150 acres with a lake in the center, my neighbours have no right to trespass on my property unless they are prepared to pay me a compensation. If the minister examines the clause he will see there is that omission.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no omission; the section is as we intended it. A lake in the midst of a homestead, does not necessarily become the property of the homesteader for the reasons set forth by my hon. friend (Mr. Crawford).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who owns it?

Mr. OLIVER. The principle set out in the Irrigation Act is that the government owns the right to the water.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A lake is not irrigation water.

Mr. OLIVER. The water has a special value in that country, and it is thought wise

to provide that the right to the land does not include the right to the water, when water is of an area sufficient to warrant it being called a lake.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Have you made any provision in the Bill to keep that water for the neighbours ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not ?

Mr. OLIVER. That matter would come under the control of the provincial government. The water is there for the public use, and the provincial government will find access to it if the homesteader does not allow his neighbours that access. There are many cases where the lake is partially on a homestead and partially on the road allowance, and of course in such cases there would be access to the lake.

Mr. FOWLER. What right would the provincial government have to interfere if a man had a homestead with a lake on it?

Mr. OLIVER. The local government has the responsibility of doing whatever is necessary for the benefit of the people under its control, and if the people of the neighbourhood required access to that water, it would be the business of the provincial government to provide it.

Mr. FOWLER. They could only do it by expropriation.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, by expropriation.

Mr. FOWLER. I see you include natural gas. That was not in the other Act?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOWLER. At Medicine Hat, for example, natural gas is easily obtained. It belongs at the present time to the owners of the soil. You propose that the new homesteader shall not have that right?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. The minister has not answered the suggestion made by the hon. member for Simcoe that subclause (a) might be eliminated without any harm being done, on the ground that the surveyors could very well state, while making their survey, whether any section of land should be open for entry or not. The section as it stands seems to be an extremely arbitrary one, as well as very vague in its wording. The minister is able to cancel an entry within six months, and without any compensation, even though the applicant may have made his entry in perfectly good faith and put certain improvements on the land.

Mr. BOLE. With regard to the policy of giving the minister discretion instead of an Act of parliament to govern in matters of this kind, I will cite a case. In the province of Saskatchewan, to the north of Regina, where members of my own family are homesteaders, they live on what is known as the edge of the bluffs. One mile north of their location it would be, according to my view, unwise to reserve even fifty acres of wood, because all the settlers have abundance; but five or ten miles south of that point it would be wise for the minister to reserve even five or ten acres of wood for the use of the surrounding farmers. Therefore I think it would be very unwise to have a provision limiting the quantity.

Mr. LAKE. What objection would the hon. gentleman have to taking the surveyors' report in regard to that matter? The surveyors, in making their survey, learn exactly the amount of timber, not merely on a certain parcel of land, but in the whole section.

Mr. BOLE. The surveyor only reports on the land he has surveyed. Circumstances could only develop the necessity of the minister exercising his discretion.

Mr. LENNOX. A surveyor who is in the neighbourhood is certainly competent to judge of the quantity of timber within seven or eight or ten miles roundabout. You have in the Act the provision that until the land is surveyed it shall not be open to homesteading. The minister, having the report of his surveyor, should decide at once whether the land is open to homestead or not, and when he does decide that it is open, there should be no cancellation. This opens a big question, the question of all surveyed and unoccupied agricultural land. This section provides that the minister may within six months of the date of entry reserve any tract of land. By section 80 it it provided that the minister may reserve different kinds of lands and among them timber lands. Not only may he reserve them and so prevent a certain person from getting them at the time, but there is the further power conferred on him by section 80 of releasing them again. So that he can turn away one person who has made a homestead entry, and within six months afterwards he can withdraw the same land from reservation, and thus enable some other person to go in and make the entry. I want to ask the minister if there is any strong reason which compels him to have this provision here at all? Could he not cut out the discretionary power at that point, and act upon the report of the surveyor?

Mr. BOLE. Why not act upon the report of the homestead inspector?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know whether the homestead inspector would have control of the matter at as early a date as that. The surveyor is the first person on the ground, and the minister can at that early date reserve the land if he thinks fit.

I ask the minister, is there any insuperable difficulty in the way of eliminating that clause altogether?

Mr. TURRIFF. The clause is very much the same as the clause that has been in the Act in the past, and I do not think we can improve it very much. I do not think it would be advisable to depend on the surveyor's report as to the quantity of timber on the land. As we all know, the surveyor runs a line around a section, and he has very little knowledge, if the land is scrubby or bushy, of what class of timber is in the centre of the section. To my mind a certain amount of discretion must be left to the minister. In the province of Manitoba there are large tracts of country, especially in the northern and eastern portions of the province, which are covered with timber that you might not call of a merchantable kind, from the sawmill man's point of view, but that you would call very merchantable from a fuel point of view. If that part of the country is to be settled, you must allow a man to homestead even if there is more or less timber on the whole of his quarter-section. But in other parts of the country we have had in the past a very few cases where an entry had to be cancelled where a man deliberately went into a good part of the bush immediately near a market and homesteaded a quarter-section that was practically all composed of merchantable timber suitable for sawmill and building purposes and his sole object was to be able to have a homestead entry, to take those logs off and sell them. In some cases the man would have no intention of utilizing the quarter-section as a farm. Therefore the regulation was made that a man before making a homestead entry had to make an affidavit that there was not more than twenty-five acres or merchantable timber on the quarter-section. We had some cases of that, sometimes over a hundred acres, a solid block of timber, and in some cases the entry was cancelled.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In order to do so he would have to perjure himself would he not?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Were there many of such cases?

Mr. TURRIFF. For instance entry is made by agents in a good many cases, and in others a man would make an application and I remember one excuse a man brought forward was that all the timber on the quarter-section might easily have been put on 25 acres and not have made it exceedingly well timbered at that. I think that this is a provision that you can fairly leave in the hands of the minister. It has been in that condition a great many years and there has been no trouble from it. There is one thing that will have to be looked after and that is in certain portions of the country entries will have to be allowed even where the whole quarter section has been covered with a certain growth of timber. To my mind it has worked out fairly well in the past and I do not think you should provide in a statute that you could only have a homestead entry if there was less than so much timber on the particular quarter-section, because what would apply in one part of the country would be absolutely unreliable in another part, or at least it should not interfere with a man making a homestead entry.

Mr. PERLEY. This seems an argument in favour of leaving this clause out altogether. In the instances cited under the present Act the minister would have the right to reserve that land altogether and when he got his report from his surveyor that would certainly be on the face of the report and it is a very simple matter to reserve any quarter-section of that kind from homestead altogether. He has power under section 80 to do that now, and the instance the hon. gentleman cites is a very strong argument in favour of leaving this out altogether. The minister has that discretion before the land is homesteaded but when a man once homesteads it seems to me he should get the land unless there has been fraud and if there has been fraud it can be cancelled and before it is homesteaded the minister has power under section 80 to reserve it.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think it would be a great mistake to withdraw the power from the minister. I know that in the district from which I come a great deal of timber has been destroyed owing to the fact that people could not enter for certain lands on account of these lands being covered with timber which was destroyed, was that there were many railway lands in that section of the country and a great many of these railway lands were timbered and were sold by the railways at a low price to people who might or might not settle on them. A great many went in and settled on the railway lands and they undertook to clear these lands from year to year by setting fires and destroyed a lot of valuable timber. I think that the power should be left with the minister and that he should use it freely too. I think it right and it might be necessary to grant homesteads on quarter-sections entirely covered with timber. It would be a protection to the timber if that was done. In the district from which I come I think it would be well if people were granted in certain districts homestead entries to lands entirely covered with timber. The settlers would be more inclined to protect the timber, but where they are allowed to purchase from the railways the odd sections, the even-numbered sections not being available because of having a

certain quantity of timber on them, they burn the timber and destroy it.

Mr. PERLEY. Why cannot the minister settle this when the surveyors report comes in ?

Mr. TURRIFF. The surveyor's report does not say which section is solid timber.

Mr. PERLEY. It should.

Mr. LENNOX. What has been said about the case of fraud is covered under section 22. The minister has power to cancel any homestead entry for fraud or misrepresentation or error.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. In the meantime the timber is all gone.

Mr. LENNOX. That may be. The point I want to make is that the minister is not in any difficulty if we go back to the old regulation and provide that the homesteader should swear that there was not more than a certain specified quantity of timber. That however is not before us at the present time, but if that provision was adopted the minister could still cancel it for a fraudulent or false affidavit. I hope the minister will either drop this or let it stand to take this into consideration.

In subsection (b) the minister will notice that he has power in connection with these water-powers not only to cancel an entry but to withdraw from its application any part or portion of the land entered for. We are only dealing with the quarter-section and I suppose that the minister has not only the power to cancel the whole 160 acres but the still more drastic power to withdraw a portion of it from entry. Then he has power in his discretion to direct that the person who obtained entry be compensated in the event of his having made improvements on the land and to fix the amount of the compensation. I submit as an amendment that he should not have the right to withdraw a portion of it except with the consent of the locatee. He might have a perfect right in the public interest to cancel the whole entry but not to divide it, and withdraw a portion of it unless the party consented to that and he should in any event make compensation. Therefore I submit that this section should be amended by introducing after the word 'or' in the 26th line the words 'with the consent of the person who obtains the entry or those who represent him.' And we should strike out, in the 27th line all the words after the word 'and' and substitute the following 'in either of such cases full compensation for the loss occasioned thereby, should be made to the person who obtained the entry or those who represent him.'

Mr. ALCORN. With reference to subsection (a), I would suggest, in the light of what has been said, that it should be amended upon these lines—that the right of cancellation should be at a specified time after report upon survey. Then, with regard to subsection (b), this is worded in an extraordinary manner and gives just the power I was speaking of a few moments ago. It would involve the right to cancel a homestead two or three miles up the stream from the dam, and that might be done at the instance of the owner of the water-power who might be favourably viewed by the minister. In Ontario, and I presume, in other provinces, under these circumstances the man up the stream would be entitled to damages for flooding his lands, but here, the owner of the power would get out of that liability if the homestead are cancelled by the minister, as could be done under this section as it now stands.

Mr. PERLEY. If the amendment suggested were made, it would be all right, for, if the owner were fully compensated, justice would be done. But surely the minister does not wish to have the discretion to decide whether the owner of the land shall be compensated or not. If a homestead is cancelled in order to develop a water-power, there should be no question about the owner getting compensation. I ask the minister to say if it is intended that it should be in the power of any one person to decide whether a man under these circumstances, should receive compensation or not ? Surely he will agree that all should be treated alike—all compensated or none compensated.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hour is late, and I think we might consider that matter to-morrow.

Mr. OLIVER. I was going to offer a few remarks, if I might be allowed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the minister would sleep over them, he would be better.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to deal with the subject of the cancellation of the homestead because of timber upon it. The first difficulty in dealing with the matter by reservation beforehand, is that it is not the surveyor's business to report in regard to the timber conditions upon the land he surveys. The surveyor is a contractor who is paid for by the mile for the lines he runs. He reports upon the nature of the country through which the line runs, but with that his interest in the matter ceases ; and, as he is a contractor and not a regularly paid servant he is not in such a position that we can depend, or can be asked to depend, upon the report he makes as to the timber conditions aside from the lines he runs.

Mr. LAKE. You could make such an arrangement with him, could you not ?

Mr. OLIVER. It could be done, but it has not been done hitherto and it would complicate the arrangements with the surveyor. If we make a bargain with him outside of the original one, our hold on him with regard to his original contract is loos-

ened to that degree. Besides, it is a fact that surveys are sometimes made many years in advance of settlement. Sometimes, it is true, we do not keep ahead of the settlers, but sometimes we are far ahead of them. Some surveys have been made so long before settlement that the lines have been obliterated by fire and the character of the country as to timber changed, before the settlers come along to occupy the land. The making of the reservation is entirely in the interest of the settler. And what occurs in my part of the country is this: A number of settlers go into a partially wooded country, and each is anxious to get the clearest piece of land he can, the piece with the least wood upon it. At the same time the fact that there is good timber in some parts of that country is one of the great reasons that part of the settlers go there. But after a dozen men get into a certain township where there happens to be a clump of timber, one of them, some day, will enter that quarter-section on which the timber stands.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There won't be much of the timber a month or two after ten or fifteen of the farmers have got there.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, this quarter-section is taken up for speculation and not for agricultural purposes. It is considered fair and reasonable, for the protection of the settlers in such a case, that the power should be held in the hands of the government, not so much for the exercise of it but that those who undertake to speculate in that way at the expense of their neighbours may not be allowed to go too far. However, the hour is late and I agree that the questions raised are important and will have to be considered well. I am willing that the section should be allowed to stand untill to-morrow.

Progress reported.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What business is to be taken up to-morrow?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) informed me that the Labour Bill would be gone on with first and after that the Bill we have just been discussing.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 15, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DEATH OF MR. A. A. STOCKTON, M.P.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, it is again my very sad duty to have to inform the House that death has once more entered our midst and removed one of our most esteemed colleagues. This is the third time in the course of a week that this painful duty has been imposed upon me. On this occasion the duty is all the more painful that the colleague whom we mourn at this moment was one of the most respected and one of the most esteemed members of this House. Dr. Stockton had been a member of this House for only three sessions, but he had been preceded here by a reputation well earned in the local legislature of his province, and the reputation that he had acquired in that body he sustained by his course in this House. It is nothing but the literal truth to say that in those three years during which he has been with us, he had acquired a reputation for high ability, for fairness in debate, for high moral standing, and for many of the qualities which should distinguish a public man. His loss I am sure must be very severely felt by his political friends, and I can assure them that it is almost as severely felt by his political opponents, and we join with them in conveying to his friends and bereaved family the warmest and deepest sympathy that it is possible to express.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I thank the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for the very sympathetic words he has used in regard to the loss we have sustained by the death of Dr. Stockton. I saw him for only a few minutes last Sunday morning, and although he seemed to be very ill, I did not then realize that he was so soon to pass from the strife and turmoil of political life to the eternal rest. He was a man of very scholarly and cultured mind, a man for whom, probably, the world of letters and scholarship had more attraction than political life. He was an eloquent man, a man, as the Prime Minister said, thoroughly fair in debate; in fact I do not think that Dr. Stockton ever had in his heart any instinct which was not that of a gentleman. He was indeed of a most lovable character, and he seemed to possess every trait that could command respect, and the admiration and affection of those who knew him well. I think that not only his own city and province, but the whole of Canada, especially the public life of Canada, has in his death sustained a very great, indeed I might say an irreparable loss.. Our deepest sympathy goes out to his family and friends.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I wish to join in the tribute which has just been——

Mr. ARMSTRONG. On behalf of the member for St. John City (Mr. Daniel) may I be permitted to read what he was going to say with reference to the death of Dr. Stockton.

'I wish to join in the tribute just paid to our late member and colleague, Dr. Stockton. Coming from and representing largely the same constituency that he did, I feel that he was closer to me than to most of the members present. During his lifetime he always occupied a leading position in St. John and his native province, both as a member of the bar and as a representative of the people. For many years he was in the provincial legislature, and was a leader of his party there. He was a man of strong views and convictions as to duty, and what he considered right, and he had the courage of those convictions, willing to join in their triumph if they succeeded, willing to suffer for them if they did not. He was a most impressive speaker and debater, and in that respect occupied a foremost position in his native province. It has been a matter of satisfaction to me, as I am sure it is to his friends and constituents, to know that in the short time he has been a member of this parliament he had already attained a leading place, and that not only as a parliamentarian, but I believe also in the esteem and respect of members generally. His death will leave a vacancy hard to fill, both in his constituency as well as in parliament and the country; for he was clean in thought, clean in life, and clean in politics. I am sure the members of this House will sympathize warmly with his bereaved relatives.'

Mr. FOSTER. I did want to say a word too, but I cannot——

RESIGNATION OF HON. C. S. HYMAN, M. P.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny) Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I want to call your attention and the attention of this House to the report of the special committee on Privileges and Elections. regarding the resignation of the Hon. Mr. Hyman, Minister of Public Works. This report was presented to the House yesterday, and it merely states that the letter of declaration made by the Hon. Mr. Hyman did not constitute a valid resignation of his seat. The report does not conclude with any recommendation, requiring the concurrence or non-concurrence of this House. On this point I desire to quote from Bourinot:

> But when the report does not contain any resolution or other propositions for the consideration of the House, it does not appear that any further proceedings with reference to it, as a report, are necessary. It remains in the possession and on the journals of the House as a basis or ground for such further proceedings as may be proper or necessary.

I might also add that on Bourinot's statement a question of this kind touching the seat of any member is also a question of privilege and should take precedence over any other. The committee on privileges and elections, having brought in this report yesterday, I shall move at the end of my remarks that it be considered now and not concurred in. My reasons are these: It is a very well known fact, Mr. Speaker, that under the British constitution in England no member can resign his seat except under the provision respecting the Chiltern Hundreds. In Canada our practice differs slightly from that of Great Britain. We have a statute under which any member may resign and he may choose, if he please, the mode provided by the statute, which, I may say, is not imperative. For instance, a member may resign from his own seat in the House and I may add that the terms of the statute are not imperative but only give a certain mode of procedure to be followed so that fraud may be avoided and so that the good faith of the member or the good faith of the House shall not be violated. It is a principle both of the British and Canadian constitutions that the House and the House only can declare vacant the seat of any member. The witnesses whom our statute calls for are only there to prevent fraud and it must be remembered that the statute does not say that the members shall have witnesses, but the statute says that a member may, under these conditions, resign his seat. Now Mr. Speaker, I say that the spirit of the law is that, if the House feels satisfied that the intention of the member is to resign, the House can do without the provisions of the statute and if it does it is not necessary for the member to have followed to the very letter the provisions of the statute. In England the speaker's decision in the case of Mr. Bradlaugh who was expelled from the House was this. On March 14, 1881, the speaker in the British House of Commons decided:

> It is a matter for determination of the House, not of the chair, whether a seat is, under certain circumstances, vacant or not, and until the House otherwise order, Mr. Speaker would regard the sitting member as filling the seat.

In the history of our Canadian parliament we have had, I think two cases of the resignations of members brought before the House. The first case was that of Mr. Bruneau, then member for Richelieu. Mr. Bruneau resigned his seat before two witnesses, had a seal affixed to his resignation and sent it by mail to the Speaker. It is a well known principle of law that as soon as a letter is put into the postal box it belongs to the receiver. Therefore, the letter of Mr. Bruneau could be considered as the property of the Speaker of the House of Commons. Mr. Bruneau went to the Speaker and asked him to give him back his resignation. The Speaker gave it back to him. The matter was brought before

the House and a vote was taken which shows evidently that the House considered itself the guardian of the seats of members and could decide whether the resignation of Mr. Bruneau could or could not be accepted. This was a perfectly legal resignation; it had complied with all the terms and with the very letter of the statute. The matter was brought before the House and upon a vote being taken it became evident that the House of Commons of Canada, the same as the House of Commons of England, considered itself the only authority which could declare a seat vacant.

Now, we have also in this country the case of Mr. Guite, the member for Bonaventure. Mr. Guite sent his resignation, signed before two witnesses, to Mr. Edgar, who was then Speaker of the House, but there was no seal attached to it. Mr. Edgar gave the following decision in the House:

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that during the month of December last, the hon. member for Bonaventure forwarded to me, and I duly received a form of resignation of his seat as member for the said electoral district. The resignation was in the words and figures, and in the form following:

He gives the letter of the hon. member and then goes on to say:

As such regulation was not executed under the seal of the member in strict compliance with subsection 2 of section 5, chapter 13, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, I determined not to issue my warrant for a new writ of election without first receiving the instructions of your honourable House.

This conclusion I communicated to the hon. member by letter dated 29th December, 1898.

Therefore, Mr. Edgar acknowledged that he could not issue his warrant on that resignation, but he must first consult the House and the House alone could decide and that then, if the House felt satisfied that the resignation was valid, that the intention of the member was evident, he could give instructions to the Speaker to issue his warrant. It is shown here that even though Mr. Guite's resignation was not received, if the House had assented to it, the Speaker could issue his warrant for a new election.

Now, what are the facts set forth in the report of the committee in regard to Mr. Hyman's resignation? They are that Mr. Hyman first sent a letter to the Speaker written in his own hand and bearing his own signature stating his intention to resign. I have seen the letter in the committee. There is no doubt about Mr. Hyman's intention to resign. Secondly, Mr. Hyman wrote a letter to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the leader of the House, again stating his intention to resign his seat as the member for London. Then, having been informed by Mr. Duffield of London, that his resignation was not in strict compliance with the terms of the statute, Mr. Hyman manifested for the third time his intention of resigning by telegraphing to Mr. Duffield to have his resignation witnessed and a seal affixed thereto. Therefore, the intention of resigning was perfectly evident and was three times manifested, first, to the Speaker of the House, then to the leader of the House, and then to his friends in London, when he instructed them to have his resignation validated. The signatures of the witnesses were affixed to his resignation. The men who signed as witnesses knew Mr. Hyman perfectly. One gentleman, his partner, had no doubt of his signature and he felt quite sure that it was Mr. Hyman's intention to resign. In giving his evidence in the committee he said that the resignation was in Mr. Hyman's own writing and that it bore his own signature. Therefore, there was no doubt in so far as Mr. Hyman's intentions were concerned and the House has not a shadow of doubt to-day that Mr. Hyman intended to resign. I say that it rests with the House to take action on the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I claim, Mr. Speaker, as I think I have shown before the House, that the terms of the statute are not imperative, that they are there only to avoid fraud and to prevent the good faith of a member being violated, and that as long as the House is satisfied that the intention of the member is to resign his seat, the House which is the only body in the Dominion which can take action, and which can declare his seat vacant can, to-day, if it chooses, declare the Hon. Mr. Hyman's seat vacant. It was the undoubted intention of Mr. Hyman to resign, and as the House has power to declare the seat vacant, I move seconded by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa):

That the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be not concurred in, but that the hon. gentleman's seat be declared vacant.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that, strictly speaking, this motion should be for the consideration of the report. There is no recommendation in the report one way or the other, which requires the concurrence of the House.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I am disposed to concur in a good deal of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armand Lavergne) has said. There is no question, so far as the legal proposition is concerned, but that, apart from statute, there is no provision by which a member of the House can voluntarily resign his seat. A duty is imposed upon a member of parliament, in the public interest, when he is selected by the people of any constituency to represent them. He cannot avoid performing that duty unless some statutory provision points out to him a method which

will relieve him from the burdens of his office. My hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) is entirely correct in his statement of the position which has been taken, as a matter of record or of history, under similar situations in the British parliament and in this parliament of Canada. The question here seems to be a comparatively narrow one; one for lawyers to decide upon the interpretation of the statute which points out a method under Canadian law, whereby a member of parliament may at his own will divest himself of the responsibility of that position. The statute has chosen to say that there must be a document not only signed by the member, but also under his seal, and that that document must be so signed by the member before not one, but two witnesses. A member may resign by standing in his place in the House and announcing that he does resign. That is a formal act which goes upon the records of the House when it takes place, and of which the House has immediate knowledge, but if the resignation does not take the shape of verbal communication to the House itself, then, to be effective, it must come in a particular form which the statute prescribes. It is easy to understand the reasons for the care with which the legislature provided these safeguards upon the manner of the resignation of a member—to guard against fraud; to protect the House against the possibility that a fraudulent resignation might be put off upon it, and equally to protect the member from the possibility that some one might fraudulently send to Mr. Speaker a resignation, which did not in fact proceed from the member himself. But, whatever the reasons may have been which led to the enactment under consideration, the language of it is very plain and it has its analogy in a somewhat similar statute—a statute passed with somewhat the same object, well known to lawyers, well known to every one—I refer to the statute which permits a man to dispose, during his lifetime, for a period after his death, of property which he may own. It is in a sense an anomalous thing, that a man, before his death, may in a particular manner direct what is to be done with his property for a generation after he himself has gone. Under the law of most, if not all civilized peoples, a man has the right to control the disposition of his property for a greater or lesser length of time after he himself is dead, provided he does so in a certain, particular, specified manner. The requirements of the law in that respect are very similar to the requirements of this particular statute, and they were adopted for somewhat similar reasons. A will, to be effective under the statutes of most of our Canadian provinces, must be signed in the presence of two witnesses, and not only that, but those two witnesses must themselves sign in the presence of the testator; the testator and the two witnesses must be together from the beginning to the end of what the law means to be a somewhat formal ceremony. Now, we have something very like that in this statute, and we have the plain indication that parliament meant, that before a member could effectively resign his seat in the House of Commons, he should prepare a writing; he should sign that writing, and that there should be three people present when it was being so signed. That is not a meaningless thing, that is done for reasons which are abundantly manifest. Then, there was an additional formality prescribed by the law. It is a souvenir, so to speak, of the ancient days, centuries ago when few men wrote, and when the thing by which a man identified himself was his seal. To the mind of the practising lawyer the presence or the absence of a seal on a document, is a matter of no inconsiderable import; it is indeed a matter of practical consequence even at the present day. A document under seal has higher authority than a document without seal. Even though the seal be a wafer or a piece of paper, different rights with regard to contracts solemnized under seal exist between the parties, than if such contracts are not under seal.

In the case of the present paper, which is simply a letter to Mr. Speaker, we have not only the requirement of the law in regard to the presence of two witnesses disregarded, but we have also something which to my mind, though it may seem a technical point, is of equal if not greater importance. This paper left the hands of the member who signed it without any seal. At that time it was unquestionably not effective under the distinct requirement of the law which calls for a document under seal. It now appears with a seal attached to it, and the oral testimony given before the Committee on Privileges and Elections discloses the circumstances under which that seal was attached. By the affixing of a seal to a document which previously had none, if it were a contract or agreement between parties, new rights entirely might be created and new obligations imposed. The putting on of the seal is in the eyes of the law a step not merely of what used to be solemnity, but one of actual practical importance, and that step was here taken upon the authority at most of an unverified telegram which did not even come to the person who chose to affix the seal. I mention this circumstance merely that you Mr. Speaker, may be possessed in outline of the facts which were before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and which necessarily had to be considered by that tribunal. That committee consists of some forty-six members of this House, every one of whom I think is a lawyer. That committee met on three or four sep-

arate occasions. It examined all the witnesses who could speak of the circumstances in question, and it then resolved that a subcommittee consisting of five members should be appointed to examine into the law applicable in the case, to search the records and the precedents and to report to the general committee itself. The subcommittee of five members consisted of two from the opposite side of the House and three from this side, and while we often hear jocular remarks made about doctors differing, and those remarks sometimes applied to members of the legal profession, I think it is somewhat to the credit of this subcommittee that they were entirely agreed and entirely unanimous in the view which, after consideration and after examination into the law applicable to the facts in hand, they reported to the committee which had appointed them. Not only so, but in the Committee on Privileges and Elections itself, and at a very full meeting of the committee, when the report of the subcommittee was presented and discussed, the report which we now have upon the Votes and Proceedings of the House was concurred in by that committee, with the single dissenting voice of the particular hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution this afternoon. Nominally it appears as having been concurred in upon division, but the conclusions of the committee in this matter were absolutely unanimous, with the exception I have mentioned, notwithstanding the fact that there was of course the usual marked division on political lines in the composition of the committee. In these circumstances, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the House might well be asked to adopt the conclusions of so large a proportion of its members upon a matter of this character. But I think it is the recognized course of parliamentary practice, certainly the recognized course of procedure in this House, that any report of a committee of the House is, ordinarly speaking, concurred in by the House, and is sent back or is not concurred in only upon good cause shown for the taking of that course. Now, if tried by that test, what cause has my hon. friend from Montmagny shown on this occasion for reversing at a stroke the whole conclusions and the whole work of this committee in these deliberations and adopting exactly the opposite course ? I have listened with care to the observations which he has made in support of the resolution he has proposed; and, without intending any discourtesy to my hon. friend, I must say that I have not heard one single reason advanced for reversing the conclusions to which the Committee on Privileges and Elections has come in this case. The only suggestion he makes is that beyond question the hon. member whose name is signed to this letter addressed to Mr. Speaker intended to resign and so expressed his intention. Well, I might answer to my hon. friend that from some things one has heard not only out of this House but in this House itself, there might not be absolute unanimity in the view which the hon. gentleman has expressed in that regard. It has been said that there never was an intention on the part of the member for London to resign his seat. Be that as it may, he has undoubtedly in this letter, in so many words, expressed the intention. But to return to the legal analogy of a will, it would not serve in the least for a man in the most explicit form to express his intention to do this or to do that with his property after he was done with it, unless he expressed that intention in the exact manner and before the exact witnesses specified in the law. Without that, his expressed intention on the subject would be altogether inoperative and ineffective.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend contend that the House is not the sole body to decide whether this resignation should be accepted or not?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have not contended anything to the contrary, Mr. Speaker. That is the matter which I take it is now before the House for consideration. My hon. friend has moved that the House declare this seat to be vacant. Upon what ground can the House be asked to take that action? Only upon the ground that there has been an attempt at a resignation which is upon the face of it inoperative and ineffective, and I am just pointing out that the fact that a member may at a certain time entertain in his own mind the intention to resign does not vacate his seat. The fact that he may day after day express that intention to his fellow members does not vacate the seat. The fact that he may day after day write letters to his fellow members expressing his intention to resign does not vacate his seat. Even the fact that he might address one of those letters to Mr. Speaker would not vacate the seat unless in doing so he complied with the requirements of the statute and signed that letter before two witnesses, and affixed his seal to it, as the statute requires. Under these circumstances, speaking as a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I certainly could feel no doubt as to what the law was, and the matter being purely and simply a legal question, purely and simply an inquiry whether what the statute defines as the only way in which a written resignation can be made had or had not been taken, there was manifestly but the one answer to be given. Why the House should be asked to deal with the matter in exactly the reverse fashion and to pronounce a decision which would be opposed to all previous decisions in any circumstance

at all similar that can be found in this country or England, is something I am unable to understand. I, therefore, oppose the resolution proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Lavergne), and if it were a matter for concurrence or adoption I would submit that this report ought to be concurred in and adopted by this House.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) takes great pride in the fact that in this matter some fourteen or fifteen lawyers all agree. To his mind that is a guarantee of the infallibility of that committee in this particular report. Perhaps I may be lacking in some respect for the legal profession, but I must say that when so many lawyers agree I am inclined to be suspicious. I have found out quite frequently that although lawyers, like doctors, disagree on questions of principle or life and death, yet when it is a question of avoiding the real issue by legal quibbling, they find no difficulty in arriving at a common decision. To my mind, layman as I am, a barbarous and unlegal member of this House as I am, the whole proceedings of this committee with reference to the resignation of Mr. Hyman are one of the greatest parliamentary jokes ever perpetrated, and I think that that is also the view taken by the great mass of the people. What are the facts ? A member of the government, after disclosures of a most damaging character regarding the means taken to secure his election, decided to go south for his health, which no doubt was impaired, and at the same time decided to place his resignation, both as member of this House and member of the cabinet, in the hands of the Speaker and the Prime Minister. As to the intention of Mr. Hyman, I do not think there is any doubt. No one can doubt that Mr. Hyman had the apparent intention to all purposes of resigning. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) seemed to justify the report of the committee by alleging that some doubts had been expressed as to Mr. Hyman's real intention, but it would be rather strange to find one of the colleagues of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) taking advantage of a declaration made by members of the opposition impugning the good faith of his colleague to argue that possibly his colleague had no intention of resigning.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I did not argue that.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, but the argument of the hon. minister led to that conclusion, and I am putting it in that light merely to show that the legal argument of my hon. friend cannot do away with the fact that no one entertains any doubt—and least of all could that doubt be entertained by any colleague of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman)—as to the real intention of that hon. minister. In my opinion the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) felt that he owed it to his self-respect and his sense of dignity as a member of this House to resign his seat which had been gained by such nefarious means, and that his intention was either to withdraw from public life altogether or go before his constituents again and ask for their support in a fair and clean election. I take it therefore that his resignation was genuine and that his message to the First Minister confirmed his intention. I take it also that his message to his agent instructing him to affix his seal to the document was further evidence of his intention to resign. To my mind, as far as the intention of Mr. Hyman is concerned, there cannot be any doubt that he meant to resign, and therefore this House should give him the opportunity of making that resignation good and of justifying his conduct before his own constituents. But of course I bow to the legal acumen of the gentlemen who have decided that Mr. Hyman did not resign. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) has defined his letter as an attempt to resign. It seems rather strange that a man like the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), who may be credited with some business ability, judgment and common sense, should find such difficulty in putting into effect such an easy thing as giving his resignation to Mr. Speaker as a member of this House.

As regards the procedure required by statute to make valid the resignation of a member of this House, I quite agree with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) that certain formalities should exist in order to protect the House against any fradulent resignation, which might otherwise be acted upon, and thus the good faith of the House and of the member himself be abused. But what are the circumstances in this matter ? The committee, to which the question was referred, has not thrown the slightest doubt as to the intention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) to resign his seat. Let me quote the language of the committee. What is the first paragraph of its report ? It is this :

> That the letter or declaration bearing date 20th November, 1906, from the Hon. Charles S. Hyman, as a member of the House of Commons for the electoral district of the city of London, and communicated by His Honour the Speaker to the House, had been, on or about the day when it bears date, made in writing by the said hon. member under his hand, in the words and figures as follows:
>
> London, November 20, 1906.
>
> Sir,—I have the honour to tender my resignation as a member of the House of Commons for the electoral division of the city of London.
>
> Yours truly,
> C. S. HYMAN.

The committee there declares, in so many words, that the resignation had been written by Mr. Hyman. It does not say that a

document was received by Mr. Speaker purporting to be a resignation and that the committee had no proof that the document was genuine. If none of the formalities had been observed, and their non-observance exposed the House to be deceived and the Speaker to be deceived, I would conclude exactly as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) has done. But the report of the committee declares that Mr. Hyman did write his resignation and did affix his signature to that document. So that as regards the authenticity of the document and the signature of Mr. Hyman, the report of that committee shows that what the Minister of Justice has described as an attempt at resignation is a resignation in fact. Therefore it is absurd to talk of any necessity for protecting the good faith of the House, or protecting a member against any fraudulent resignation such as, for instance, a possibly forged document. What remains to be decided is whether those formalities are, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, so binding that even when it is clearly beyond doubt that a member of parliament has been attempting for three months in good faith to resign, the House will not accept his resignation because the document is lacking some piece of sealing wax or red tape.

I repeat that while I have of course a great deal of respect for the legal opinion of the Minister of Justice or of any body of lawyers, it seems to me that the idea of attaching so much importance to formalities that have been introduced for a moral purpose, is certainly not of such a character that we must follow those formalities when the purpose for which they have been introduced is completely and more than completely reached by the evidence that was before the committee, and when the committee itself concludes that the object for which these formalities had been introduced had been accomplished, which is that Mr. Hyman meant to resign and in fact had resigned.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) has compared this to the formalities that are required for the execution of a will. Without attempting to enter into a legal argument with the learned gentleman, I dare say that, in my humble common sense, there is quite a difference between the formalities required for the execution of a will and the formalities required for the execution of a document of this kind. The formalities required for the execution of a will must necessarily be of the most binding character, because when the document is proved the man who is directly interested in it is no longer there to say whether he did or did not sign that document; whilst in a matter of this kind, the man is living, and in this instance, he has been in communication with the Prime Minister, members of his family have been in communication with the Prime Minister, he has been in communication with his own agent, he has manifested time and again, since that document was signed, that he meant the document to be genuine and wanted to resign. The Minister of Justice now tells us that we cannot act on that because the document has to be compared to a will which has to be proved after the interested party, the signer, has died and is no longer there to prove his good faith and his signature, or to challenge those who may want to impose on his heirs a false document.

The minister has given as another reason for not accepting the resignation of Mr. Hyman, the fact that it was completed after it was signed, and he said: Suppose a contract in civil matters to be entered into between parties and signed on a certain date, all the formalities not having been accomplished but the document being filled in later on by the parties, the conditions may have changed in the meantime. That is exactly where the comparison of the Minister of Justice is lacking because in a matter of this kind there is no question of contract, it is the status of a member of parliament in this House. Now that member finding that the conditions under which he became a member of this House are such that he feels bound in honour to step out of the House in order to redeem his honour by going back to his constituents, where is the change—because the little red paper has been affixed fifteen days or three months later? Where is the change in the position of Mr. Hyman either before the House or before the country or before his constituents? If his resignation had been based solely on the ground of ill-health, and as I understand that Mr. Hyman is now in good health and coming back to parliament, then I would understand that there would be a certain ground for the argument of the Minister of Justice, because circumstances would be changed; but, Sir, the circumstances that were unveiled in the police court in Toronto have not changed; they are exactly the same as they were then. Either they were of a damaging character or they were not of a damaging character; and I presume the Minister of Public Works, the member for London (Mr. Hyman) is the sole judge of his honour, the sole judge of his relations with his constituents, and with this House. In his full capacity as minister and as member, in the enjoyment of his full liberty he has judged it necessary for his own honour, his own standing in this House, to tender his resignation and to go back to his constituents. And now we come and say: We know that Mr. Hyman wanted to resign, we agree to his request; but because a certain little piece of red paper was affixed three weeks later, his resignation is no good, and he has a right to remain in this House. Of course it may be that Mr. Hyman, when he comes back, will take the necessary procedure, and will give in due

form his resignation before the House, but I repeat that in the eyes of the common place people of this country, in the eyes of the people who have not been initiated to the highest and most subtle lights of law, it will certainly appear that this whole procedure is nothing but a farce, in order to avoid an election in London ; and the agreement between both parties in this committee will be judged by many people to have been reached not because there was such a consensus of opinion among lawyers, but because politicians on both sides did not care to have an election in London at the present time ; and I think that is a far better explanation of the report of this committee than the affixing of seals or the signing of that document on this day or that by certain gentlemen as witnesses.

Motion (Mr. Lavergne) negatived.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. BARKER moved :

That the sixth report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be taken into consideration at the next sitting of this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The next sitting of this House will be on Monday ; that will be a very inconvenient day to take such a motion and I suggest therefore that it be taken into consideration on Wednesday next.

Mr. BARKER. I agree to that.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Mr. BARKER moved :

That the minutes of proceedings accompanying the sixth report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be printed in the Votes and Proceedings of the House of this day.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 117) for the relief of Selina Kingan Ansley.

Bill (No. 118) for the relief of George William Hadley.

REPORT OF THE INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Mr. BOURASSA. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to give notice to the House that on a week from Tuesday next, on a motion to go into supply, I shall bring up again, for more complete discussion the matter on which I have already twice addressed the House : I mean the consideration of the accusations, or insinuations, or charges, that have been exchanged between members on both sides of this House. In order to make myself quite clear and that everybody may be prepared for it, I intend to refer to the report of the Insurance Commission, not exactly in order to consider its conclusions, but in order to complete what I would call the documentary evidence in support of the subject I want to discuss. I have consulted the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, and they both agree that a week from Tuesday would be convenient.

PREVENTION AND SETTLEMENT OF STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 36) to aid in the prevention and settlement of strikes and lockouts in mines and industries connected with public utilities.—Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. LENNOX. When we were last in committee certain amendments were proposed, one by the leader of the opposition, and I understood that the Bill was to be reprinted and that that particular matter would be considered, that is, the question of applying this Act to railway employees.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When the committee reported progress the other day we were engaged in the discussion of that clause of the Bill, which give the railway employees and companies a right to invoke either the Railway Labour Disputes Act or the present Act, in case of any dispute arising between them. I drafted an amendment which was discussed, and which embodies the principle I have just mentioned. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition also suggested an amendment on similar lines, but a little different in the wording.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the new section printed in this Bill ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I did not have that section printed for the reason that I propose to give now. I propose to move the reconsideration of three clauses of the Bill which have been adopted so as to incorporate in them the principle contained in a section which I proposed to the committee the other day. I move that we reconsider sections 5, 6 and 56.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The present section 5 reads as follows :

Whenever any dispute exists between an employer and any of his employees, and the parties thereto are unable to adjust it without having recourse to a lockout or strike, either of the parties to the dispute may make application to the minister for the appointment of a board of conciliation and investigation, to which board the dispute may be referred under the provisions of this Act.

The amendment I propose is as follows :

Provided, however, in the case of a dispute between a railway company and its employees, such dispute may be referred for the purpose of conciliation and investigation under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and labour.

This will give the railway employees and companies the option which I mentioned the other day, and to which both sides of the House agreed.

Mr. BOURASSA. Will that have the same effect as the original section in preventing strikes ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. I may say that the object of the three amendments is the same as the object contained in the clause which I intended to insert in the Bill the other day, that is to say, to give the railway companies and their employees the benefit of both Acts, the Railway Labour Disputes Act and the present Act, for the purpose of a public investigation in any case before a strike or a lockout.

Mr. BOURASSA. I think the minister stated the other day that some amendments would be required to the other Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have changed our minds since. We are going to bring the railway employees and companies under the Railway Labour Disputes Act. That would make it compulsory upon them to have an investigation before a strike or lockout. We made that offer to the railway brotherhood and they objected to it, because they said that the procedure was too expensive and too cumbersome. Now as they refused our offer we came at the last sitting of the committee with the proposition to put them under either one of the two Acts, with this condition, however, that the investigation should take place necessarily before a strike or a lockout. Now, coming to the section which I propose to amend, I will read it as amended :

Whenever, under this Act an application is made in due form for the appointment of a board of conciliation and investigation and such application does not relate to a dispute which is the subject of a reference under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and labour, the minister, whose decision for such purpose shall be final, shall, within fifteen days from the date at which the application is received, establish such board under his hand and seal of office if satisfied that the provisions of this Act apply.

This amendment is made necessary on account of the objection that was made ; that is to say if one of the parties shall refer under this Act and if it should happen that the other party shall invoke the other Act. Under this clause, as amended, the minister would direct the parties to go under the Act which would have been invoked at first by either of the two parties. Now, the other amendment comes in section 56, which section as amended would read as follows :

It shall be unlawful for any employer to declare or cause a lockout, or for any employee to go on strike, on account of any dispute prior to or during a reference of such dispute to a board of conciliation and investigation.

Then it is proposed to drop out from the words 'or during' to the word 'under.'

Under the provisions of this Act, or prior to, or during a reference under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and labour; provided that nothing in this Act shall prohibit the suspension or discontinuance of any industry or of the working of any persons therein for any cause not constituting a lockout or strike ; provided also, that except where the parties have entered into an agreement under section 62 of this Act, nothing in this Act shall be held to restrict any employer from declaring a lockout or any employee from going on strike with respect to any dispute which has been duly referred to the board and which has been dealt with under sections 24 or 25 of this Act or with respect to any dispute which has been the subject of a reference under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting conciliation and labour.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, you have in these three amendments only one amendment because they embody only one principle ; that is that you give to the railway companies and to the railway employees two modes of procedure in case of a threatened lockout or strike. They can invoke the Railway Labour Disputes Act or they can invoke the provisions of the present Act. They are the two modes of procedure under which they can have a dispute investigated. But the main principle which predominates in both cases is that whether you come under the operation of the Railway Labour Disputes Act or under the operation of this Act no strike or lockout can be declared prior to or pending the investigation which can be had under these two Acts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The practical effect of this is to amend the Railway Disputes Act by importing into it the provisions of section 56. I do not see very much difference between that and the Act in its first form. There is not very much difference in so far as the principle is concerned. That which the railway men object to in this Bill is imposed upon them by means of another procedure or of another form of legislation. That is all it amounts to as far as I understand it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend knows the objections of the railway men to the present legislation. The objections are twofold, first, that the procedure under this Act is too expensive, and second, that it is too cumbersome. They do not object to a public investigation before the strike or lockout. A few of the brotherhoods object to the procedure as being too cumbersome and to expensive. If my hon. friend will read carefully the letters that have been published he will find that these are the two objections made. Now, I am positive in saying that no railway employee and no railway company are against the principle of compulsory investigation. I think I can make bold to say that every fair minded

railway employee and every railway company in this country will be in favour of this principle. Some of the railway employees object to this procedure as provided by this Act because they are under the impression that it is too cumbersome and too expensive. Well, we meet them half way. We say: Our Act must go into force and the brotherhoods and railway employee who would prefer to come under this Act will be at liberty to invoke this Act, while, if those who have been accustomed to the Act of 1903, choose to come under that Act they may do so. They will have their investigation less expensive and less cumbersome, as they state. They will have the benefit and advantage of that Act. That option is given to them in clear words and I believe that it would be in the interests of the country. My hon. friend, as well as nearly every hon. member of this House, has agreed that the principle of a compulsory public investigation before a strike or lockout is a safe and good principle. Well, let us carry out that principle fairly and squarely.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman state how it is more cumbersome for the railway people than for others?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The brotherhood represented by one gentleman here were the only ones to object and to state that the provisions of this Act are cumbersome and expensive. We say they are not. We say they are less cumbersome and expensive than those of the other Act, but as we have the other Act on our statute-book and as the Act of 1903 has worked fairly well we say that we will leave that Act on our statute-book and that they can take advantage of it

Mr. LENNOX. It is eminently unfair to every one concerned, that the minister should adopt such methods as he is adopting in reference to this Bill. It is bad enough that this Bill was not sent to a committee in the first place, but it is worse when at the last moment a most important amendment on a most debateable point is presented to us, without notice, and without opportunity to consult those immediately interested. That is not fair to the men; it is not fair to the members of this committee, it is a thing which should not be tolerated by the House.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I join in the protest of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). This is one of the most important Bills that has been introduced into this House of Commons for some years. It has been discussed at great length in the House and in the committee, and outside of the House by the people of the country. The Bill proposes reforms which are new and experimental in their nature, and the interests concerned should have every opportunity for consideration of its provisions. The most important feature of this Bill is the section which is now before us. There is no desire to make any political capital out of this measure; it is a measure which the House should approach from the standpoint of fairness, to the exclusion of party considerations, and I think members on both sides have regarded it in that light. When this Bill was last in committee, the Minister of Labour promised that it would be reprinted, and that a clause would be included in the reprint covering the point we are now discussing. That has not been done, and I have had to depend on a typewritten copy of this amendment, which I obtained from the chairman, in order that I may endeavour to understand its effect. The amendment, is far reaching. I have taken an active interest in this Bill from its very inception, and I certainly am unable, without time for consideration, to express anything like an intelligent opinion on this amendment. The interests affected by this Bill have been more or less consulted during its progress, but now at the last moment it is proposed to rush an important section through the House, without giving the railway men or those interested an opportunity to express their opinion on it. Those outside of the House who are interested in the measure have not been apprised of the contents of this amendment. It is in the interest of the legislature itself, and it is in the public interest, that men, or bodies of men affected by legislation of this kind should have an opportunity of saying what they think about it. It may be that they would agree to the amendment, but that I do not know. Nothing can be more unwise than to enforce such legislation on unwilling people. The measure has been under discussion for a considerable time, and no harm can be done by allowing it to stand further until the railway men have an opportunity of considering this proposal. Had the Minister of Labour taken the advice of many gentlemen in this House when he introduced the Bill, he would have referred it to a special committee, which would have reported long since, and in all probability presented a workable measure for our adoption. At all events, I am entirely opposed to such hasty procedure as is now contemplated by the Minister of Labour.

Mr. PARDEE. There will be an opportunity upon the third reading of the Bill to present any amendment that may be desired, so that between this stage and the third reading, gentlemen opposite will have ample time to consult those whom they desire to consult. Surely it cannot be said by any one that this Bill has not been amply, and thoroughly, and fully discussed. Every phase of it from the preamble to the last section has been gone into. Every objection that could possibly be raised has been raised, and has been considered by the

House in committee, until last Monday evening we finally got to the consideration of the clause now before us. The leader of the opposition, and hon. gentlemen on both sides, felt when we last discussed the Bill, that the only thing that remained to be done was to harmonize the provisions of the Act of 1903 so that they could be made effective concurrently with the provisions of this Bill of 1907. It was that point which the committee was endeavouring to solve. Several amendments were submitted by both sides with that end in view, and there was no objection then raised to the fact, that prior to the time of the investigation, no strike should be inaugurated by the men. The House was endeavouring to provide that there should be investigation and conciliation prior to the strike, and the question before us was to make the provisions of the Act of 1907 accord with the provisions of the Act of 1903 in that regard. The views of the various labour organizations, and particularly the views of the trainmen, have been put before the House by their representatives. As I understand it, there has been an absolute conclusion come to by them that they have not the slightest objection to conciliation being invoked prior to a strike. Of course, it is the last thing the men want; it is the last thing any of us want, that a strike should be brought about if there is any possible way of avoiding it. I am led to believe that the men have not the slightest objection to the Board of Arbitration being appointed and to their grievances being looked into prior to the strike, and it is to that end that the amendment now proposed by the Minister of Labour is directed. What the men did take objection to was, that, in their opinion, the procedure under the Act of 1907 was more cumbersome and more expensive than that provided for in the Act of 1903.

They in effect say, let us remain under the Act of 1903, so that we may avoid the cumbersomeness and expensiveness of the other Act, but more than that we care not whether the one Act or the other applies; we are perfectly willing to accept the provisions of the Act of 1907, so long as we may do it under the procedure of the Act of 1903. The hon. member for South Toronto says that the question has been discussed over and over again, not only in the House, but in the labour organizations. I may say that I have letters from labour organizations which, far from being opposed to the Bill, are absolutely in favour of it. So that, with all the discussion that has taken place, and with all the pains that have been bestowed upon the Bill by the members of the House, especially by the Minister of Labour, it is surely not to be said that we cannot pass an Act of this kind without having a precedent for it from somebody else. Surely it is not to be said that we are not to stand on our own feet and initiate legislation on this subject simply because some other country has not tried it. I do not think that is either logical or good policy. I think these amendments are perfectly fair to the railway organizations and to everybody concerned who may come under the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask if these particular amendments have been submitted to the representative of the men?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The principle of these amendments has been known to the men for a long time. I have had several communications with Mr. Hall, who represents the brotherhoods, and he has known it to be my intention to propose these amendments. He refused to accept the proposal which I made several weeks ago. I can assure my hon. friend that there is no change in principle in the amendments which I submit to-day. We might pass the Bill through the committee stage, and at the third reading, if there is any opposition to that principle, an amendment might then be made. But there is no change at all in the principle which has been offered to the railway brotherhoods. I may say that at the last sitting of the committee, I thought it would be necessary to add a section, but I found that we could embody the principle in the Bill simply by amending in a few words sections 5, 6 and 56.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister's position, as I understand it, is that although these particular amendments have not been submitted to the representative of the men, they do no more than embody a principle which he has already submitted to that representative, and which has not been accepted. That is about the way I understand it. It is practically the first proposition of the minister, although in another form. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee) did not quite accurately appreciate my position when we were discussing this matter some time ago. The minister asked me whether or not under the terms of the amendment I proposed, the men would be permitted to strike before an investigation. I told him frankly that I thought they would, and I said further that until the men had an opportunity to come before a committee of this House and make their representations to the members who proposed to legislate for them, you should not impose this restriction upon them against their will. That is not in accordance with what the hon. member for London said just now—through inadvertence, of course. I have no objection to discuss these amendments at the present time; the question whether or not they should stand over, I will not discuss at the moment. Let us look at the amendment to section 5:

Provided, however, in the case of a dispute between a railway company and its employees, such dispute may be referred for the purpose of conciliation and investigation, under the provisions concerning railway disputes, in the Act respecting conciliation and labour.

These provisions provide for two steps. The first step is that the minister may not refer, but cause inquiry to be made into the dispute and the cause thereof, and for that purpose he may establish, under his hand and seal of office, a committee of conciliation, mediation and investigation, to be composed of three persons named by a particular method which I need not set forth. The minister is to notify each party to name a member of the committee, and it shall be the duty of the committee to endeavour, by conciliation and mediation, to assist in bringing about an amicable settlement. If that step does not meet with any success, or, as the statute expresses it, in case the committee is unable to effect an amicable settlement by conciliation and mediation, the minister may refer the difference to arbitration. What I desire to inquire is whether or not it is intended, by the language used in this amendment, to provide that the minister shall take both these steps; because, if so, it seems to me the language is not very happily chosen. The expression is: 'such dispute may be referred for the purpose of conciliation and investigation.' The word 'refer' is used in the statute of 1903 only in connection with the second step, and I presume that is the only step intended.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend will see, in reading over the Act of 1903, that its intent and purpose is to have conciliation and arbitration. It uses the word 'arbitration,' but my hon. friend knows that the purpose is investigation. The conciliation is the first step. If by conciliation the minister succeeds in making peace between the parties, of course he will not have recourse to the other one; but if conciliation does not succeed, then he can order the formation of a board for investigation. I suppose my hon. friend's objection is that it may take too long a time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not making any objection, but only trying to find out what is the intent.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Act of 1903 provides for the establishment, in the first place, of a board of conciliation, and then, if the board of conciliation does not succeed, a board of investigation is appointed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I am asking is whether this amendment is intended to provide for both steps contemplated by the Act of 1903 or is it intended, as its language seems to imply, that the minister shall take only the second step mentioned in that Act?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The evident object of the amendment is that if the parties choose to come under the Act of 1903 it does not follow that the two means provided for settling disputes will be taken. If conciliation succeeds, there will be no need for a reference to a board of arbitration. But if conciliation does not succeed, then the other recourse will be had.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the amendment says that only one step shall be taken, and that is the second step. 'Such disputes may be referred for the purpose of conciliation and investigation.' That is the language of the amendment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It adds 'under the provisions concerning railway disputes.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But there is only one reference under the Conciliation and Labour Act. We are dealing with words used in another statute. One clause provides that you may cause inquiry to be made into the dispute or cause thereof. The other provides that in case that inquiry should be futile, you may refer the matter to arbitration. In his amendment the minister says that such dispute may be referred under the provisions of that Act. I would understand that to contemplate only the second step, and that is why I put the question whether or not the minister contemplated the possibility of both steps. It is not a matter perhaps of much moment except that I do not think the amendment carries out the intention of the minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the amendment is very clear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister is satisfied, I shall not say another word.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The intention is that railway companies and employees may invoke either one or two means. If they choose to invoke the provisions of the Act of 1903, they may do so. The minister then may cause an inquiry to be made into the dispute, and he has two means of making that inquiry. He must begin by a board of conciliation. If that does not succeed, he may refer the same subject to a board of arbitration, but always under the provisions of that particular Act. I think really the amendment is well drawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be well drawn, but not for that purpose, because the minister has not used words appropriate to the process provided for by section 13 of the Conciliation and Labour Act. He is only using words appropriate to describe the proceedings under section 15 of this Bill. I feel satisfied the language is not happily chosen, but if the minister is satisfied I shall not argue further.

Mr. CONMEE. Would not the effect go this far? The proceeding is to be under

the Act of 1903. That Act contemplates first a board of conciliation. If the word 'reference' is not used, the men might strike at the conclusion of the efforts of those who tried to conciliate, but by using the word 'reference' that makes it clear that until the reference is concluded, which is the latter remedy under the Act of 1903, the men would not be at liberty to strike or the company to lockout.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved that section 6 be amended by inserting after the word 'investigation' and before the words 'the minister' in line nine, the words 'and such application does not relate to a dispute which is the subject of a reference under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Act respecting Conciliation and Labour.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This section would have a curious effect if the minister's argument of a few days ago is well founded. At that time the minister took the ground that there was no obligation upon him to act under the Conciliation and Labour Act of 1903, that it was absolutely discretionary with him. The result of this then is that as the men cannot go on strike until there has been a reference under that Act, when a dispute once arises the whole question as to whether they can go on strike in all the years to come rests upon the minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is assuming that I will not act wisely in the exercise of my discretion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am only taking the argument the minister put forward himself on the last occasion. I tried to convince him then but I apparently did not succeed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I became wiser since.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must conclude that while holding his opinion he will still exercise that discretion, so if one thousand or two thousand men desire to strike and the minister does not see fit to grant a reference, the men must remain under the then present conditions for all time to come. I do not see any alternative under that proposition.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course if I should be unwise enough to refuse a reference in such a case, the parties would only have to invoke the present law and under that law I would be bound to give them a board of investigation. At all events if, as my hon. friend says, I am using language not similar to what I used the other day it is because I have become wiser since, after reading the weighty arguments of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister really experienced a change of heart and opinion on that question ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not admit it, but assuming that my hon. friend finds contradiction in my words——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The contradiction is not important but the question of the minister's heart and opinion on this matter is very important. Does the minister feel himself absolutely bound to act under the statute of 1903 in case an application should be made ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend the other day stated that the word 'may' used in that section means 'shall.' My first impression on reading that section was that it was purely discretionary on the part of the minister. I may have been wrong, I freely admit if I am wrong I am correcting myself to-day, but I could go so far as to say that the Minister of Labour, being responsible to the country and to parliament, will never refuse a reference whenever an application is made to him and whenever he finds that there is sufficient evidence before him that society is endangered by the threatened strike or lockout. We must believe that the minister will always be wise enough and prudent enough to exercise his judgment cautiously and prudently.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I would ask whether there should not be some time limit on the commission for reporting on a strike of this kind. You limit the time for the appointment of the commission to fifteen days, and I would suggest that if the Board of Inquiry do not report within the specified time the men will have the right to go on strike. I think that is a reasonable precaution and should be inserted in the Bill, because if the board take an interminable time in inquiring into a matter it would be most unfair.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend will read section 68 he will see that :

> The minister may make regulations as to the time within which anything hereby authorized shall be done, and also as to any other matter or thing which appears to him necessary or advisable to the effectual working of the several provisions of this Act. All such regulations shall go into force on the day of the publication thereof in the 'Canada Gazette.'

I quite agree with my hon. friend that it would be very unwise if the Board of Investigation should sit indefinitely and retard the settlement of a dispute or even the using of the weapon which is properly in the hands of the employees. But my hon. friend will admit with me that it would be difficult to fix a limit of time. In some cases as that of the Pennsylvania coal strike the investigation may last a long time and then if we had a limit fixed by statute we might find it cumbersome in the end. The minister may publish these regulations in the 'Canada Gazette' every week, and for instance order interim reports from the commission if it appears to the public and to

the parties that the board is delaying matters. In these questions we must rely on the good sense of the minister and especially on that of the registrar, who will, before this board and between the two parties, act as a sound counsellor.

Mr. CONMEE. It seems to me it might be dangerous to put in a limit. I agree with my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo that it is very important that this reference ought not to be dragged out for a long time and that there should be despatch of business, but if you fix a time I apprehend from my hon. friend that he would desire to have a short time fixed, say thirty or forty days; then this contingency might arise, that one of the parties to the dispute might seek delay in order to accomplish some particular purpose, so if the Act is sufficiently broad to have it in the power of the minister to fix in the commission which he gives to the board or in regulations, some time limit or means of forcing the despatch of business that would seem to be a good remedy. If the Act is broad enough to cover the suggestion of the minister that would meet with my approval, but if it is not, I think this is the time to make such a provision.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Section 68 is broad enough, I think, for that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister think section 68 would be broad enough to empower an interim report; if it is, I would think section 68 ought to be struck out? But I do not think it would authorize any such thing as that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is not a report of such a nature that it would be final, it is a report of the progress of the investigation. Public opinion might become impatient, the parties might become impatient, and in order to carry out the intention of the Act it would be wise that an interim report should be published during the investigation, in order to let the public know, who in the last resort is the supreme judge, that progress is made, and that the procedure is not wilfully or corruptly delayed by members of the board. That is the only object of such an interim report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister is talking about the policy upon which this statute should be moulded, I am discussing what is in this Bill; they are two entirely different things. It may be desirable that there should be interim reports, that is one question; the other question is, what does the Bill actually provide. This board has absolutely no power, function or authority in any respect except what is given to it within the four corners of this statute. These powers would be construed with considerable strictness as they involve a departure from the common law of the land. There is only one report provided for, and that is by section 27. That is the only report the board can make which would have an official character. So if it is desirable to have interim reports, you must provide for them by special enactment. I have one further remark with regard to section 68. It seems to me, even under the limited construction which I am inclined to place upon that section, that the powers ought to be exercised by the Governor in Council and not by the minister. They are regulations of some importance, and in so far as this parliament delegates its powers, they ought to be exercised by the Governor in Council. Important changes in that line have been made in legislation during the present session. It is not contemplated I suppose that the minister should make special regulations in any particular case, the regulations are to be in the nature of general regulations. There is therefore no possible inconvenience in my suggestion that they should be made by the Governor in Council. Of course we thoroughly understand that they would be made upon the recommendation of the minister, and the minister no doubt would act upon the report of his technical officer. But the regulations should have behind them the responsibility of the whole cabinet.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the Railway Labour Disputes Act the last clause reads as follows:

> The minister may from time to time make, alter and amend regulations as to the time within which anything hereby authorized shall be done, and also as to any other matter or thing which appears to him necessary or advisable in order to the effectual working of the several provisions of this Act.

Of course this interim report would not be of the nature of a final report, even if it did embody some recommendations which might have a bearing on the whole case. We must certainly surround any such procedure with all the necessary precautions. But as it is only one of the minor details in order to facilitate the operation of the Act, and to put the machinery in motion, so to speak, I think it should be left within the power of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Because he is the person who is best informed on the subject, he is the one who has in hand the administration of the Act, and he has all the facts and all the knowledge of the progress of the case. I think my hon. friend might well let the clause stand as it is. As I have mentioned several times, this is experimental legislation, and if later on we find that these regulations give too much power to the minister we can amend the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not agree with that at all. The minister recommends to Council, but I want the responsibility of Council behind the regulations. If the

minister had to act suddenly to do anything suddenly then power should be given to him.

On section 68,

In the event of any question arising as to whether or not a particular employment properly appertains to an industry or class of industries included under the terms 'agency of transportation or communication, or public service utility,' the matter shall be referred to the minister, whose decision shall be final.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I move to strike out the word 'minister' and to substitute therefor the words 'Governor in Council,' and to add the following words:

And shall be laid before parliament within fifteen days after such publication, or if parliament is not then in session, within fifteen days after the opening of the next session thereof.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion that the amendment shall be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the amendments are read a second time, I suppose as a matter of course that all these regulations are published in the 'Labour Gazette' so it is not necessary to make any special provision about them; that it is done as a matter of routine?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Amendments concurred in and Bill reported.

DOMINION LANDS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 7,—proviso as to water supply and power, harbour and landing.

Mr. LENNOX. On that section we were calling the attention of the hon. minister last night to certain provisions that were not acceptable to some members and we asked the minister to consider the question of leaving out subsection (a) and amending subsection (b). I indicated at that time the amendment that I thought ought to be made in subsection (b). It will probably be clearer if I strike out a certain number of words and read the amendment that I propose to have made to that subsection. I would ask to have all the words after the word 'or' in the 26th line struck out and the following words substituted:

With the consent of the party who obtained entry or who is to represent him in estate withdraw from its applicaton any part or portion of the land entered for and that in either of such cases full compensation for the loss occasioned thereby shall be made to the person who obtained the entry or who represented him in estate.

The minister provides here not only that he may cancel the entry, but that he may cancel it as to part; that is, he may withdraw a portion of the 160 acres from a person who has made the entry. That is an expropriation proceeding of a very drastic character and it is even more than a mere question of expropriation, because it is left in the discretion of the minister whether even in that case he shall allow any compensation or not. I submit that the minister should not have any discretion in the matter. A man enters and obtains his homestead in good faith. If the minister sees fit afterwards to withdraw a portion or all of the land from him there should be no alternative to the minister but to compensate him for the actual loss that he has sustained.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Chairman, I am quite willing to agree that there should be no choice as to the payment of compensation. I am quite willing to agree that the question of compensation should be left to arbitration, but I cannot say that I can see in the same light the desirability of leaving the matter subject to the consent of the homesteader. It is necessary, or it is generally conceded to be necessary, that water-powers shall be for the general benefit, and the purpose of this section is that having declared that water-powers exist for the general benefit, means are taken whereby they may be preserved for the general benefit. As the section reads, of course, a hardship is liable to be committed upon a settler, and I am quite agreeable to provision being made that that hardship shall be compensated for by arbitration, but I do not think it would be in the public interest that the right to the land necessary for the development of a water-power should be subject to obtaining the consent of the homesteader. If it were so then the man who had fortunately located a homestead which controlled a water-power would, for all practical purposes, own the water-power and that would not be in the public interest.

Mr. LENNOX. I have not made myself clear to the minister. What I mean is this: I do not think that there should be any limit upon the right of the minister to take back a homestead if he thinks fit, but I do say that the minister should not have the right, without the consent of the owner to say: I will take part and I will not take the whole. In other words when this man goes to obtain the homestead he gets his 160 acres, he is living on it and the minister decides to take eighty acres of it; 160 acres make a farm and eighty acres make no farm at all. The minister has the right to take eighty or 100 acres and to say to the man: You shall keep the balance of it. Yet, the man cannot get any compensation as to that. The minister should have the

absolute right to take the land in the public interest, but if he wants to take less than the whole 160 acres and compensate the man for the loss he has sustained it should only be in case the man is willing to retain the balance. That is fair between the country and the settler.

Mr. OLIVER. I think if it were provided that the owner shall be paid compensation, which compensation may be fixed by a fair arbitration then it ought to be competent for the government to withdraw as much or as little of the land as is required, because, if the farm is broken so that the remainder is of no value, it is simply a matter of increasing the compensation. There is no necessity to lay down a hard and fast rule that we must take all or nothing. As long as we agree to compensate on a fair basis and provide that there shall be no limit to the compensation, that is as far as it is necessary to go. In reference to the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) I would propose to add the words :

Or withdraw from its application, any part or portion of the land entered for, and the amount of the compensation therefore to be fixed by arbitration.

Mr. LENNOX. You could say :

Or upon making full compensation therefor, the amount of the compensation to be settled by arbitration.

Mr. OLIVER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) draft some words which would meet the point. The hon. member from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) last night raised a question as to the result of withdrawing land for the development of water-power. Our intention was to withdraw all lands necessary for the construction of the works only, and we left the results of the development to be settled in the ordinary way. We believe the section meant that, but in deference to the hon. gentleman I would ask that the section should read in this way :

If after entry be obtained, it is ascertained that the land entered for or any part or portion thereof, is necessary for the preservation of any water supply, or (for the location and construction of works necessary to) the development of any water-power.

I add the words in parenthesis so as to make the clause quite clear, if there should be any doubt about it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Subsection (a) seems to give a very remarkable discretion to the minister. Is it the minister who is to ascertain that the lands are so valuable that the entries should be withdrawn ?

Mr. OLIVER. In practice it would be the minister on the report of the officers of the department, but really upon the application of the surrounding settlers who would hope to benefit by the reservation of the timber.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no provision for compensating a man who may in good faith have made an entry and expended money.

Mr. OLIVER. There is not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that fair to the settler ?

Mr. OLIVER. There should be provision to compensate a man who made entry in good faith and made expenditure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would be only fair. If there are many cases of this kind who made entry in good faith and made expenditure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would be only fair. If there are many cases of this kind in which compensation should be given, it would be less cumbersome if a general provision were made, determining what the compensation should be.

Mr. OLIVER. The cases are few, and I think they will be met by inserting a provision in each clause. We could provide a general clause as to the method of arbitration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The most convenient and the usual way is to provide, that the proceedings upon an arbitration should be conducted in accordance with the law of a particular province. I suppose Alberta and Saskatchewan have arbitration laws now.

Mr. OLIVER. I rather doubt it.

Mr. McCRANEY. Unless such an Act was passed at the last session, it is my impression that Saskatchewan has no law with regard to arbitration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was there an arbitration Act in the Northwest territories ?

Mr. McCRANEY. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no doubt that British Columbia and Manitoba have arbitration Acts.

Mr. BENNETT. Are not the field notes of the surveyors so comprehensive that they would show if there was considerable quantity of timber on a particular section, so that the department might reserve these at the outset, and present the possibility of such a thing as this occurring.

Mr. OLIVER. The surveyors who run the subdivision lines are contract surveyors, and it is no part of their contract to give us correct information as to the interior of the sections around which they run the lines. I think it will be agreed that if we made another bargain with them it would

rather complicate matters and would not produce the very best results. Then, many surveys are made long before settlement occurs, and it may be that in the meantime fires have run over the land and changed the whole condition of the country. Then, as was pointed out last night, the value of the timber does not depend so much on the timber itself as on the country surrounding; that is to say, a small clump of timber surrounded by a large area of clear prairie is of immensely greater value than a similar clump surrounded by a timbered country. The surveyor's notes with regard to the timber are not what we want, and we do not want to make any reservation unless the requirement of settlement calls for it. Therefore, in practice, it is an authority that we do not exercise of our own desire, but simply to meet the desires of settlers for the holding of a piece of timber for their use.

Mr. LAKE. The minister will admit that, if it were possible to do so, it would be preferable for the department to reserve in advance the sections in which entries should not be allowed, and I hope he will endeavour to make arrangements to do that. Where it is impossible to do that in individual cases, I think the suggestion that he has made that there should be compensation where entries have been made in good faith, and that compensation should be settled by arbitration, will meet the case fairly well.

Mr. LENNOX. In amending the section, I think it would be advisable to have something on the line which the hon. leader of the opposition suggests. I started to draft an amendment and found that, in providing that the compensation should be determined by arbitration, it would be necessary to set out the procedure or else to refer to some Act. I think we have in the Dominion statutes a General Arbitration Act which might govern. Later on in this Bill we might have a general provision for that. If the minister has decided not to strike out subsection (a), the alternative is to provide for compensation. In reference to subsection (b), what I propose is, after the word 'for' in the twenty-seventh line, the following: 'Upon payment of full compensation for the loss occasioned thereby, and in case of dispute the amount of compensation shall be determined by arbitration as hereinafter provided.' Perhaps a similar provision in subsection (a) might cover the case.

Mr. OLIVER. And I will introduce a general clause providing for the procedure.

Mr. J. W. ROCHE. The amendment will mitigate to a certain extent the objection made to the original form of this section, but still I wish to reiterate once more my objection to the naming of the homestead inspector as the officer on whose report the minister will cancel or refuse to cancel, as the case may be, a particular homestead. The compensation will of course be satisfactory to the individual whose homestead is cancelled; but after all how much compensation will be necessary to pay for improvements made in the short space of six months? Comparatively little. Having had the experience I have had of homestead inspectors, I was impressed last night with the guilelessness of the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) that the homestead inspectors should report on the timber, for I felt that the hon gentleman, representing a city constituency, could not have had much experience with that class of officials. If he represented Marquette and were in opposition to the government, he would have a better idea of how these homestead inspectors perform their duties. It is only necessary for me to cite one instance. Last session there was a Forestry Bill passed through this House and under it certain lands were withdrawn from the Riding mountain timber reserve. It was published in the Northwest that on the 1st October those lands would be open for entry in the Dauphin office. About three hundred people went up to Dauphin prepared to make entry for those lands, but when they arrived there they were informed by the land agent that it was decided not to open them for entry until the 1st of November. They returned to their homes, and before the 1st of November a message came from Ottawa that the opening of those lands had been indefinitely postponed. In the beginning of the session I asked the minister when those lands were to be opened, and he informed me that the matter was still under consideration, that it had not been definitely decided. I asked him in reference to squatters who had located on the lands prior to their having been taken out of the timber reserve and those who had located since, and his reply was that each individual case would be considered on its merits, and that the homestead inspectors had been authorized to make reports. In that case, as in this, there is no principle applied, but each case is considered by itself. A few weeks ago I was informed by a gentleman who is a political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite that he was told by the homestead inspector to go and locate on those lands, and he would undoubtedly have priority when he came to make his entry. I do not know if the officials have received pointers from the government or not, but they are urging their friends to locate on those lands as squatters and then they will be given precedence in making their entries. When we see homestead inspectors utilizing their position in this way, is it any wonder that I am somewhat

skeptical regarding the advantage of placing such great power in their hands and allowing them to be the arbitrators as to whether there is sufficient timber on the lands or not to reserve them from settlement. I would much prefer our adopting the suggestion made last night that the surveyors' report as to the timber, and that different instructions be issued in the future to cover such cases as the present and not have the lands thrown open at all. Even though the holder of the land be compensated, that compensation will amount to very little, and he will lose his hand, which is something he cannot be compensated for.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say positively that homestead inspectors are instructing settlers to settle on those lands at present?

Mr. WILLIAM J. ROCHE. When I was home a few weeks ago I was told by some gentlemen that they themselves were given the tip by a homestead inspector to locate on those lands. I may say further that on October 1 when a number went to Dauphin to enter for the lands, they were told that they would not be opened for another month. Before that month was up I was informed that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) said to a gentleman that he need not go up to make an entry the 1st November as the lands would not be opened until after this session and the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) had no business giving the notice he did. My informant told me that this information came from the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford). That hon. member had inside information that the lands would not be opened until after next session, and within a week after that announcement was published in the newspapers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As regards the statement about my giving information in connection with the land situation, I deny it altogether. It is utterly unfounded and not in keeping with the facts.

Mr. WILLIAM J. ROCHE. Am I to understand that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) did not inform the reeve of Odanah—for it was from him the information came—that those lands would not be opened November 1?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would like to make a correction of a statement I made. I find that there is a general ordinance in chapter 35 of the revised statutes which would govern in the two provinces unless repealed.

Mr. LENNOX. As regards what has been just said on this side, I do not understand that the minister would be complying with the provision he is agreeing to if he were to appoint an inspector as one of the arbitrators. That inspector would represent the government in a very close sense. The provision, I assume, will be a provision for a purely independent tribunal to decide the matter.

Mr. OLIVER. When we get the provision drafted, it will have to meet the approval of the House. For the present it will be quite sufficient to provide that there shall be an arbitration. Later on we will discuss the provision. Even although we should refer to the ordinances or Acts of the present provinces, it would be desirable to have a general clause.

Mr. BENNETT. How would it be to add this proviso, that this shall not refer to any lands which may be comprised in any survey that may be made after this date. The department would then simply instruct all surveyors from this out that they must report on the value of the timber. The department then would be in a position to refuse, in the first instance, to allot the lands to the settler.

Mr. TURRIFF. That provision would not be of much value because the land might not be entered for ten years after the survey. A report on the timber would not be of the slightest value at the end of ten years because a fire might have destroyed the timber altogether. You could not depend on the statement of a surveyor as to the quantity of timber except immediately after the survey was made. That would add very much to the cost of the survey and would be no improvement on the plan adopted in the past. In spite of what has been said about homestead inspectors, my experience of them is that, as a class, they are very reliable and their reports, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, are correct. I do not know of any cases in which individuals have been hurt in any way by reports of inspectors. Sometimes the inspector may not report quite as fully as he might, but as a rule their reports are good and they are the best informed men on that class of work. They are driving all around the country and are in a position to report accurately on all these matters. You would not improve matters by taking this out of the hands of the inspectors. Certainly to make an entry of a quarter-section depend, as to the amount of timber, on the report of a surveyor would not work as well as the present system.

Mr. BENNETT. Assuming that a fire might intervene, as those homestead inspectors are thoroughly conversant, each with his own district, they could report that timber had been destroyed by fire on certain lands.

Mr. TURRIFF. The expense of the survey would be much greater and we would not accomplish anything.

Mr. BENNETT. I have seen the field notes of different sections of land and they seem to me pretty full. They point out where there might be a creek, or a certain part is indicated as being a ridge having stone on it or a little timber or something of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a matter which has necessarily come to the attention of the department in all stages of its administration, and for the reasons which have been given we have found that it is practically impossible to protect the interests of the settlers in cases where they most need protection. As I have already pointed out, it is not so much the kind of timber or the amount or the condition of the timber as it is the condition of the surrounding country and the requirement of settlers resulting from their coming in. We do not consider it sound policy to make reserves here and there unless there is a direct demand for such reserves. We do not think it good policy to go into a new country and reserve sections here and there from settlement because of timber, but when settlers go into a country and demand the reservation of a section I think it is good policy to give it to them and we think that in this section provision is made to do so and by providing for compensation by arbitration we prevent the possibility of serious damage to any man. At any rate it is a case where the interest of the many should dominate the interest of the individual and we make it as fair as we can all around.

Mr. BENNETT. If a man settled there in the summer he might be dispossessed when the cold weather was coming on and then in the succeeding spring he would have to start out to look up a new homestead. The question of damages would depend on each particular case, and while the damages may be very remote, it would be hard to study out what they would be in each case.

Mr. SPROULE. Why take in one instance only six months in which you can cancel and in the other case until the issue of the patent ?

Mr. OLIVER. The reason for the difference between the six months' term in the one case and the unlimited time in the other is that in the case of timber the benefit to surrounding settlers is only temporary and therefore it is not of as great importance as in the case of the water supply, water-power, harbour, or landing where the benefit is for all time, and it is thought that in such a case the government should have the right to step in and protect the public right at any time up to the issuing of the patent. As the law now stands it has been held that a patent issued for land that controlled a water-power was issued in error and could be cancelled. We do not propose to have any such provision as that, but we desire to lay down clearly and distinctly in the law just how far we are entitled to go and when we are going so very far short of the law as it stands and providing for compensation I think we meet pretty well all interests and all views.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 82) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

Mr. LENNOX. I would ask that this matter be allowed to stand. I was speaking to my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) about it. There is hardly anybody here to-night and there are some gentlemen who wish to assist me in this matter. I would ask that it stand over until next week.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would be only too glad to comply with the request of my hon. friend, but the promoters of the Bill are very anxious to have it put through this House at as early a day as possible. There are some rumours that this House may prorogue in a few weeks from now and I would not feel at liberty to jeopardize the rights of the promoters of this Bill even for the sake of pleasing a good friend like the hon. member for South Simcoe. I insist upon the third reading of the Bill now.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know that it is a matter for the private holder of the Bill. I address myself to the government as well. This is a matter that affects the public interest, it is an exceedingly small House, and I think I might very fairly appeal to the government to say that this matter should stand over to-night. I do not want it to stand over beyond next week, but I think that it would be only fair that it should be adjourned.

Mr. GERVAIS. The amendments which are proposed to be made to this Bill were disposed of by this House in 1904. Since then decisions of our courts have been rendered and I do not see that any debate upon these amendments would have any result now. All questions respecting the validity of the arrangement between the employees and railway companies have been settled by the Act, 4 Edward VII, chap. 31. This Act has been submitted, in regard to the question of its constitutionality, to the Supreme Court of Canada, and it has been declared that it was within the jurisdiction of this parliament to pass such legislation. Then an appeal was taken to the Privy Council and the Privy Council confirmed the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada last November. The Act is being put into force by

way of procrastination on the first day of April next. All the questions which the hon. member for South Simcoe is trying to raise were threshed out and discussed in the sessions of 1903 and 1904, and later before the courts. As a matter of fact, the amendment which the hon. gentleman wishes to propose now is unconstitutional and moreover useless. I reserve to myself the right to discuss that question later on.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the government say anything in reference to the matter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have just read the amendment which has been suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) and it seems to me that this amendment would be better in the Railway Act itself. I do not know why it should be incorporated in the Grand Trunk Railway Bill alone. My impression is that my hon. friend some time ago presented a Bill embodying the principle which we see in this amendment and in view of that I think that my hon. friend should not press his amendment in connection with this Bill. General principles should be embodied in the Railway Act itself and not applied to one company alone. For that reason it seems to me that this amendment, which I have not read very carefully, as I have just now seen it, should not be introduced into a private Bill but must form part of the Railway Act.

Mr. LENNOX. That is begging the question. Here is the private Bill of a railway company in which a large number of people are interested. We have not the means of discussing it to-night. I am prepared to discuss it myself if necessary, but I am asking the ministry to have this matter stand over until it can be properly discussed. I am not going into the merits of whether I am right or not. If the minister says it must go on I will go on and argue it, but it is not giving fair play to a large class of people if it is forced on to-night.

Mr. GERVAIS. The very question which this hon. gentleman wishes to argue has been discussed on previous occasions.

Mr. LENNOX. That is begging the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a motion for the third reading of the Bill and I do not think that hon. members should be allowed to talk three or four times on the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand the position taken by the government at all events, and I shall take a reasonable length of time to explain my position on the matter. The Act I am seeking to amend is an Act conferring some general rights on the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and providing that they shall also have power for the purpose of making provision for the payment of allowances to employees after leaving the service, to establish a fund to be known as 'Grand Trunk Pension Fund,' and from time to time contribute thereto out of the gross revenues of the company such amounts as the directors determine.

The Bill also provides, by section 6, that :

> Any sums contributed to the said fund by the company shall be considered as, and form part of, the working expenses of the company as defined by the agreement set out in the schedule to the Grand Trunk Act, 1893.

Section 7 provides :

> The directors may make and adopt all such rules, by-laws and regulations not inconsistent with law as they deem proper and necessary for the due and efficient management, administration and disposition of the said fund.

This is not the first legislation that we have had of this kind. We had a provision similar to this introduced in 1874. That was a provision authorizing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to establish a fund to be called the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada Superannuation and Provident Fund. That provision was made by chap. 65 of 37 Vic., 1874. The 11th section provides that they can establish this fund :

> For the payment of superannuation allowances to the officers and servants of the company, or such of them as shall become and continue contributing members of the fund, or for the payment of allowances to such officers and servants in case of sickness, or to their widows or children or other representatives in case of their death.

You will notice that the provision here is for a somewhat similar fund to that which is established by this Act. Then it provides that :

> The fund should be formed, invested, managed and distributed in accordance with the rules and regulations contained in a scheme to be prepared by the company, and sealed with their common seal within six months after the passing of this Act.

And it provided that these regulations may be altered from time to time. So we have here two features common to these Acts, the right to establish a fund, and the right to make rules and regulations for the government of that fund. This Act of 1874 then went on to provide the proportion in which the company should contribute to the fund, and the proportion in which the men should contribute, and also that the fund should be vested in a committee. That was followed by the Act of 1878, chapter 25, a section of which provided :

> It shall be lawful for the Grand Trunk Railway Company to make provision for insurance against accidents to its employees, which may include insurance against death.

Then it provided for contributions, as in the former Act, and it provided that the provisions of the previous Act as to the management of this scheme should apply to the insurance fund by this Act created.

So we had these two features, the right of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to establish a fund, and to make rules and regulations for its management. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that it would be better to have general provisions in the Railway Act, instead of the provision I am asking to introduce by this amendment. Well, we are dealing with a concrete case, we are dealing with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and it is practically the only company in Canada that seeks provisions of this kind. It is the company, too, that created the difficulty, and it is to meet that difficulty that I propose to move an amendment. The difficulty was this: That company proceeded to make rules and regulations under the provisions of these Acts which they were empowered to make. According to their rules, if an employee, or the representatives of an employee had been paid the proportion of the fund provided for by these regulations by way of insurance or indemnity, then, although the death or injury of the person had been caused by the negligence of the company, that person or his representatives had no remedy. It was argued in this House that these statutes could not have that effect. But the fact was that it had that effect, as declared by the cases decided in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. In Grenier and the the Queen, Holden and the Grand Trunk, and Harrison and the Grand Trunk, it was found that these regulations made under the authority of that Act barred the wife and children of the employees that were killed through the negligence of the company, from recovering the compensation to which they would have been entitled but for the passage of that Act.

My hon. friend who is supporting this Bill says that this matter has been determined by legislation already introduced. I should be a reasonable judge of that matter, perhaps, because I was the person who fought for that legislation and got it. But there is no legislation that deals with this matter. My hon. friend says in one breath that this matter is satisfactorily provided for, and in the next he suggests that this is ultra vires. As regards the question of its being ultra vires, that is determined by the statute to which reference has been made. In 1904 we passed the Act 4 Edward VII, chapter 31, to which reference has been made. That Act provided that,

> Notwithstanding anything in any Act heretofore passed by parliament—(a) no railway company within the legislative power or control of parliament, shall be relieved from liability for damages for personal injury to any workman, employee or servant of such company; nor (b) shall any action or suit by such workman, employee or servant, or, in the event of his death, by his personal representatives, against the company, be barred or defeated, by reason of (1) any notice——

And so on. That Act was passed, and it was a condition of its passage that it should be submitted to the court to determine whether it was within the competence of this parliament so to legislate. The Supreme Court, and ultimately the Privy Council, decided that this parliament had power to legislate upon this question, but beyond that, the decision did not go. The Act provided that if it was declared to be competent for this parliament to pass the legislation, then it should come into force by proclamation, and under proclamation issued, it will come into force on the 1st of April next. The section of this Act which I seek to amend, provides:

> The directors may make and adopt all such rules, by-laws and regulations not inconsistent with law as they deem proper for the due and efficient management, administration and disposition of said funds.

Mr. Biggar told us the other day in the committee that he introduced these words 'not inconsistent with law' with a view to meeting the difficulty I am suggesting, that is, that by the introduction of these words we are limiting the right of the company as to the rules and regulations that they might make. Now we have no law that governs a case of this kind. If we had a provision of law which would govern this case, then these words 'inconsistent with law' would be effectual. But we have no common law which will control the Grand Trunk Railway Company and prevent it from making such by-laws, rules and regulations for the management of their fund as they may deem proper and necessary. Therefore I desire to amend that section by providing that there shall not be conferred upon this company, by this section a power such as it was determined that the same company had under the Act of 1874 and 1878, with similar provisions, of preventing a person who has been injured through the negligence of the company, or that person's representatives, from recovering the damages to which they would otherwise be entitled. In other words, I want to make it clear that whilst the railway company professes to be conferring a benefit upon their employees by establishing a fund called a retiring pension fund, they shall not in the future, as they have in the past, take advantage of legislation of this class for the purpose of enabling them to make rules, regulations and provisions by which they shall bar their employees from the just compensation to which they would be entitled but for the passage of this Act. Therefore I move that section 7 of the Bill be amended by adding thereto the following:

> Provided, however, that the company shall not be relieved from liability for damages for personal injury to any of its workmen, employees or servants, nor shall any action or

suit therefor by such workman, employee or servant, or, in the event of his death by his wife, heirs at law, or personal representatives against the company, be barred or defeated by any rules, by-laws or regulations made or adopted under authority of this Act, or

2. By reason of any notice, conditions or declaration made or issued by the company as to the terms upon which the said fund or any portion thereof shall become payable, or

3. By reason of any express or implied acknowledgment, acquittance, or release obtained by the company prior to the happening of the wrong or injury complained of or the damage accruing to the purport of effect of releasing or relieving the company from liability for damages for personal injuries as aforesaid, or by reason of the contribution or payment of the moneys of the company to the said fund or of the benefit or payment to which the workman, employee or servant, or his wife, heirs at law or personal representatives may become entitled out of the fund aforesaid.

I contend it is not right, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company should, under cover of the provisions of this Bill, have the opportunity of barring these men and their families from the right of action to recover damages for negligence, to which they would otherwise be entitled. In other words, the Grand Trunk should not be allowed to contract itself out of its liability. I declare by this amendment, that the Grand Trunk, before it takes employees into its service, or when it takes them into its service, shall not have the right to compel them to subscribe to the rules they may make, and one of which may be that in case of accident the employee shall not recover anything beyond the provision made for him in these rules. I ask that there shall be no condition, declaration, or statement by which the company shall escape liability. If, after the accident happens, the employee frees the company from liability, well and good, but I hold that before the accident happens the company should not be allowed to free itself from liability. I provide, therefore, that no arrangement or release signed prior to the happening of the accident, shall have the effect of releasing the company from liability. The Act which this parliament passed in 1904, recognizes that this is a proper provision to make. It cannot be argued that the clause now moved to insert in the Bill is not necessary. It is necessary, because the provisions that were made in 1904 were with reference to the insurance and provident association, and it is therefore in the public interest that this safeguard which I propose, should surround the employees of this company. It is said in section 8 of the Bill:

Nothing in the preceding sections shall be construed as in any way limiting any powers conferred upon the company, but the powers by this Act conferred shall be held in addition thereto.

Mr. LENNOX.

That is an important point, not to be overlooked, in considering the extent to which the company wants to go. As regards the fund which they had authority to create under the Acts of 1874 and 1878, they had power to make rules and regulations, until 1904. The wording of this Bill would not be a just provision, because the powers heretofore conferred were the powers of 1874 and 1878, which were limited by the Act of 1904. Therefore that clause should be amended as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) proposes, by substituting instead of the words 'heretofore conferred' the words 'now vested in the company'; thus limiting the additional powers to those that are now vested in the company and not to those which were heretofore conferred. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Roche (Marquette) that section 7 be amended as I have read.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact, that on the third reading of the Bill, no amendments except such as are merely verbal, are customary, under our practice. The usual form is to move, that the order for the third reading be discharged and that the House go into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the Bill as proposed.

Mr. LENNOX. Then I beg to put my motion in that form.

Mr. GERVAIS. I rise to a point of order; no notice of this motion has been given.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lennox).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lennox,
Avery,	McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Barker,	Paquet,
Barr,	Roche (Marquette),
Bennett,	Schaffner,
Borden (Carleton),	Sproule,
Chisholm (Huron),	White,
Christie,	Wilmot,
Elson,	Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Gunn,	Wright (Muskoka)—22.
Herron,	
Lake,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Black,	Macdonald,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Macpherson,
Brodeur,	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Caldwell,	McCool,
Carvell,	McCraney,
Cash,	McIntyre (Perth),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	McIntyre (Strathcona),
Conmee,	McLennan,
Copp,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Crawford,	Michaud,
Ethier,	Oliver,
	Paterson,

Finlayson,
Gervais,
Hall,
Harty,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
LeBlanc,
Loggie,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Schell (Oxford),
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Talbot,
Templeman,
Turgeon,
Watson.—48.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Harty,	Reid,
McColl,	Ward,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Wilson (Russell),	Broder,
Fielding,	Monk,
Sinclair,	Ames,
Boyer,	Armstrong,
Belcourt,	Bergeron,
Bureau,	Blain,
Campbell,	Boyce,
Devlin (Nicolet),	Brabazon,
Derbyshire,	Bristol,
Devlin (Wright),	Clare,
Finlay,	Clements,
Grant,	Cockshutt,
Carney,	Crocket,
Clarke,	Daniel,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Aylesworth,	Foster,
Law,	Ganong,
Fisher,	Haggart,
Galliher,	Henderson,
German,	Jackson (Elgin),
Gordon,	Kemp,
Guthrie,	Lancaster,
Beland,	Leonard,
McKenzie,	Macdonell,
Miller,	MacLaren,
Maclean (Lunenburg),	Maclean (York, S.),
Bole,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Pardee,	Marshall,
Sifton,	Northrup,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Osler,
Ratz,	Perley,
Schell (Glengarry),	Porter,
Smith (Oxford),	Seagram,
Stewart,	Smith (Wentworth),
Tolmie,	Staples,
Bickerdike,	Thompson,
Zimmerman,	Lewis,
Turriff,	Lalor,
Dyment.	Morin.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to move an amendment. Section 8 of the Bill is in these words :

Nothing in the preceding sections shall be construed as in any way limiting any powers heretofore conferred upon the company, but the powers by this Act conferred shall be held to be in addition thereto.

I do not profess to have given a great deal of attention to this matter, but the amendment stands in my name, and is moved at the suggestion of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), who has given to the subject a great deal of attention and care, and has been, I may say, looked upon as the champion of the railroad employees, including those of the Grand Trunk. This Bill on the face of it looks a very innocent Bill, but on closer inspection it would seem that the Grand Trunk Company has been gathering up every odd and end of legislation which they thought might be favourable to themselves, and in this innocent looking clause there appears to be a good deal involved. In 1874 and 1878 certain legislation was conferred on the Grand Trunk Railway Company by which they were given very extensive powers. These were to a great extent curtailed by legislation enacted in the year 1904. The result of this clause, as I understand it, would be to place them practically in the original position they were in prior to that legislation of 1904, and for that reason it has been considered in the best interest of the employees that this section should be enacted in the words of the amendment which I desire to move, and which is as follows :

That the order for the third reading of the Bill be discharged and that the House go into Committee of the Whole with instructions to consider the following amendment :

That section 8 of said Bill be amended by striking out therefrom the words 'heretofore conferred upon,' and substituting therefore the words 'now vested in.'

The effect of that will simply be that all the employees of this railway will be practically in the same position that they were in on the passing of the legislation of 1904, and it will remove any doubt as to the standing of the men.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I have just a word to say on this. As I have already said, certain powers were conferred on the Grand Trunk Railway Company by the Acts of 1874 and 1878. In 1904, by 4 Edward VII., chapter 31, we amended that law and curtailed the powers of the company very decidedly, and it has been argued here tonight that we curtailed them to the extent of bringing about the result I sought for by my former amendment. Be that as it may, a number of the powers conferred on the company by the Acts of 1874 and 1878 have been taken away by the Act of 1904. By section 8 of this Bill we propose to add to the powers which the company originally got or which have been at any time conferred on it, the powers which are conferred by this Act, thus taking in the widest range. That is not what this parliament or the Railway Committee expected to do. What they expected to do was to add to the powers that the company now possess by the additional powers contained in this

Act. Therefore, I submit that we should adopt the amendment introduced by the hon. member for East Simcoe.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is my hon. friend's point? Is it that these words might operate as a re-enactment of provisions which have been repealed?

Mr. LENNOX. It is provided here that you shall add to the largest powers already conferred on the company all the powers that are contained in this Bill, and the two will make the sum of the company's powers. What you should provide is that the company shall have all the powers given in this Bill in addition to those they possess to-day. And this is how it should read: Nothing in the preceding section shall be construed as in any way limiting the powers now vested in the company, but the powers conferred by this Act shall be in addition thereto.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should not suppose there will be any objection to that change.

Mr. GERVAIS. If the proposed amendment of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is adopted, section 8 of the Bill might have the effect of repealing the powers granted in years gone by to the Grand Trunk Railway or promoting litigation about the question of rights conferred upon or vested in the company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I cannot understand the argument of my hon. friend. I cannot see the slightest foundation for one word he has said in that regard. The words proposed to be substituted are 'now vested in.'

Mr. GERVAIS. All the rights 'conferred upon' the Grand Trunk Railway in years gone by are surely vested in that company and when they are now asking for new powers they do not wish that such vested rights be taken away from them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend either does not understand me or I do not understand him, or our minds are so constituted that they will not work along the same lines. He has inserted in this clause very remarkable language:

> Nothing in the preceding sections shall be construed as in any way limiting any of the powers heretofore conferred upon the company.

Now powers have been conferred upon this company and taken away. That is the point made by my hon. friend from Simcoe. They have been conferred upon the company by parliament and have afterwards been taken away or limited or qualified. This clause, which is designed to prevent any repeal of powers now vested in the company, should be limited to the powers which the company now actually possesses. That ought to be perfectly obvious to any one who will give the matter a moment's consideration. The ordinary words for accomplishing that purpose would be these:

> Nothing in the preceding section shall be construed as in any way limiting any powers now vested in the company.

That would be the ordinary way of drafting such a provision. I do not think that that admits of argument. But the hon. gentleman does not do that. Face to face with the position that there have been powers granted which have afterwards been taken away, modified or qualified, he uses language which may be used as an argument that that repeal, qualification or modification is intended to be taken away by this statute, and the law is intended to be restored as it was before the enactment of the repealing or modifying or qualifying sections. If this is a bona fide attempt to accomplish only what the hon. gentleman says, there is absolutely no need for those words; but if he desires something more than he has admitted, then there is a good reason on his part to insist that these words shall remain as they are. It seems to me that they should be changed; and in the absence of some better explanation, the House should adhere to language ordinarily used in a case of this kind for the purpose indicated by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for private Bills having expired, the House will again resume in committee on Bill (No. 21.)

DOMINION LANDS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 21) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. OLIVER. I would ask Mr. Deputy Speaker to read paragraph (a) of section 7 as proposed to be amended.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The proposed amendment is as follows:

> If entry be obtained for land which, though not reserved at the time, is ascertained to be valuable on account of merchantable timber upon it, the minister may, within six months of the date of such entry, cancel the same on payment of full compensation for the loss occasioned thereby; and in case of dispute, the amount of compensation shall be determined by arbitration hereinafter provided.

The same words are added at the end of subsection (b).

Mr. OLIVER. In connection with that, I thought it would be right to add a proviso that the timber upon the land should not be considered as any part of its value.

Mr. LENNOX. I would be disposed very seriously to object to that. A man goes in

and makes an entry in good faith for a homestead. He goes to considerable trouble in doing that and probably moves on to the lot before there is anything done. The government is allowing the right of pre-emption under this Bill and is allowing parties to have their land under pre-emption rights at $3 an acre as a minimum price. If the government dispossesses a man who has gone in bona fide and entered for a homestead, he is entitled to fair compensation according to the value of his land—not an extortionate but a reasonable value. And if there should be timber on it, I do not see why he should not be compensated for his timber. What I understand the government to want is the right to reserve a particular timber lot for the general use of the public, but if that lot is expropriated by the government for the general benefit, the holder should be paid whatever it is worth, and I do not know that it would be fair to deduct the value of the timber from the amount to be paid.

Mr. OLIVER. If it is recognized that it is proper for the government to take the homestead from the settler for the sake of the timber, then the value of the timber should not enter into the compensation. We are not holding out to settlers the advantages of the timber upon lands; we are only holding out the advantages of the land. When they take land that is valuable because of its timber they are going outside the principle or intention of the homestead Act and when we interfere to cancel the right that is acquired, in the interests of surrounding settlers, it is in my mind that it would be unfair that this man who should not have taken the section at all, should be given the benefit of the value of the timber which the public demands he should not receive.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me an extraordinary doctrine that when the land is up in the market for sale, because there is a certain amount of timber on it, he must not take it and if he does take it his homestead is lible to be cancelled at any time; and not only that but if a man in prospecting in the country finds certain lands with timber on them and on account of that timber which he thinks would be just sufficient for his own use, selects that quarter section, it would not be encouraging settlement if he should be made to feel that at any time the land might be taken away from him and that he would get no compensation for the timber. The settlers should be better protected than that and it would be dangerous to place them in that position. The logical result of such a policy would be that a man taking such a homestead would destroy the timber or sell it at once so as to make money out of it as soon as possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is only within six months that this can be done I understand ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would be inclined to concur in the view the minister has advanced, although this is difficult to work out from the standpoint of absolute justice. A man enters for 160 acres of land and you are going to pay him for that without taking into consideration the value of the timber; but are you going to pay him for it on the basis that the timbered portion is good agricultural land ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that would be only fair.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, I would think that would be fair. I originally suggested that you should simply pay him for the improvements, I think the amendment would result in paying the full value of the land, plus the improvements.

Mr. OLIVER. It would involve the payment of damages whatever the arbitration agreed on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is just the question of damages that I have been a little troubled about. If a man could not get another homestead then as he has acquired a right to 160 acres of land and has put some work on it, it would be perfectly right, looking at that aspect alone, to give him the value of the 160 acres of land at the time he entered for it, plus the improvements, the added value which he has given to it by his work and his labour. But then he will be at liberty to enter for another homestead will he not ?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The result of that will be—I am not criticising it for a moment, I am just looking at the way it may possibly work out—that you will have paid him the full value of the homestead he has acquired in the first instance and all the improvements he has effected on it, and then you will give him another homestead which may be quite as good as the first. Perhaps that is something you cannot guard against but that is the way the section as proposed will work out, and it is entirely a question of what is right and fair to the settler under the circumstances. Perhaps if you could assure him another homestead of equal value his rights would be fully satisfied if you paid him for all the improvements, the work and labour he put upon the first. So far as that is concerned, deal with him upon a pretty generous basis; but would that not meet all the requirements of the situation ? Of course the possibility remains that he would not be able to get another homestead if the prognostications of

the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) are likely to be realized.

Mr. OLIVER. I hardly understood that the valuation would be made exactly as my hon. friend has suggested, that is to say that he would be given the full price of his homestead, to which he would be entitled only after he got the patent. I do not think that in any valuation a man who had been less than six months on a homestead would be given the same value as if he had acquired a proprietary right by the completion of the three years' residence. However, I think, now that the point has been raised, there is a considerable difference between the two conditions, between the provision we desire to make in regard to the man who has taken timber which it afterwards desired to reserve for the use of settlers, and the provision in the next section for taking a portion of land required for water-power. In the case of taking land for the water-power no doubt the land taken should be paid for, but in the case of taking the land with timber on it, of value to the neighbourhood, I think the view taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is probably the correct one, that if the person who should not have taken that land, according to the spirit of the land Act, when it happens to be found afterwards that it is in the public interest that it should be held for the public benefit, is settled with for his improvements by a fair board of arbitration, probably fair justice is done in the matter. As matters stand I think we may carry this idea of compensation too far and go beyond the point that would really be justice to all parties concerned. So perhaps it would be well, if the mover of the amendment would agree to it, in regard to subsection (a), that provision be made to pay the homesteader for his rights subject to arbitration as suggested.

Mr. LAKE. I think the minister has hardly got beyond the idea of a man going in and deliberately taking up land which he ought not to take according to the spirit of the homestead laws. He, I think, is forgetting that there may be many cases in which a man would take up land in perfectly good faith. The conditions vary in different parts of the country and he may in perfectly good faith take up a quarter-section which in another part of the country he would be allowed to take up, according to the minister's own statement. Then he puts on his six months residence, he loses not only six months of his time and the improvements he has made, but he loses the opportunity of taking up another quarter-section elsewhere, and perhaps a better one. Therefore I think there should be some compensation for that as well. To restrict the compensation simply to the amount of the improvements he may have put upon his land, would not be fair. The amount of the compensation might be left to the arbitrators who, I think, would take all the circumstances into consideration and give a fair decision.

Mr. OLIVER. Would my hon. friend agree to a proviso that the value of the timber should not be taken into consideration in the valuation?

Mr. LAKE. I am inclined to agree to that, with the consent of the mover.

Mr. LENNOX. I will agree to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN I would suggest that the idea of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) is perhaps after all the better one. You can eliminate the value of the timber, and then, apart from that, I would leave pretty generally the affairs to the arbitrators.

Mr. TALBOT. I would take this occasion of appealing to the minister on behalf of a certain class of settlers who start from the province of Quebec and go to the Northwest Territories to take up land. Now, if there is one thing farmers from the east like better than anything else it is land with timber on it. I understand from people who are acquainted with that district that there are two classes of timber lands, there is land with timber for lumber purposes and land with timber for fuel purposes. I am afraid that if this section is adopted in its present form, you will prevent from going into that country a class of settlers who wish to take up land with a certain amount of timber upon it, whether for fuel or lumber purposes. The minister proposes to leave it to a particular officer or a land agent to declare what is timber land, and that might affect some people settled upon land having a certain amount of timber which they desire for fuel. Many people prefer to live in an uneven country where timber generally grows to living on a prairie. The interpretation of what is timber lands seems to be pretty wide, and it might be so construed as to prove a detriment to the settlement of the country by a certain class of people who prefer land of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER. This provision is not new. It has been a part of the land law ever since we have had a land law. We are merely trying to make it more easily understood and more easily operated. This provision does not debar settlers from timber lands. It will rather debar settlement upon lands where the country is not generally timbered, but where the timber has an especial value. Where land is all timbered, or where it is generally timbered, then the timber has no special value, and there is no reason why a man should be hindered from going on that timbered land because everybody has enough timber in a timbered area. The re-

striction only applies where it happens to be timber fit for sawing. In such a case there is no doubt that the interest of all the surrounding settlers is that one man should not have an absolute control of the sawing timber. It is in the best interest of all the surrounding settlers that each should have an opportunity to get a timber permit and apply that on the timber growing on that quarter-section, rather than that one man should control the supply of sawing timber for a whole settlement. There is nothing new in the principle.

Mr. TALBOT. I do not wish to raise an objection merely for the sake of raising an objection. But I am informed that in a certain portion of the country if a man makes an entry for a certain portion of land, and there are farmers settled all around him on homesteads without any timber, they consider that the timber within a certain distance of their farms is their own and they can at any time raise an objection and say that they have no fuel on their farms. They can say: This fuel belongs to us, and under certain regulations they may raise an objection and an official of the department may declare that to be timber land. I am informed by people living in that part of the country that timber land is divided into two classes, timber for lumber and timber for fuel. If a man desires to settle in any section sparsely covered with timber, why should he be debarred from settling there because that land might be declared to be timbered land?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the provision we are inserting now that damages will have to be paid if the land is cancelled, is a sufficient protection. There is no danger of any unwarranted cancellation. Under the circumstances provided in the Bill, and especially as it is proposed to be amended, there is no doubt that cancellation can only take place upon the desire of the surrounding settlers, and when it has been demonstrated that it is their interest. Everybody must agree that in such a case the interest of the majority should rule.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister interpret the word 'merchantable' to mean timber that can be cut into boards?

Mr. OLIVER. It depends on circumstances. In a prairie country, timber that is suitable for cordwood is merchantable timber, but in a wooded country of course such timber is not merchantable. In a wooded country only that timber is merchantable which can be cut into lumber. The term 'merchantable timber' depends upon the particular locality you are in.

Mr. BENNETT. Will each land agent or homestead inspector be the judge of what is merchantable timber?

Mr. OLIVER. The department, speaking generally, will have to be the judge according to the conditions of the different parts of the country. There is no way in which we can make a positive definition or description.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As it is proposed to be amended subsection (a) will now read:

If entry be obtained for land which, though not reserved at the time, is ascertained to be valuable on account of merchantable timber upon it, the minister may, within six months of the date of such entry, cancel the same on payment of full compensation for the loss occasioned thereby, and in case of dispute, the amount of compensation shall be determined by arbitration hereinafter provided, but the value of the merchantable timber shall not be taken into consideration.

Mr. LAKE. Before that is carried I would like to ask the minister if he will explain exactly what the position of a man would be who, being in possession of a homestead and boring for water in the ordinary way, strikes natural gas. I understand he will have no right to the natural gas.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, he would own the surface right and owning the surface right he would have immediate control of the gas. At the moment I do not think we have any regulations dealing with gas, and until such regulations are made the surface owner would absolutely control it. No doubt it will be necessary to make regulations for dealing with the question of gas supply, and as in the case of petroleum the surface owner should not have absolute rights or absolute ownership, but he should have prior rights in regard to the petroleum or gas that may be found within the limits of his holding.

Mr. LAKE. Is there any land coming in under this category in the immediate neighbourhood of Medicine Hat where we know there is a supply of natural gas and where it is a very valuable commodity and greatly used?

Mr. OLIVER. Undoubtedly there is considerable land in the vicinity of Medicine Hat that may be shown to be gas land and that would come under the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. LAKE. And the land has already passed into possession of homesteaders?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. There are a number of homesteads which are at present occupied or have been patented under which gas may very well be found and there is still a great deal of land which has not been alienated.

Mr. LAKE. This is going to take away, I suppose, the right which they might be assumed to have possessed up to the present moment?

Mr. OLIVER. No, this Bill does not in any way presume to detract from any right held under the law as it stands. We declare what the law is to be for the future but the man who has acquired the right to land under which natural gas may be found and who possesses that right now, unless there is a reservation of that gas in the patent, owns the gas.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that some attempt should be made to define some of these expressions having no especial legal meaning, and which will lead to confusion in the future because one homstead inspector or one officer of the department may construe them in one way and another officer may construe them in another way. The minister may answer that there will be regulations. Well, if there can be regulations there should be a definition. The regulations will not improve the matter in that regard unless there is something done in the way of definition and if there is to be definition I think it should be done in the Act and not in the regulations. We have have such expressions as 'agricultural land.' 'merchantable timber,' 'water-power' and 'water supply.' They have no defined legal meaning. I admit the difficulty of defining some of them. If you asked me at this moment to sit down and write a proper definition of them I do not profess to be able to do it, but I am quite sure that a certain amount of consideration would work out a definition which might serve as a guide or a principle at least. With respect to what I have just mentioned, perhaps the minister will not object to our returning to section 7 for the discussion of that point.

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, no.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a very comprehensive expression used in subsection (c). I will omit the unnecessary words for my present purpose.

No entry for a homestead shall convey any exclusive right or privilege with respect to any body of water within the land covered by the entry.

You declare that the man has no exclusive right in any water upon his land. It may be desirable or necessary, but I thought it worth the attention of the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. That matter was discussed here last night.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not know that.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The value of water, as is well known, is very great in that country and under the Irrigation Act the right of the water is declared to be absolutely in the crown. This is merely following the principle enunciated in the Irrigation Act. It is not intended to take away from any proprietor the water that may be on his land in ponds or in small quantities, but it provided in the former Act and in the administrations, as it has prevailed, that where there is a body of water which can be considered to be a lake: in the first place, he is not required to accept that as part of his homestead, or, if he purchases, he is not required to purchase it. It is excluded by special survey from the homestead or the purchased land and the right is retained in the Crown. In administration no attention is paid to less than twenty acres but larger areas, if attention is called to them, are surveyed and set apart. It is the intention that the right to the water shall remain in the Crown.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course no usage of administration would in any way control the direct provision of this statute ?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, no.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So that any body of water however small within the land covered by the entry would really not belong to the individual who might happen to have entered for that land. It may be desirable that that should be the law but it seems unusual to any one accustomed to the eastern country, where a small pond in a man's pasture is a very valuable asset and which would not be nearly so valuable if it were not his own. Do you mean that if there is a small pond of that kind his neighbours would have the right to it or that the Crown would be enabled to give to his neighbours the right to use it and to go upon his land for that purpose.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no provision that gives his neighbours the right to cross his property if the pond does not happen to touch the boundary, but if it does touch the boundary, then his neighbours have an equal right to a share of that water for their own purposes. The provincial government could, by the expropriation of a roadway, provide access for his neighbours to the water upon his land. It is considered to be sound policy where water is scarce that this should be so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do the provincial governments have power of expropriation of that kind and for that purpose ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, they have full powers of expropriation for roadways.

Mr. LENNOX. You provide in this section, among other things, that the entry does not give any exclusive right to a 'stream' which passes through the land covered by the entry. In old Canada, the man who had a patent for his land was not entitled to exclusive right in a navigable river, but he had an exclusive right to what we understand by the word 'stream.' The provision in this clause may be necessary in the west, but it is likely to cause diffi-

culty to the owner if he has no exclusive right in a stream, even as against his neighbours who may trespass on his land.

Mr. LAKE. This provision is advisable owing to the conditions which prevail in the west. Those who have been through a succession of dry seasons there, know that it is very important that the people should have access to even a small lake. I have in mind an instance where a homesteader had on his quarter-section a deep lake, small in area but containing a wonderful supply of water. It was the only water within a considerable distance and the neighbours used it to water their stock, but he fenced it off. The local government very properly expropriated the right of way to the water, under the provisions of the Irrigation Act, paying the homesteader fair compensation. The right of way to any of these waters must be purchased by the provincial authorities, and I think we can leave it to them to act in the interest of the people.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have a note here which says :

It would appear that hay lands are open for homesteads. Is this intended ? All the available natural hay meadows which in some places are most valuable may be obtained by a very few, and the balance go without.

If that statement is correct, some of the considerations which have been advanced in regard to the water, might be equally applicable to these hay meadows.

Mr. OLIVER. In considering the matter we thought it was as well not to make any provision of that kind in regard to hay lands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The matter has been under consideration?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes? If we wish to prevent individual occupation of certain hay lands we would do so by withdrawing the lands, but if an entry is given we think it should stand.

On section 8, subsection 2—application by woman as head of family.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What would be the nature of the doubt as to who is the head of the family?

Mr. OLIVER. A husband and wife may have separated and the wife may be raising the family; there was a question as to whether she could be considered the sole head of the family. It was thought well that the minister should have power to decide whether such a person should be entitled to a homestead.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This provision appears to be designed to encourage separation. The husband may separate from the wife and get a homestead, and the wife who retains the family may be regarded as the head thereof, and she can also enter for another homestead.

Mr. OLIVER. If we provided that the husband and wife who are separated should each be entitled to a homestead, that would be so, but, it is left to the minister to decide each case on its merits.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then we will have no further difficulty about divorce courts, because the Minister of the Interior will act in that capacity in future.

Mr. LAKE. This rule has been interpreted rather too narrowly in the past. A case came under my notice a short time ago of a woman whose husband had died and whose children were grown up. She wanted to get the homestead entry for her husband's pre-emption, but that was denied on the ground that she was not the sole head of a family, because she had grown-up children.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is a little in error. It was not because she was not the sole head of a family, but because she had no dependent children.

Mr. LAKE. I think a widow should be considered the sole head of a family. I think this rule should be interpreted more broadly than it has been in the past. In the United States, I understand, homesteads are granted to spinsters, and I think we might go half way in that direction by providing that a woman who has had a household of her own and has become a widow shall still be enabled to take up land.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the minister have jurisdiction to decide whether or not the woman is the sole head of a family when the husband and wife are living together?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is settled beyond question; it is not left to his jurisdiction.

On section 8, subsection 3—reservation for entry—

Mr. TALBOT. It is provided here that between the time the minister makes the reservation and the time the application is made ten acres of the land reserved must be cultivated. I would like to know how that cultivation can be made.

Mr. OLIVER. Because a year intervenes. The land is reserved as a homestead for the young man, and we give him the privilege on condition that he or his friends for him shall cultivate ten acres as an evidence of good faith that he intends to enter for such homestead.

Mr. LAKE. There is a matter that seems to be overlooked. A man may not be residing on his homestead, but on land adjoin-

ing it which he has purchased. It seems to me that in such a case his son should be entitled to this reservation of land. I think it is a mistake to confine it to those who reside on the homesteads of their relatives.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I quite agree with the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. That is a point I spoke of yesterday.

Mr. OLIVER. I remember my hon. friend's suggestion of last night, and I would suggest that after the word 'homestead' in the third line of subsection 3 there be inserted the words 'or on farm land owned by him of not less than one hundred and sixty acres,' or the area may perhaps be reduced to eighty acres.

Mr. LAKE. Is there any necessity of making it imperative that the land shall be owned by the parent or guardian? Would it not be better simply to add after the word 'homestead' the word 'or other agricultural land?' A farmer may be living on rented land or he may be managing a farm for somebody else, or his sons may be growing up into manhood and may wish to have a homestead reserved for them. I think the provision should be made fairly broad.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot just agree with my hon. friend. The purpose of this special privilege is that the young man shall be enabled to acquire a homestead in the vicinity of that of his parent for the purposes of mutual help. When this special privilege is given, I think it should be given only where the parent and son desire to be near each other for the purposes of mutual help in carrying on legitimate farming operations.

Mr. TALBOT. I may be somewhat obtuse, but I would like to know upon what basis the minister will declare that a quarter-section is reserved under subsection (b.) Nobody knows anything about it but himself. From a report of the census or otherwise he learns that in so many families there are so many children of 17 years of age, and he makes reservation for these children. Between the time the minister makes the reservation and the time the young man has a right to apply, that is a year; how is the young man empowered to cultivate ten acres of that land? That is what I cannot understand.

Mr. TURRIFF. The matter is, I think, clear enough. A farmer has a son only seventeen years old, and there is a quarter-section not taken up in his vicinity. Under this Act, that quarter-section will be reserved on application by the son or the father.

Mr. TALBOT. Not at all. There is no application for a reservation, and a year must elapse between the reservation and the application for a homestead.

Mr. TURRIFF. The quarter-section will be reserved in the land office and no one else can make an entry for that land until the boy becomes eighteen years of age. In the meantime the boy will have to break up ten acres. My hon. friend asks how that can be done. In the past it has been done in hundreds of cases by young men who had no right whatever. This is a very good provision because it enables the son to get a homestead by having it held in reserve for a year, whereas if it were not held in reserve some one else could come in and the son might have to go away ten miles from home to get a quarter-section.

Mr. WILLIAM J. ROCHE. There must be an application for a reservation as well as an application for a homestead entry.

Mr. TURRIFF. Certainly there must be an application from the son or the father.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I am in favour of the provision, but it seems to me that the requirement with regard to breaking up ten acres for cultivation should only be insisted on if the reservation is made say six months from the time when the young man will become eighteen years of age. If he were say seventeen years and ten months old when he made that application for a reservation, he might not be able, within two months time, to perform the cultivation duties and would lose his right.

Mr. TALBOT. Would it not be considered a trespass by the Crown if any one should step in on any land, the property of the Crown, and cultivate a certain portion of it, whether that portion be ten acres or fifteen square feet? The minister has power to reserve that land when the youth is seventeen years of age, but the application can only be made when he is eighteen years of age. In the meantime between the moment the minister reserves that land and the moment the father or the son applies for it, ten acres have to be cultivated. But that land is still the property of the Crown. How therefore can any one cultivate it without committing a trespass?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman finds great difficulty in understanding a very simple matter. There are two applications.

Mr. TALBOT. There is only one provided in this Bill.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. There must be an application for the reservation or the quarter-section will not be reserved. There is a primary application for a reservation and then there is a second application for the homestead entry. When the application is made for a homestead entry, three years are given the applicant to perform his home-

stead duties and at the end of that time he gets his patent. Under this provision, the land will be reserved for four years, but the first year is under one agreement and the other three years are under a subsequent agreement. The first is only a provisional agreement and the second is the ordinary homestead agreement.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister said yesterday that this was a privilege exercised in days gone by and not a right, and that he was converting the privilege into a right. Is he sure that the wording of this clause will entitle the settler to a reservation as a right? The words are 'the minister may reserve.' Should it not be 'shall reserve'?

Mr. OLIVER. The provision is intended to be mandatory, but the word 'may' does leave a discretion which the word 'shall' would not. It is only fair that there should be some measure of discretion allowed in the case of a privilege of this nature. It is a privilege that might be exercised for the purposes of speculation, and I do not think it would be well to leave the minister no possibility of refusing any application that might be made.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If all the necessary requisites are complied with, the applicant should be entitled to the reservation. But if you leave the granting of the reservation subject to the discretion of the minister, that discretion might be exercised in such a way that one applicant would get a reservation and another, equally entitled to it, would not. So long as the boy complies with all the conditions, why should he not be granted his reservation?

Mr. OLIVER. There might be reasons why the reservation should not be made. The boy might not be mentally qualified or he might be unfit physically. If the conditions are fulfilled, the provision is mandatory; but the use of the word 'may' gives a discretion which would only be exercised when the conditions were not absolutely complied with. May I suggest an amendment to this subsection 3? In the third line after the word 'lives' strike out the words 'on a homestead'; and after the word 'guardian' in the fourth line, add the words 'on a homestead or on farm land owned by him of not less than eighty acres.' I would also make subsection (b) to read as follows:

There shall be ten acres of such land cultivated within one year of the date of reservation.

I think it would be more workable than it is now and would answer the purpose.

Mr. LAKE. I do not think it would altogether answer the purpose, I would suggest that you put in the limit after the word 'application'. Provided at least four months intervene between such reservation and such application.' Otherwise, if the suggestion of the minister is carried out, if the reservation is made for a boy of 17 years and one month, no work at all would be done on the quarter section until a month after he had entered into possession of it.

Mr. OLIVER. I say that instead of saying that he must do ten acres of cultivation between the date of reservation and the date when he becomes 18 years of age, which might be an interval of only one month, we should say within a year of the date of reservation he should have 10 acres in cultivation. It would not matter if it was a month or eleven months before he became entitled to make entry, when he became entitled to make entry he would do so and the cultivation would be provided for if time permitted. Oh, my friend's point is that he might do the cultivation at the end of the year; suppose we make it read within six months of the date of reservation?

Mr. LAKE. That might be impossible if the reservation took place in October.

Mr. LENNOX. Why not make it read 'until he has attained the age of 18 years.'

Mr. OLIVER. What we want is to have evidence of good faith by reason of cultivation during the time we are holding this land under reservation, so we will have some guarantee that it is not merely a speculative reservation, the boy holding it until some other person comes along who is entitled to make entry.

Mr. LENNOX. Why not make it that after he becomes seventeen you can make reservation for one year, and that he shall within that time cultivate the ten acres and shall at the expiration of a year from the date of reservation make his permanent entry?

Mr. OLIVER. We want his permanent entry as soon as he is 18 years of age.

Mr. McCRANEY. I rather like the suggestion of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). In a country like that a man cannot always get to the registration office on his birthday and if the application is to be made within one year it would be for him to get his application in as soon as possible after attaining his 18th year as he would thus get his homestead so much sooner.

Mr. OLIVER. We will amend subsection (a) and instead of saying that he shall make entry at the age of 18 years, say he shall make entry within one year.

Mr. LAKE. He would make personal application at the age of 18.

Mr. OLIVER. (Reading).

The person for whom such reservation is made shall, within one year, make (personal) application for the homestead.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In case a reservation of this kind has been made and the cultivation has not been done within the time limit, then the boy, on attaining his 18th year, shall not be debarred from making an entry provided that no other qualified person has made an application in the meantime.

Mr. OLIVER. If no one else has applied, but in order to keep his own priority he must fulfil this requirement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no provision for any application for the reservation ?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no special provision for a form of application but the minister has power to make a reservation and it is provided that he may make a reservation for this purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Knowing nothing of the conditions in the west and the methods of administration in this particular, I would not understand that any one made application to the minister ; I would understand that the minister would find out about the people answering this description and make the reservations accordingly but if an application is required it would seem to me there should be some reference to it in the Act.

Mr. LENNOX. There might be a provision in the section :

The minister may, upon application therefor, reserve an area of agricultural lands, &c.

Mr. OLIVER. We will make that amendment.

Mr. TURRIFF. It seems to me we are going to make this clause cumbersome. During my experience in the department I never knew of a case where a young man applied to have a quarter-section reserved for him that his relatives did not carry out these conditions ; it is always where land is scarce and there is great anxiety to get land in the vicinity of the father's home.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have noticed that there is certainly a great deal of machinery to cover the period between 17 and 18 years.

Mr. TURRIFF. All you need to do is to provide for the reservation and the boy or his father or friends will see that this condition is fulfilled. It is only one year and if he does not come forward within ten days after he becomes of age the land would be available for the next applicant. So there will be nothing lost, and it would simplify matters if the land was reserved for him, as it has been in the past, without legislation, only by regulation.

Mr. LENNOX. It is provided in section 8 that every male who has attained the age of 18 years, being a British subject, or who declares his intention to become a British subject, and who makes application in the manner provided, shall be entitled to obtain an entry for homestead. But when we come to deal with a person 17 years of age, there is no provision as to his being a British subject, or declaring his intention to become so.

Mr. TURRIFF. At the end of the year when he comes to make application for his homestead entry, then he has to declare that he intends to become a British subject. In the meantime it is held for a year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the minister has certainly shown a very generous spirit in one of these amendments, because section 4, as it stands at present, reads as follows :

The minister may, upon application, reserve for one year any area of agricultural land not exceeding one quarter-section for any male of the full age of seventeen years, who lives with his father, mother, brother, sister, or guardian upon a homestead, or on farm land owned by him of not less than eighty acres.

That enables any young man in the eastern provinces 17 years of age to get a homestead out there. I think the people of the east should feel very much indebted to the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. The father, mother, brother, sister or guardian must be the owner either of a homestead of 80 acres of farm land.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose the father, mother, brother or guardian owns a farm in any of the surrounding counties here, he comes within the terms of this section.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you mean it to apply all over Canada ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but there is a provision which does not require the residence of the young man upon the quarter-section. Therefore it makes no difference so far as that is concerned, whether he is near or remote. But when the young man gets his entry he is expected to reside upon it, the resident requirements of the Homestead Act come in, and he must reside on that unless he takes advantage of a provision later on where he may fulfil his homestead duties by residing within nine miles.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. But the minister does not mean this section to apply to people residing all over Canada ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not. But we are following the Act as it has existed, and the present definition. We can amend the definition if necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Any person living in eastern Canada or British Columbia would apparently, under the literal reading of this section, have a right to make such an application and entry as is referred to here. I thought from the form of the section as

it was at first, the minister was providing for cases of persons living upon homestead land in the west, or in the vicinity of homestead land.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the intention, of course.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The language is much more comprehensive than that.

Mr. OLIVER. I admit that.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is one point that is not made clear. A farmer may have taken up a homestead several miles away and may be living on a rented farm, and there may be a vacant quarter-section on the same section where he has taken his homestead. For the first year or two he may not be living on his own homestead; so I think this should be made a little wider, and would suggest amending the section to read as follows:

The minister may reserve for one year any area of agricultural land not exceeding one quarter-section for any male of the full age of seventeen years who lives on farm land of not less than eighty acres, with his father, mother, brother, sister or guardian.

That would enable the son of a man who was living on a rented farm to take advantage of this reservation. A man may be living on a rented farm, and have taken a homestead six or seven miles away, and there may be another vacant quarter-section that he wants to get for his son. But if, in the meantime, this farmer is living on a rented farm a few miles from his own homestead, the son would not be eligible under this section to have that quarter-section reserved. I would use the expression 'agricultural land,' making the term more general.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it agreed that we shall require ownership or not?—because if we require ownership, then we can define the vicinity or the distance within which this privilege may be allowed. If we do not require ownership, there is not much use in making a definition of 'vicinity.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My idea of the principle would be that you should require that a man should own a certain amount of land, and that he should be carrying on farming operations.

Mr. OLIVER. We agree that this privilege shall be extended to a young man who has lived with one of his relatives upon land which he occupies as a farm of an area of not less than 80 acres and that the privilege may only be exercised within the vicinity of such a farm.

Mr. LENNOX. Stating a limit for the vicinity?

Mr. OLIVER. Shall we limit the word 'vicinity?'

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, leave that open.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that when we do not require an ownership we cannot very well limit 'vicinity.' I think we had better use the word 'vicinity' and let it go at that. Would that be agreeable?

Mr. LAKE. I am still rather inclined to think that the suggestion as made by the leader of the opposition would be better that the parent or guardian should be the owner of not less than 80 acres of agricultural land and that he should be residing on the land which he has been farming. Then strike out the word 'vicinity.'

Mr. OLIVER. That again brings up the objection raised by the hon. leader of the opposition that a person in Ontario might have the privilege.

Mr. LAKE. I take it for granted that would be provided for.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the word 'vicinity' should be used. If the subsection is allowed to stand I will have drafted a provision embodying the idea as we have agreed to it.

Mr. LAKE. Would it not be advisable to more closely define the terms that the minister has used as to who is to be considered a woman being the sole head of the family. Would it not be better to define that as a woman having junior children depending upon her?

Mr. OLIVER. I am willing to accept the assistance of my hon. friend in making the definition, but it is a matter I have had to consider with some frequency and there have been no two cases alike.

Mr. LAKE. Could the minister give an example of a number of cases which come under this category?

Mr. TURRIFF. There must be a considerable discretion. A case will come up where a woman who has a child dependent upon her, but who is not a married woman, makes application for a homestead. You cannot very well define that. That is a case that has to be dealt with when it comes up. There are a good many cases involving different conditions that come up and we have to decide on the merits of each case. Take the case of a grandmother of three or four children under 21 years of age, perhaps under ten years of age, dependent upon her. Her son and his wife, both the parents of these children, have died and this old lady has the full care of these children and has to support them. She has no children of her own under twenty-one years of age and, strictly speaking, under the definition, she is not entitled to a homestead. I remember numbers of cases of that kind that came before me when I was a commissioner and

I just had to use ordinary common sense and discretion and I do not hesitate to say that in every case of that kind where a grandmother came forward and proved to the department that these children were orphans, that their father and mother were both dead and that they were absolutely dependent upon her for support, she was considered the sole head of the family within the meaning of the Act and allowed to take a homestead, although, strictly speaking she was not the sole head of a family because she had no children under twenty-one years of age dependent upon her.

Mr. LAKE. Or even an adopted child dependent upon her, I suppose ?

Mr. TURRIFF. There is the case also where people have adopted children, and that is one of the cases where a great deal of care has to be exercised, because we had cases coming before us where parties had attempted to prove adoption in order to get the right to make a homestead entry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what ground was it held that a woman who had grandchildren living with her was not the sole head of a family?

Mr. TURRIFF. The general interpretation that was put upon that clause was that a widow who had children under 21 years of age was entitled to a homestead entry. If her children were over 21 years of age, if her sons and daughters were all doing for themselves, she was not considered the sole head of a family.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They were not living with her?

Mr. TURRIFF. They were not living with her, but where there were grandchildren, the parents both dead, and they were depending upon her, she was granted a homestead entry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought you said she was not considered the sole head of the family?

Mr. TURRIFF. Not under the strict interpretation of the Act, but she was always given a homestead entry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well——

Mr. TURRIFF. There is just a case where some latitude must be given to the minister who is administering the Act, and although the Act did not provide that a woman who had grandchildren dependent on her was entitled to an entry, if she proved she had grandchildren depending on her she was given a homestead entry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think you should have done that if you did not consider here the sole head of a family, because the statute provides, in my opinion, that a woman living with her grandchildren under those circumstances shall be regarded as the sole head of a family and, therefore, while you thought you were violating the statute you really were complying with it.

Mr. McCRANEY. Within the past two or three months I have brought a case to the attention of the minister which will illustrate that point very well. A father near Battleford had become insane without having exercised his homestead right and the mother wished to obtain entry and under these circumstances the minister was willing to allow her to obtain it.

Mr. LAKE. I am very glad to hear from the hon. member from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) what was the practice of the department when he was in it, and I assume from the minister's silence that it continues to be the practice that the right is conceded to a woman who has children dependent on her in one way or the other.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see any reason why a woman under these circumstances should not be regarded as the sole head of a family. The term 'family' is comprehensive enough surely to include circumstances of that kind, and a woman is to all intents and purposes the head of a family when she has children dependent upon here and is bringing them up.

Section 8 allowed to stand.

On section 9—rights of persons settling on lands before survey.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have a statement before me, that this period of six months should be reduced to three months. I have no opinion on it, but I would like to know why the minister fixes the period at six months ?

Mr. OLIVER. Where a man has settled in advance of the survey, he is generally far from a land office and as he is considered to have a vested right it is thought proper to afford ample time to exchange notices in order that he may protect himself.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This clause only refers to settlers who have located and made improvements prior to the land being surveyed.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In cases where lands have been surveyed and have not been thrown open to settlement, is there any provision in regard to squatters?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the policy of the minister in regard to squatters on such lands? Why does he discriminate between lands that have been surveyed but

not thrown open, and lands that have not yet been surveyed ?

Mr. OLIVER. The man who is on the land before the survey has a recognized legal right, but the man who goes on surveyed land, whether it is thrown open or not, must necessarily be dealt with at the discretion of the minister.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I object to this system of giving the minister discretion in such cases. I can see where the door is going to be thrown open wide for abuses. If, on these already surveyed lands it is left to the discretion of officers to say whether the squatter shall be allowed to remain; it is sure that some will be allowed to remain and some will be ejected.

Mr. TURRIFF. The squatter has never had any right on surveyed land, because it is open to him to make a homestead entry. In the case of land, for instance, reserved for timber limits, the government puts up a notice that the land is not available and all law abiding men will be governed accordingly. But one man out of ten will set the law at defiance and squat on the land. If you provide by law that he shall have priority, you will open the way for all kinds of people to squat on every bit of reserved land. My experience is that the bona fide squatter on surveyed land, who remains on it, always gets his entry in the end. It is only the man who squats on the unsurveyed land and is on the land at the time of the survey to whom this clause applies. This section will not apply, nor did the old section apply, to the man who squatted on unsurveyed land and broke five acres and then disappeared. During the last year or two a great many have gone ahead of the survey, knowing that a township was about to be surveyed, and they put up a shanty, but the land not being surveyed as soon as they expected a great many of them did not remain. These would not come under this clause. It is only the bona fide squatter who is on the land when the survey is made who gets the benefit of this provision.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. member knows, that although notices have been posted saying that the rights of squatters will not be recognized on the reserves scores of settlers have located on those reserves. The outside townships of the Riding Mountain are filled with the Galician settlers, notwitstanding that they are timber reserves, and in consequence the minister excluded those townships from the reservations in the Forestry Bill last session, and the squatters were allowed to remain.

Mr. TURRIFF. A bona fide squatter always gets an entry in the end.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There are a number of those squatters who have been located in the heart of that reservation for some years, and they are anxious to know whether they are going to be allowed to remain or not.

Mr. LENNOX. If this is the practice, is it not better to define it by statutory right ?

Mr. TURRIFF. If you allow that you might as well not make any reservations.

Mr. LENNOX. It ought to be allowed by statute or else it ought not to be sanctioned by practice. There is no use having a statutory law, if the department recognizes the universal ignoring of it.

Mr. LAKE. A correspondent in the west informs me that he has presented a case to the department in which he alleges this privilege has been abused. He tells of one man who has put in a claim as a squatter, and who never was on the quarter-section for more than a day before the survey was made. If a man squats ahead of survey he should in some way notify the authorities, that he is in occupation and is actually residing there. This clause of the Bill is altogether too loosely worded.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What does the minister mean by a 'bona fide settler'? I know of one gentleman who happened to find out where a certain railway station was going to be, and rushing forward he cut down a little tree and put four or five little sticks in a pile and claimed he was a settler. That land is worth $50 or $60 an acre to-day. This man had not even a tent on the place and yet he managed to get an entry through. I can tell the minister that there are a good many cases like that. I draw the minister's attention to the words providing that the notice shall be given by the local agent 'or to a grown-up person found on the land so settled upon.' That might be some stranger rambling about the place who had nothing to do with it.

Mr. OLIVER. What would the hon. gentleman suggest?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would strike out these words.

Section amended accordingly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it intended that the occupation of the land shall include residence ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not necessarily. The rights of a squatter are superior to those of a homesteader, and the fact of a squatter having improvements would give him a right under this section where a homesteader would not have a right unless he were a resident.

Mr. LAKE. Is it the intention of the minister that a man may go out ahead of the survey, plough up a couple of acres and put up some kind of a shack in order to

prove occupation of the land, and then retire and live on his homestead until the land is surveyed, and then within six months after notice make entry for that land ? Is that sufficient occupation to give him priority of right to that land after it has been surveyed ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not. The first line of the section provides that he must be a person who has bona fide settled and made improvements on the land that is his headquarters.

Mr. LAKE. I cannot help thinking that bona fide settlement should include permanent residence.

Mr. OLIVER. It includes permanent residence in this way, that it would be his main place of residence ; but it does not require him to be on the land all the time, or even half the time. It would be a serious hardship to a squatter to require him to remain on an out-of-the-way place all the time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do you require of the homesteader ?

Mr. OLIVER. He has to put in six months residence in each year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why should you not require the same of the squatter ? You should not make it easier for him.

Mr. OLIVER. I think we should. He has acquired rights by common law, and we do not desire to limit them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If he had acquired rights by common law, I would agree with the minister, but he does not acquire any right by common law against the Crown.

Mr. OLIVER. He does against other people.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He acquires a right so far and only so far as he is in occupation. It is not necessary that a man should be on a piece of land all the time to be regarded as living there. If his usual home is there, and he goes away to engage in some occupation elsewhere, he would still be regarded as living there. But if a man is a bona fide settler on agricultural land, why should he be away from it ? You give a homestead to a farmer on condition that he shall live on it six months in the year and cultivate it. The settler who is to acquire a prior right to a homestead should, it seems to me, have qualifications in that regard at least as great as the homesteader, because his homesteading is really a continuation of his squatting.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Unless the settlement duties are very carefully considered. I can point out to the minister how a great many opportunities will be afforded for sharp practice. In one of these districts where the surveys are not yet completed, but where a railway is expected to strike in, a squatter with an eye to business who wants to get control of land near a town site, will be able under this clause to take up twenty different sections, putting up a shack and doing some little improvement on each one ; and when the time comes when he can see where the station or crossing will be, he can elect to take whichever one of these locations he chooses, unless he is limited by residence to one particular section.

Mr. OLIVER. We do not require people to live in a certain place or under certain conditions all the time. There are always outposts of settlement where there is no land surveyed, but where people make their living as best they can—perhaps as fishermen, hunters or voyageurs. They may be away from the place for a great part of the year, but it is their home. When the survey is made, does my hon. friend wish that they should be deprived of their home because they do not live on it all the time ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the man is a bona fide settler, I would be the last man to move him, but I want him to be a bona fide settler. I do not want town site jumping to be indulged in, as it could be under this section. The minister should determine what bona fide settlement means.

Mr. TURRIFF. In the beginning of the clause it is pointed out that a man is only considered a squatter if he has not been in residence——

Mr. LENNOX. It does not say residence at all.

Mr. TURRIFF. The word occupation is used. He could not be in occupation of ten or a dozen different quarter-sections at the same time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the hon. member never heard of such a thing ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I have never heard of any one being in occupation of a dozen homesteads at the same time. This clause was originally intended to protect the rights of people who had gone out years before settlement, and what we want to guard against is something like what the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has suggested. In the district of Qu'Appelle, a year or two ago, dozens of people went in prior to survey and put up shacks. When the surveyor came along and made the survey, he simply noted that there was a shanty on the place. But that should not give them any prior rights. A man who puts up a shanty and goes away and leaves the quarter-section, is not a bona fide resident.

Mr. LAKE. I agree with the hon. gentleman, and the case I was mentioning is one exactly in point. The man had gone in and put up a shanty and then went away

and was allowed an entry. He was considered to be in occupation. That was a case I had to protest against.

Mr. OLIVER. How does my hon. friend propose to amend this section ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Make the residence in some way more specific.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall be very glad to have a suggestion, but I have not thought it desirable to take a position that would deprive the pioneer of his rights.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would suggest the words 'ordinarily resident.'

Mr. OLIVER. That would be satisfactory, but I think that is covered by the expression 'bona fide.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The other would give a little additional safeguard—'in occupation of and ordinarily resident upon.'

Mr. OLIVER. I shall be glad to put those words in if that will be satisfactory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In occupation of and ordinarily resident upon.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to call the minister's attention to something else. I understood that there might be a survey made and the land not be opened for entry for some years. Is that correct ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a very unusual case. The land is open for entry within say three, four or six months after survey as a rule.

Mr. LENNOX. Last night it was said that it might not be opened for a long time after survey.

Mr. OLIVER. That is an error.

Mr. LENNOX. If only for three or four months, the difficulty I am anticipating might not arise, but it might to some extent. The wording is 'and is in occupation of the land at the time of survey.' But he ought to have been in continuous occupation or residence upon the land up to the time of the entry if he is to be entitled to the benefit of this clause. A man for instance, knowing that a survey was about to take place, might go on the land a week or two previous and make the improvements. He would be in actual residence at the time of the survey. Then he could abandon it until he got a notice, and after he got a notice, he has six months. There ought to be a provision requiring that he shall conform practically with the conditions as regards homesteading—that is that he shall at least reside one half the time continuously on the lot from the day he settles on it down to the time he makes an entry.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not see how you can tie up the squatter by hard and fast rules.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You do tie up the homesteaders.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That may be, but two-thirds of the people who settle on homesteads do not live up to the conditions.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is where the land agent gets a crack at them when an election is on.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Two-thirds of the people who have settled on homesteads, if they were forced to live up to the conditions of the homestead Act, could not stay in the country. The people who are the backbone of the country are in a great majority poor people, and unless great latitude is allowed them and their time extended, they would have to abandon their homesteads and quit the country.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. How do they manage to get patents ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. They are allowed extra time, at any rate so far as residence is concerned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The words in the tenth line 'or to a grown up person found on the land so settled upon' are struck out.

Mr. OLIVER. After the word 'of' at the end of the second line insert the words 'and ordinarily resident on.'

Mr. LENNOX. What about continuous residence ? You open the door for any amount of speculation and dishonesty unless you provide for continuous residence or occupation down to the time of making the entry. Otherwise you can put a man in to make the improvements a few days before the survey takes place, and then after the survey is made he can leave the land.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The ordinary homesteader is not a speculator in any sense of the word.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The point is that this offers opportunity for speculation.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot agree with that. If these words in the first line and the words added at the suggestion of the leader of the opposition have any meaning, there is no need for the amendment suggested by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). The man must be a bona fide settler and this land must be his ordinary residence.

Mr. LAKE. Might I ask whether there is any provision for a formal notice that a township is going to be thrown open to entry after the survey is made, and what notices are to be given the public that a date has been fixed when such and such a township shall be thrown open for entry ?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no provision in the Act for such an announcement; it has

not been considered necessary. The period after the completion of a survey within which a township can be thrown open varies greatly according to circumstances, according to the quality of the survey, the necessity of corrections, inspection and one thing and another, but as soon as it is ready to be opened it is opened, the land agents are notified and entries can be made.

Mr. LAKE. I think there should be some formal notice. Under this clause a squatter, prior to survey, has a certain priority of rights in homesteading, but directly the survey has been completed no one can obtain priority rights except the man who is there upon the homestead. Public notice should be given to enable people to go in and take up homesteads, and this would avoid the possibility of inside information being given to the detriment of the general public.

Mr. TURRIFF. If anything of that kind was done it would delay the opening of townships for homesteading. I have never heard of any difficulty arising.

Mr. LAKE. The law formerly was different; a man could go in after survey and obtain priority of rights.

Mr. TURRIFF. He could not make entry. After a survey is made it has to be inspected, and with the great amount of surveying that is now going on, new townships are being thrown open practically every day and the department cannot tell beforehand just how long it is going to take owing to the necessity of making corrections, inspections, &c. I do not think there will be any difficulty from the fact that there is no public notice given when certain townships are to be thrown open. If the notice were given there is no doubt it would cause considerable delay.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In order to prevent anything like favouritism notice should be given when a township would be available for homesteading.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not suppose it would ever be done otherwise.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I think it is a most important point, and I need only recall the illustration I gave this afternoon to show how important it is that the public should be notified a certain length of time ahead in some conspicuous manner as to when certain townships are to be open for homestead entry. It was no small task for 300 or 400 individuals to go many of them 300 miles to the Dauphin land office, as many of them did this fall when notice was given that the lands taken out of the timber limit would be open to entry, but when they got there they found they were denied an opportunity of entering and the land agent informed them that the lands would not be opened for another month. In the last two months I have received over a score of letters asking when these lands would be thrown open for entry, but I have not been able to obtain the information. Some persons have sent money to the department here, applying for these lands, but they have been informed by the Dominion Land Commissioner that the department was not in a position to accept the money and many individuals are to-day anxiously waiting for notice when the lands will be thrown open, and I think it only right for the protection of these people that there should be some public method of giving notice of the opening of these lands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the hon. gentleman is trying to leave a wrong impression so far as this Dauphin business is concerned. There was no public notice given that the lands would be opened at Dauphin and the 400 people whom he mentions went there entirely on their own responsibility in so far as any notice from the department is concerned. These lands were supposed to be opened at Minnedosa on the 1st of October; public notice was given of that fact in the public press of the country—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How long in advance?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Some time at least; I cannot say how long. Owing to the closing of the Minnedosa land office on the last day of September, when the 1st of October arrived there was no Minnedosa land office.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Why was it closed?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Twenty or thirty people went to the Minnedosa land office on the 1st of October to enter and the office was closed. My hon. friend did not see fit to give that information to the House; he tried to make the House believe that notice was given that the lands would be opened at Dauphin at a certain time, which was not in keeping with the facts. These people who went to Dauphin went entirely on their own responsibility.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) has made the strongest possible argument in favour of a public notice. He says no public notice was given and yet three or four hundred people went up there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They went up on the strength of rumour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They should not be compelled to rely on rumour.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The department was not to blame because they did not advertise the lands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The department is not obliged to advertise the lands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The lands are not opened yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the point; the people knowing that they have only rumour to depend on, that there is no public notice given in the ordinary course, go out there on the strength of rumour. But we are urging that there should be a formal notice so that men will not go there for the purpose of locating upon mere rumour. The hon. gentleman says the land office was closed. Why was it closed?

Mr. OLIVER. It was closed because it had ceased to do any important amount of business.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) contradicted my statement a few moments ago with regard to the notice of the Dauphin land office. I had a great deal of this information from applicants who had visited the Dauphin land office, and who informed me that the agent there had told them he had received instructions that the land would be thrown open in that office, and that the work of the Minnedosa office was largely transferred to the Dauphin land office. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. Well, let me read what the minister said about this. On the 28th day of November, I asked the following questions:

1. Were any of the Dominion lands agents notified when to accept entries for the even-numbered sections in those townships recently taken out of the Riding mountain timber reserve? If so, what was the date mentioned?
2. Were those instructions subsequently cancelled? If so, for what reason, and at whose request?
3. When will those lands be available for homesteading?
4. Will squatters who have located on the lands, either before or since the lands were taken out of the reserve, have priority in making entry?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. (a) Instructions were sent to the agent of the Dominion lands at Minnedosa to grant entries for even-numbered sections in the tract taken out of the Riding mountain timber reserve. Similar instructions to the agent at Dauphin were, through a clerical error, sent to Yorkton. The mistake was not discovered in time, but the advertisement which appeared in the press correctly stated the facts.

(b) The date mentioned was the 1st of October, 1906.

2. Owing to the closing of the Minnedosa land office on the 1st of October, 1906, entries were not granted. Action on the instructions was therefore stayed.
3. That question is under consideration.
4. An investigation is being held by officers of the department as to rights of squatters on the land question, and action will be on the merits of each case.

So I was perfectly justified in using this as an argument why public notice should be given in order that these people might not be misled, as they were in this case.

On section 10,

Mr. LENNOX. We have the word 'homestead' here and in other sections. The minister will recollect what was said about the definition of 'homestead.'

Mr. OLIVER. I have an amendment prepared, which I will give to the House at a convenient moment, to subsection (f) of the interpretation clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let us have it now.

Mr. OLIVER. Subsection (f) will read thus:

'Homestead' means land entered for under the provisions of this Act or chapter 55 of the Revised Statutes of Canada of 1906, or of any Act relating to Dominion lands repealed by that Act.

That is to read into this Act the meaning of 'homestead' as provided in the previous Act.

Mr. LAKE. I would ask the minister to consider more fully the suggestion which has been made that after the lands have been surveyed, and before they are put on the market and thrown open to entry, full notice should be given to the public that they will be so thrown open to entry. That will avoid a suspicion which will be created that some people will have inside information in regard to them.

Mr. OLIVER. I will take the matter into consideration. I think it is a matter of such a nature as might be left to departmental action.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think a matter of that kind ought to be left to departmental action. You should embody in this statute a provision that public notice must be given, unless the Governor in Council, on a recommendation setting forth full reasons for departing from that rule, should order to the contrary. I am surprised to know that such a rule was ever departed from. Here is a public domain to which the citizens of this country become entitled to make claim. Now why should not people generally have notice that that particular tract of land is going to be open for claim under this law? I am astonished that any departure from that principle has ever been sanctioned in the administration of the department. If any man had told me outside this House that any departure from that principle had been sanctioned in the administration of the department, I would have been inclined to think he had been entirely misinformed. It seems to me outrageous that public notice should not be given.

Mr. TURRIFF. It never was at any time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The principle I am propounding is that you should embody in this statute a public notice, the law should provide that it must be given. Take the mineral lands of Nova Scotia. Suppose, for example, there was no provision that they should be open to entry by any person, and that some favoured individual in that province should have the right in advance of the general public to make claim to valuable mineral areas. Why, the thing would be regarded as a perfect outrage. It is an outrage not to have a statutory enactment providing that it must be done here.

Mr. TURRIFF. The routine always followed has been that as soon as the surveyors have surveyed the township lands, the plans are sent to the agent and then become available. The case referred to by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) was a special case. They were not regular lands that were surveyed and made available. These were lands that had been in a reservation which had not been taken up and which were supposed to be made available. I see no objection to notice being given. It would have to be defined how the notice would be given. The only objection I saw in the first place to it was that it would be bound to cause a delay for a certain length of time because the department would not be able to say how long beforehand it would be in a position to open the lands if it had to wait until the township plans were ready until it could give the notice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that slight delay would be very well endured for the sake of a higher principle that all should be placed on a basis of equality.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. This notice would be all the more necessary now owing to the fact that homestead lands are getting rather scarce.

Mr. OLIVER. The suggestion that notice shall be given would not involve an amendment to this section at any rate. It would probably come as an amendment to section 5 and if it is desired we can make some provision for notice.——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it is very desirable.

Mr. OLIVER—in an amendment to section 5, but it would not involve any amendment to section 9.

On section 10: subsection 1—application for entry.

Mr. LENNOX. Why do you say 'between such hours as may, from time to time, be fixed by the Governor in Council?'

Mr. OLIVER. Hitherto there have been no hours fixed by the Act. We thought it as well to fix the hours by the Act but still circumstances might arise under which it would not be desirable to maintain those hours, and we therefore make provisions that they may be changed under the authority of the Governor in Council. The insertion of the hours in the Act here renders illegal or of non-effect an entry made any other time than between these hours which was not the case in the Act as it has been. We thought it was well in order to make it as definite as possible to define the hours in which a legal entry may be made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would agree with that. In so far as I am concerned I think it is a good provision, but I would like to ask the minister what he proposes to do about a matter that I mentioned in a few remarks I made on the second reading of the Bill, and that is the application of the principle of publicity to these land offices. Why should not they be in exactly the same position as the registry office or the mining office in Nova Scotia, or any similar office? Why should not every one be at liberty to inspect any record in that office upon payment of a small fee? It is no more than a registry office in principle at least. There are certain details connected with the administration of these lands which are not to be found in the older provinces. In Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec, in so far as I am aware, any person can inspect the records of the country in regard to the ownership of land. These are records which affect ownership. Why should they not be open?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not prepared to say that they should not be, to state the case just in its barest form, but the reason, if I understand it correctly, why they have not been open in the past—and, of course, they have not been as it has been the usual practice to deal with them as they are now dealt with—is that it was not considered to be sound public policy to facilitate in any degree the operations of the claim jumper. It was believed that if a man had such an interest in a quarter-section that he desired to acquire it he might acquaint himself by his own observation as to whether the duties were being performed or not and then, having satisfied himself that they were not, it was eligible for him to apply for cancellation. But, in the condition of the country, particularly as it has been, as my hon. friend from Portage La Prairie (Mr. Crawford) has said, a very large proportion of settlers of very limited means have been compelled by circumstances to be absent from their homesteads perhaps beyond the time permitted by the strict letter of the law in order that they might ultimately make a success of their homesteads. These people were rendering themselves liable to cancellation. In years gone by, no doubt more than at the present

time, but in those years and to some extent even in these years, to facilitate the operations of the claim jumper by giving him access to a knowledge of the moment at which the homesteader's right became liable to cancellation was not thought in the long ago, nor is it at the present time, to be sound public policy. It may be, however, that under present conditions, with settlement as it is and with a larger proportion of land under entry and therefore a larger number of cancellations available, a change would be advisable, but I think it is just as well to state clearly to the House for the information of every one the reasons, which, I understand, governed the late administration, and as well the present administration, in withholding the information to which, as my hon. friend says, the public are, under a strict right of the law, absolutely entitled to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would be inclined if necessary to remove the evil which the hon. gentleman has spoken of as one possibly arising. I would greatly prefer to make the conditions of settlement less severe and to have the land office open to the public. If the evil were of such a character I would be prepared to do that but I would like to see any office touching the public domain of this country open to the people so that they would know upon examination exactly what the records were. I think that is a good principle which ought not to be departed from except for the very gravest reason. I hope the minister will come to the conclusion that the time has arrived when that can be done. I would be inclined to some relaxation for the sake of having the principle I am advocating carried out.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The present system tends towards a number of people holding homesteads for speculative purposes. There are scores of homesteads not open for entry and you cannot find out who owns them. If one could know it was John Smith, you could locate John Smith and some one could properly jump his claim.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no limit to the application for cancellation; and then the question has to be decided whether the homesteader is in good standing or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The policy has been not to afford facilities?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the idea, but I am quite ready to admit that as conditions change it is quite possible that a change in that system may be advisable.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Under this section the applicant for a homestead entry has to make an affidavit that he is eighteen years of age. It would be wise to have a special form of application for a reservation, or otherwise boys of sixteen years might come in and tie up the land for some years.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a good suggestion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to have subsection three held over, and I would mention a matter now so that the minister may consider it in the meantime. Subsection 3 reads:

> Such application shall have no force or effect until it is accepted by the local agent or an officer acting for him.

I would suppose that if a man goes to an office, and makes his application in a proper form, and hands it to a proper officer of the government, he has discharged all the duty the law imposes on him, and no act of an officer by refusing to accept it or in any other way, should have the slightest effect upon that man's rights. But the words of the statute seem to cast some doubt on that.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not intended he shall be prejudiced. The agent has no discretion; he must accept the entry if the law is complied with, and what is intended by the clause is that the acceptance of the entry by an agent is an evidence of entry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I see what the minister means, but I think the clause could be better worded.

Progress reported.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT, 1898.

Bill (No. 18) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy.—read the second time and referred to the Select Committee on Masters and Mates.

Mr. FISHER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken on Monday?

Mr. FISHER. This Bill will perhaps be taken first, and then Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You cannot say definitely?

Mr. FISHER. I have not consulted the Prime Minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will you be good enough to let me know in the morning.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 18, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 122) respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—Mr. Crawford.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Crawford.

Bill (No. 125) respecting the Lake Superior Power Company.—Mr. Talbot.

RETURN PRESENTED.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) laid on the table, a return to an order of the House dated February 11, 1907 for a copy of the record and of all the proceedings in the suit in the Exchequer court of Canada between the King and H. E. Lyon, plaintiffs, and Malcolm McKenzie and Felix A. Montalbetti, defendants. He said: This is a partial return consisting of the papers in the Interior Department. Another part of the return will be brought down by the Justice Department.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

On the Orders of the Day being called.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) in reference to the Trent Valley Canal. In the 'Globe' of Saturday, as well as in pretty nearly every Toronto paper, a report is given in reference to the selection of the route from Lake Simcoe to the Georgian bay in which it is said that the Severn River route is recommended. The statement is as follows:

SEVERN ROUTE RECOMMENDED.

A report giving the recommendations of Mr. Butler, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, and of Mr. E. J. Walsh, engineer in charge of surveys on the Trent canal from Lake Simcoe to Georgian bay, was laid on the table of the Commons this afternoon. For the northern part of the canal they recommend the route by way of the Severn river from Lake Couchiching to Georgian bay. This is the natural route, and eliminates all questions of diversion of water and other technical difficulties. The surveys made by Mr. Walsh show the estimated cost of six feet navigation to be $1,219,818. The cost of eight feet navigation is estimated at $1,457,244. Mr. Butler recommends that the draught of eight feet be decided upon, in view of the fact that the additional cost would be only $237,426, and the greater draught would very materially reduce the cost of transportation of all products from the west into Lake Simcoe. This practically means that the whole of the Trent Valley canal route from the Georgian bay to Trenton is finally settled, and when completed will allow of a continuous eight feet navigation from the northern to the southern outlet.

In reference to that article which appeared in the 'Globe' of March 16 I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he received this letter from me:

Mr. FISHER.

March 14, 1907.

Hon. H. R. Emmerson,
Minister of Railways and Canals, Ottawa.

My Dear Mr. Emmerson,—Referring to the conversation which I had with you to-day in regard to the route of the Trent Valley canal from Lake Simcoe to the Georgian bay, I beg to protest against a selection of that route being made until there has been a proper survey of the route from the east end of Kempenfeldt bay to Nottawasaga bay upon which an estimate of the cost of construction can be made.

It is quite apparent from the reports which you showed me to-day that no proper estimate can be made from the report of Mr. Walsh, based on the reconnaissance survey which has been made. I therefore urge you, and through you the government, not to make a selection until you have had a proper survey made of this route upon which an estimate of cost can be based, and I urge you to immediately take the necessary steps to have such survey made.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) LEIGHTON McCARTHY.

I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he received that letter and if so whether such a survey as I ask should be made will be made and made immediately?

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals answers, I would like to ask him if he received a letter from me, dated the 14th March, virtually in substance, saying the same thing as that which is contained in the letter of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy); that is protesting against any definite action being taken by the government before a complete survey has been made of the alternate route from the head of Kempenfeldt bay to the Georgian bay by way of Nottawasaga river?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Before the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) answers I would like to ask him if he will be good enough to intimate to the House if a large appropriation will be made this year for the completion of the section recommended to the Georgian bay, which I need hardly say, is the only, original and proper route to adopt.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I may say that the matter of the route between Lake Simcoe and the Georgian bay end of the Trent valley canal has not been finally determined. It is true that I laid on the table the other day the plans and reports of the engineer. The reports favour the Severn river route, but at the same time there was not furnished a comparative estimate of the cost of the Nottawasaga bay route so called. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) wrote me and I received the letter, a copy of which he has read. I also received a letter from the member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). The matter has been determined in this way: that the final dis-

position will not be made pending some further information that is necessary from the engineers, and instructions have been given by the deputy minister to the superintending engineer, Mr. Walsh, to have the necessary instrumental survey made.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURN.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to point out that on the 4th of March, a return was ordered on my motion, asking for the number of desks of every kind and description bought for the House of Commons since 1896. The return is a very small one, and as the acting Minister of Public Works is not in his seat I would ask one of his colleagues to call his attention to the necessity for bringing it down as early as possible.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND COMMUNICATION.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, what information he has within the last few days concerning the ice bound Prince Edward Island steamers 'Stanley' and 'Minto,' whose crew and passengers have been for the last ten or fourteen days, in danger of their lives.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have had no information to-day with regard to the two steamers. On Saturday we had news that the 'Stanley' had gone back to Georgetown, and that the 'Minto' was still in the ice and would not be able to move until the wind blew from the south.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I called up the department by telephone about two hours ago, and I was told they had no news either yesterday or Saturday. I wish to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. There can be no discussion on this question now.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I will hand a notice to you, Sir.

Mr. BRODEUR. My deputy informed me on Saturday that the news I have given had reached the department.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I press my motion to discuss the matter as a question of urgency; the information given by the minister is not satisfactory to me.

Mr. SPEAKER. The notice which the hon. member has handed to me is a mere statement that he intends to interrogate the government. This would not come within the rule, allowing a motion to adjourn on a question of urgency.

Mr. A. MARTIN. But there is something more than that statement in the notice. It proceeds: 'and discuss questions in reference to the present unsatisfactory winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.'

Mr. SPEAKER. The notice as framed does not come within the rule.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Will you allow me to read the notice ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the matter ; the notice is not at all framed under the rule.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I would like to have the paper read.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before you leave the chair Mr. Speaker——

Mr. A. MARTIN. Just one moment please; I wish to say Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would point out to the hon. member (Mr. Martin) that the rule requires, that, if a member intends to introduce a discussion at this stage, he must rise and ask the leave of the House to move to adjourn for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance. There is nothing in the notice handed to me which at all intimates that such is the intention of the hon. member.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Will you allow me to read this notice ?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member wishes to put his notice in proper form it is quite open for him to do so.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I have written in the notice that I intend to interrogate——

Mr. SPEAKER. I have ruled the discussion out of order.

Mr. A. MARTIN. And so discuss the question——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. A. MARTIN. And to discuss certain questions in reference to——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I have intimated to the hon. gentleman the mode in which he can bring the matter before the House at this stage.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I will take another opportunity. I think I am quite in order—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

FOREIGN GOODS UNDER BRITISH PREFERENCE.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Before you leave the chair Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the government what action they intend to take in reference to an item which appears in the weekly report of the Trade and Commerce Department, and which is as follows :

CUTLERY.

I am informed that a very large amount of German cutlery, razors, &c., is shipped from Germany to Sheffield, and is there exported and sent to Canada as Sheffield goods. Canadian buyers cannot be too careful in seeing that the goods are stamped from Sheffield, and especially that they are dealing with well-known Sheffield firms.

In to-day's 'Citizen,' there appears the following article in reference to the same matter.

Not made here.

Mr. J. B. Jackson, Canadian trade agent at Leeds, in a report just received, again expresses the belief that a considerable portion of the goods imported by Canada under the British preference are foreign goods, shipped into England, repacked and sent to Montreal as English goods. He quotes from the Yorkshire 'Post' a report of an interview which delegates of the Associated Chambers of Commerce had with Mr. Lloyd George, President of the Board of Trade. They urged a better enforcement of the Trade Marks Act, alleging that there was much fraud in the marking of goods. Mr. Lloyd George suggested that the Chambers of Commerce institute prosecutions on their own behalf.

Mr. Jackson particularly mentions cutlery and felts as lines of German goods which enter Canada under the advantage of the British preference. Much of the cutlery stamped 'Made from Sheffield steel' never saw that city. German felts are sold in Canada at prices which make it evident that they must enter under the preference, for less than they can be purchased for in Germany.

In justice to the manufacturer of these goods it would be well for the government to give some explanation in reference to the matter.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I cannot tell of course whether there is any foundation for that statement. Occasionally, goods come in, upon which the surtax has not been paid. If they are entered in such a way they come in at the risk of the importer and action is taken thereon. In addition to the surtax they have to pay a penalty for infraction of the law. Such attention as the department is able to give to this matter is being continually given to it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister be good enough to lay on the table a copy of the letters sent by Mr. J. D. Jackson to the Trade and Commerce Department in reference to this matter ?

Mr. PATERSON. I shall ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and if he has no objection to comply with the hon. gentleman's request, I shall be glad to place the letters on the table.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY OF CANADA.

Further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Gervais for the third reading of Bill (No. 82) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company, Canada, and the proposed motion thereto of Mr. Bennett.

Mr. BENNETT moved :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions that they have power to amend section 8 of the said Bill by striking out therefrom the words 'heretofore conferred upon,' and substituting therefor the words 'now vested in.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no objection to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill, amended the Bill as moved by Mr. Bennett and reported.

Mr. GERVAIS moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state why I think this Bill should not be read a third time, and to again direct the attention of the House to the attitude to the public of the Grand Trunk Railway Company now seeking relief. My contention is that if a great corporation like the Grand Trunk Railway Company is in default as regards previous legislation of this parliament, it ought not to get any relief until any grievance the public has against it is redressed. Now, there are two great grievances in this country to-day against the Grand Trunk. One is in regard to its non-compliance with the penny a mile clause in its original charter. It has refused to give that penny a mile rate; it is opposing the attempt to get it in the courts. It is fighting the law, fighting the public, and fighting and defying this parliament ; and any company that is an outlaw and that defies the law of the land ought not to get any kind of relief until it complies with that provision of its original charter. But there is another thing which I am going to give in a little detail to the House. Section 253 of the Railway Act expressly prohibits any company from 'subjecting any particular person or any particular description of traffic to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever.' That prohibits any discrimination against any locality or person or description of traffic. I have shown in this House and outside of this House, I have proved beyond a doubt by the fare tariffs, and the Railway Commission have confessed in communications addressed to this House, that this Grand Trunk Railway Company does to-day deliberately charge all the people who travel over its line east

of Toronto, 11 per cent more than it charges the people west of Toronto. That is a gross injustice that amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars a year; it is an injustice which the people in all the towns east of Toronto are speaking out against. They are holding meetings, and declaring it to be most unfair. If that is so, my contention is that this railway company should get no relief until it removes this discrimination. Why does the Grand Trunk choose to discriminate against the people who live east of Toronto? Wholly and solely because it has no competition there. It may claim that under its original charter it can charge these abnormal rates. I do not know on what ground it contends that. The present Minister of Railways and his predecessor have both declared, and pledged themselves and their party in this House, that the Railway Act would suppress all kinds of railway discrimination. This section 253 is framed on the lines of a similar clause in the Interstate Commerce Act, which declares that 'there shall be no undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage to any particular description of traffic in any respect whatsoever.' The words are exactly the same. The Grand Trunk to-day, then, is discriminating against all that country east of Toronto, which includes twenty-two constituencies represented in this House. Under these circumstances, why should this parliament afford that company any relief? As I have said before, the object of parliament, at least in past days, was to make new laws; but it was also to obtain redress for grievances, and there could be no legislation, there could be no supplies granted, until the grievances of the public were redressed. Well, here is a grievance of the public—not a petty grievance, but a grievance amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, affecting twenty-two out of the eighty-six constituencies in the province of Ontario, as well as the rear constituencies, which are more or less connected with those on the front.

I ask the House to refuse to give them any legislation in the way of relief until they comply with the law of 1852, which binds them to give the people a penny a mile passenger service. If the Grand Trunk Railway can override the law in this respect, they will override it in every respect. What assurance have we that, under the circumstances, they will carry out the agreements they entered into with regard to the construction of a great transcontinental system, which is to build up northern Ontario, northern Quebec and New Brunswick, which is to build up our national ports and encourage all kinds of home industry? If the doctrine be laid down that this Dominion is not responsible for the enforcing of federal laws, that it is no concern of ours if any company incorporated by this parliament neglects its duty, if the Grand Trunk Railway is free to repudiate that clause in the Railway Act which says they shall not discriminate in any respect, if they are to be allowed to charge on this portion of their line though the most thrifty and closely populated portion of Ontario, 11 per cent higher passenger rates than in any other, we are forced to the conclusion that the Grand Trunk Railway is greater than parliament. The issue before the people is whether this Dominion parliament is inferior to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, whether this parliament has or has not the courage to compel that company to do what is right. If the government are going to put this Bill through without insisting on a rectification of these grievances, the government will be simply giving the Grand Trunk Railway a free hand with regard to every solemn obligation and duty imposed upon it by parliament. I submit that we ought not to put through this Bill before compelling the company to live up to its obligations. The right hon. Prime Minister laid down a similar doctrine some years ago in dealing with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That company were asking for great concessions with regard to the Crows' Nest Pass Railway. Well, at that time there were public grievances against the Canadian Pacific Railway regarding their traffic arrangements and tolls, and the government claimed credit for having compelled the company to remedy those grievances before consenting to give the franchises asked for. If that doctrine held good then, it ought to hold good to-day, and we should refuse to give the Grand Trunk Railway any legislation until they remove the cause of the complaints now made against them. I believe that to-day the passenger agents and the head men of that company are in this city, and I would not be at all surprised if some negotiations were going on regarding passenger rates. There is a very substantial rumour that the government have at last come to the idea that something must be done. Let us then hold back this legislation and give the company a chance to explain and to do what is right. Will the hon. minister ask that this Bill be suspended until he can get information from the Grand Trunk Railway as to whether it is true or not they are disobeying the law and discriminating against all the towns that lie east of Toronto?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). We have heard the speech just made by my hon. friend so often that I am sure many of us almost know it off by heart. On several occasions my hon. friend has presented his views in this matter in almost identically the same language, and on every occasion he has been answered. I do not think therefore that I need take up the time of the House by repeating the very obvious answer which has

already been given several times. My experience is that wherever there are grievances in this country and whenever those grievances are presented in all sincerity either to this parliament or provincial legislatures, they are recognized and remedied. And I fancy that this parliament will consider grievances wherever they are found and will afford a remedy for them. But grievances must be presented in sincerity, and not for the mere purpose of repeating over and over the story that ought not to be heard more than once. I have no answer to make other than has already been given to the speech that we have again listened to this afternoon.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time.

On motion that the Bill do now pass and the title be as in the order paper.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If I may speak on that motion, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it takes a good long time to make this government realize the existence of any grievance; but if you tell them often enough and strongly enough, if you put it up to them time after time and make them justify their conduct, they grow afraid and yield at last. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) speaks of my having made a speech on this subject two or three times. But with regard to other grievances I have found it necessary to speak a dozen times and more to get the idea through the heads of ministers and compel them to remedy grievances. All the amendments and improvements in the Railway Act that they are claiming credit for are the expression in the form of law of suggestions made to them by the member they now pretend to ignore. I shall live to see the day—and perhaps that day may come before this session is over—when the Minister of Railways, who has repudiated the statements I have made and has told us that no amendment can be made, will come down to this House and confess that there is something needed and will acknowledge that he is forced to concede it. Why he said the same things that he said today with regard to the telephones, with regard to the express companies, with regard to a great many other things; but, little by little, the railway law is being improved and it is being improved as a result of agitation in this House, the presentation of the facts and sticking to them. Let the Minister of Railways go into any of these counties between Toronto and Kingston and tell the people that there are no grievances, or that he has no intention of remedying them except in his own particular way. Why he will not dare to say to the public there, that this parliament is not the proper place in which to present a grievance; he will not dare to tell the people there that the proper time to present a grievance is not when a lawbreaking company is seeking relief. Let him go into East Northumberland, where there is a vacancy, and make the speech that he made here to-day. Let the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), who ran once in a constituency in that portion of the country, go into East Northumberland and justify the remarks that the Minister of Railways has made here. They will have an opportunity of showing how close the relation is between the Grand Trunk Railway and the government and how the Grand Trunk Railway is master of this parliament, at least the government side of it, so that it can repudiate the law, setting a bad example to every great corporation in this country, with no effort on the part of the government to force it to obey the law. Where will the government be if things go on in this country as they are going now? Why, anarchy must come, if the law is not respected. But when we have a Prime Minister, a Minister of Justice, a Minister of Customs, a Minister of Finance, and a Minister of Railways, who, one after the other, tell us that they are not responsible for the enforcement of federal law, anarchy is at hand—and the anarchists are the men who set this example of the defiance of law. It has been well said, and widely repeated, in the United States that the great promotors of the sentiment in favour of public ownership, are not Roosevelt and men of that stamp, but the men who conduct the railways and the great corporations and who assume to be above the law. Anarchy is nothing but a disobedience of the law, and ignoring of the law; and the greatest anarchist in this country is the Grand Trunk Railway which refuses to obey the law with regard to the penny a mile service, refuses to obey the law with regard to discrimination. I hope some of these ministers of the Crown will come into East Northumberland and tell these people along the Grand Trunk that this government does not consider it its business to enforce the law against the Grand Trunk, or to compel the righting of grievances when this company comes here for relief. Let them tell these people that the business of the government is to make laws not to enforce them. I know now why the Minister of Justice does not want to enforce Dominion law. He and the Prime Minister got into a very bad hole the last session. They passed a law relating to the Sabbath, and placed the duty of enforcement upon the attorney generals of the provinces. They so arranged it that the province of Quebec could get out of enforcing it. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice would not like to be held to the duty of enforcing a federal law of that kind. And so they are forced to make that ignominious confession they have made in this

House that they are not responsible for the enforcement of federal law.

Now, I want to finish my constitutional argument with that great lawyer, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) He got up here as wise as Minerva's owl, and told us that he was not responsible for the administration of federal law, and quoted from the clause in the——

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) state how this discussion is pertinent to the motion before the Chair.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is quite pertinent to the criticism the Minister of Railways passed upon me.

Mr. SPEAKER. At this stage, it is not customary in this House to debate a Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I receive that information with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, but I understand that you do not say that I am out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The practice in this House has been that the motion that a Bill do now pass is agreed to nemine contradicente immediately after the third reading. I will say that that practice should be followed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that it is very seldom done, but I understand also that you do not rule that I am out of order. But I bow to your statement of the practice of this House and will say no more. I had nearly finished in any case, and I can finish on another occasion what I had to say. I have answered the Minister of Railways sufficiently, I expect to see him in East Northumberland.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether I am in order in adding a word to the discussion—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think not.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. —but if I am in order—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The question is on the motion that the Bill be now passed.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would ask whether it is your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that on the motion that the Bill be now passed, discussion is precluded?

Mr. SPEAKER. Discussion is not absolutely precluded. If a member desires to postpone the passage of the Bill or that further consideration of it be postponed, he may move accordingly. But discussion, apart from that, as I understand the practice, is not usual on this motion.

Motion agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 91) respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Ferry Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Traders' Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Johnston.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the British America Assurance Company.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 115) to amalgamate the Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company and the Erie and Ontario Development Company, Limited, into one corporation, under the name of 'The Jordan-Erie Power Company.'—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 117) for the relief of Celina Kingan Ansley.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 118) for the relief of George William Hadley.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRANSPORTATION OF FRESH FISH.

Mr. SINCLAIR—by Mr. Johnston—asked:

1. How many refrigerator cars are available for the transportation of fresh fish on the Intercolonial Railway?
2. What quantity of fresh fish was shipped by the Intercolonial Railway from Mulgrave to points west during each calendar year since 1895?
3. What proportion of said shipments were carried by express?
4. What were the gross receipts taken in each of said years by said railway for freight on said fresh fish shipments?
5. What were the gross receipts taken in each of said years for shipments of fresh fish by express?

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

1. 103 cars.
2. 18,035 tons since the year 1898.
3. 14,630 tons.
4. In order to get the information to answer this question it would be necessary to examine every freight and express waybill. As these are very numerous it will be apparent that this would mean great delay and expense.
5. Answered by number four.

GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING.

Mr. VERVILLE asked :

1. How much has been expended for government printing in each of the last six years ?
2. How much has the printing for parliament cost in each of the last six years ?
3. Has any one particular supervision of printing done for parliament during the session ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1.—Expended for Government Printing from July 1,			1900	to June 30,	1901	$448,768	47
"	"	"	1901	"	1902	412,536	36
"	"	"	1902	"	1903	414,627	51
"	"	"	1903	"	1904	462,261	93
"	"	"	1904	"	1905	512,561	03
"	"	"	1905	"	1906	510,265	55
2.—Expended for Printing for Parliament July 1,			1900	to June 30,	1901	$145,849	71
"	"	"	1901	"	1902	144,991	08
"	"	"	1902	"	1903	132,003	09
"	"	"	1903	"	1904	159,448	07
"	"	.	1904	"	1905	161,023	62
"	"	"	1905	"	1906	165,207	91

3. The printing done for parliament during session is under the general supervision of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament. It is especially under the supervision of the Clerk of Stationery and Superintendent of the Printing of the Sessional Papers of Parliament.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. When and to whom were homestead entries granted for the following Dominion lands : northeast quarter-section 20, township 14, range 1, west second meridian ; southwest quarter-section 16, township 28, range 1, west third meridian ; northwest quarter-section 36, township 21, range 8, west second meridian ; southeast quarter-section 36, township 21, range 8, west second meridian ; northeast quarter-section 2, township 22, range 8, west second meridian ?
2. Are the persons holding the entries fulfilling their duties ? If not, to what extent have they fallen short ?
3. Have extensions of time been granted, and on what grounds ?
4. Have patents or recommendations for the issue of patents been granted, and on what grounds ?
5. Have any of the entrants had previous homestead entries ? If so, what were the dates of the same, and were patents granted ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

N.E. ¼ sec. 20, tp. 14, range 1, W. 2nd M. was patented to Wm. Goldsmith on the 10th October, 1888. He had no previous entry.

S.W. ¼ sec. 16, tp. 28, range 1, W. 3rd M. (1). Homestead entry granted to Wm. B. F. Whitesides on April 26, 1905. He had no previous entry. (2). The homesteader failed to perform the required duties, his residence being defective owing to ill health. He had lived on the land for six months only, but had broken 12 acres and erected a house. (3). On the 19th May, 1906, an extension was granted until the 1st of November following. The grounds for such extension were that the entrant had resided for six months upon the homestead, had erected a house and cultivated 12 acres. (4). No certificate of recommendation was issued ; but on account of the ill health of the entrant, necessitating a change of climate he was allowed to purchase at $3 per acre.

N.W. ¼ sec. 36, tp. 21. range 8, W. 2nd M. (1). Homestead entry was granted to John Bradley on the 3rd October, 1902. He had no previous entry. (2). Homesteader is at present in Brandon, and attributes his absence from homestead to a broken leg. His duties were in default when land was visited by homestead inspector on February 21, 1906, as no residence had been performed although there was a house on land worth $25, and 20 acres of breaking was done. By a subsequent report dated July 24, 1906, the value of the house was placed at $10. Homesteader has announced his intention to return to the homestead as soon as able and perform necessary residence. (3). The following extensions were granted in this case : October 19, 1904, entry protected to May 18, 1905, no reason recorded ; April 4, 1906, entry was protected to May 1, 1906, for the reason that the inspector recommended that the entrant should be given an opportunity of going into residence. February 20, 1907, entry was protected to May 1, 1907, under general order protecting all homesteads in Regina district owing to scarcity of fuel and severe winter. (4). Neither certificate of recommendation nor patent has yet been issued.

S.E. ¼ sec. 36, tp. 21, range 8, W. 2nd M. (1). Homestead entry was granted to John Bradley. He made no previous entry. (2). Present condition of duties uncertain. The duties having been reported in default the agent was instructed on the 9th of November, 1906, to cancel the entry, but on the 16th idem the agent wrote to the head office inclosing copy of a letter from entrant

stating he was going on to his homestead that week. Consequently, the agent was instructed to hold over proceedings for a homestead inspector's report, and not to carry out instructions if entrant was found in occupation. The agent on the 6th of December, 1906, instructed the inspector to furnish a report, which has not yet come to hand. (3). On the 18th of January, 1906, the entry was protected until 1st of May, 1906. No reason recorded.

N.E. ¼ sec. 2, tp. 22, range 8, W. 2nd M. (1). Homestead entry granted to Thos. Forster on 31st January, 1907. He had no previous entry. (2). There has been no correspondence since the present entry was granted. (3). No extensions have been granted. (4). Neither patent nor certificate of recommendation has been issued.

JUDGES IN REVIEW OR APPEAL.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. What is the detailed statement of the travelling expenses of Judge Tellier, for the years 1891, 1892 and 1893, when he had his official residence at St. Hyacinthe ?
2. For how many days of court sittings, outside the district of St. Hyacinthe during each of those years, did he make special claim ?
3. During each of those three years, how much did he receive under this heading ?
4. Does the honourable Minister of Justice intend to leave exclusively to the chief justices of the Superior Court and of the Court of Appeals, at Montreal and Quebec, the responsibility of selecting the judges to sit in review or, as judges ad hoc, in appeal ?
5. Does not the honourable Minister of Justice purpose rather to have an understanding with the said chief justices to the effect of forbidding a judge—who had in the first place exercised his jurisdiction in a rural district, without having, on leaving there, obtained a certificate from the bar of that district—from hearing, as a judge in review or of appeal, cases originating in the said rural district ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1.

1891	$1,362
1892	1,500
1893	1,488

2.

1891	217 days.
1892	217 "
1893	227 "

3.

1891	$1,302
1892	1,302
1893	1,362

4 and 5. Under the revised statutes of the province of Quebec, article 2321, it is the duty of the Chief Justice of the Superior Court, or of the judge performing the duties of Chief Justice for Montreal District, to select the judges who, in the Superior Court sit in review. If the despatch of judicial business calls for it, he may require the temporary services of any judge outside Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be.

By article 2299 of the said revised statutes, the Governor General in Council may appoint an assistant judge in the King's Bench, appeal side, in case of the prolonged absence of a judge, if the Chief Justice, or, in his absence, the senior puisné judge, who is able to act, certifies his opinion that the due administration of justice would be promoted by such an appointment.

In cases of simple re-hearing under article 2303 of the said revised statutes, a judge of the Superior Court may be requested by the Chief Justice to act ad hoc.

The responsibility of selecting judges to sit in review or as judges ad hoc in appeal, does not rest upon the Minister of Justice unless the appointment of an assistant judge under the provision of article 2299 becomes requisite.

CLAIM OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND GOVERNMENT FOR REFUND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Has the government of Prince Edward Island made a demand on the Dominion government for three cars of hay short delivered by the Intercolonial Railway, valued at $371.26 ?
2. Has any demand been made by the government of Prince Edward Island for the refund of $4,000 paid under protest, as charges per steamship 'Minto' and steamship 'Stanley' ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to pay these claims, or either of them ?
4. Will the government lay on the table of the House, all correspondence between the two governments relating to these claims ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.
2. A claim had been made for the refund of $4,000 paid under protest by the local government of Prince Edward Island, in connection with hay carried by the winter steamers.
3. The claim made by the local government for the refund of $4,000 paid for extra labour in handling hay from the cars to the steamers and discharging the hay, is under consideration at present in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The other claim is also under consideration.
4. There is no objection to laying on the table of the House all correspondence between the two governments.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—NEW ROUNDHOUSE AT PICTOU, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. CHRISTIE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What are the dimensions of the new roundhouse at Pictou, Nova Scotia ?
2. Who is the contractor, and what is the amount of the contract ?
3. What is the total expenditure to date on said roundhouse ?

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

1. Engine house to accommodate nine engines, side walls, 99½ feet, rear walls, 133 feet and 134 feet ; front walls, 117 feet, covering an area of 1,900 square feet.

2. E. A. Wallberg, bulk sum, $62,523.55 and schedule for foundation, &c.

3. $79,022.89.

ST. PIERRE AND MIQUELON IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Is the government aware of the recent arrival in this country of a considerable number of colonists, natives of the French colony of St. Pierre et Miquelon?

2. If so, have measures been taken to retain and settle those immigrants on Canadian soil ?

3. What are those measures ?

4. Who caused those immigrants to come here ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. and 3. No special measures.

4. A letter in this connection was received by the department in December last from Dr. T. A. Brisson, agent of the Montreal Repatriation Society, stating as follows:—'Following the several consecutive seasons of bad fishing and also for various other reasons which have aggravated the crisis at the present time, the population of the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, which was formerly from 5,500 to 6,000 souls has decreased this year to from 4,500 to 5,000. Over a thousand immigrants already have left, more than 500 have come to Canada, a quarter has gone to the United States, and the balance consisting of the important ship owners, of merchants, and of the best fishermen have returned to France.

As, in the opinion of even the most optimistic, there is little hope that the situation will be improved in the near future, the population is preparing to desert in a body as soon as it will have found the way of sufficient investment. I estimate 2,000, as a low estimate, as the number of those who will set out in the course of the next year.

Convinced of the excellent quality of this emigration, the Colonization Society of Montreal has busied itself with the means of attracting it in this direction, and letting it know the prosperous state of Canada as well as the great need of labourmen which is prevalent, and of procuring for it considerable facilities of transport and employment.'

To this the Superintendent of Immigration sent the following reply :—'Referring to your report dated the 5th ultimo, on the subject of French immigration from the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, I beg to say that the view taken by the department is that as long as there appears to be a field for their activity in Canada the movement referred to is acceptable, but as the immigrants are fishermen, rather than farmers, the department cannot take the same interest in the work as if the people were farmers, inasmuch as the government's interest in immigration is largely to help the movement in agricultural population.'

CROOKED LAKES INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Has any arrangement been made with the Indians residing on the Crooked Lakes Indian Reserve for the sale of any, and what, portion of the land included in that reserve ?

2. If so, in what quantities, and under what terms and conditions will the land be sold ?

3. When does the government expect to be able to conduct sales of the land, and at what point or points ?

4. Does the government propose to acquire by purchase or otherwise any portion of the reserve for homestead purposes ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes. On January 28, 1907, the Kakeewistahaw band of Indians surrendered 33,281 acres of their reserve, No. 72, in the province of Saskatchewan, lying south of the road allowance between projected townships 17 and 18, ranges 4 and 5, west of the second meridian, to be sold for their benefit, and on January 29, 1907, the Cowessess band of Indians surrendered 20,704 acres of their reserve, No. 73, in the province of Saskatchewan, lying south of the road allowance between projected townships 17 and 18, range 6, west of the second meridian, to be sold for their benefit.

2. Terms of sale not yet determined.

3. Sale of land to take place after subdivision survey has been made, at a place to be determined.

4. No.

MR. JUSTICE ROUTHIER.

Mr. DELISLE—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. During what length of time did the hon. A. B. Routhier fulfil the duties of chief justice of the Superior court of the province of Quebec ?

2. Why did he retire and what reasons did he give for his retirement ?

3. What is the amount of his annual superannuation ?

4. Is it true that he still draws a salary as judge of the Vice-Admiralty court, and what is the amount of that salary ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. From September 30, 1904, to June 6, 1906.

2. The government is not in possession of any information on the subject?

3. $8,000.

4. Yes, $1,000.

BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked:

Has the government yet decided as to whether it will introduce a Bill at this session of parliament providing for an extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Owing to the expected early departure of the Prime Minister to attend the Imperial Conference. it is hardly possible to give an affirmative answer to this question.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY STATION AT PICTOU.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Who was the contractor for the erection of the new railway station at Pictou, Nova Scotia ?
2. What was the date and the amount of the contract ?
3. When was the building completed and the contract passed ?
4. How much was paid for extra work ?
5. What has been the total expenditure in connection with the construction to date ?

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

1. Rhodes Curry & Company.
2. January 9, 1905. $32,900.
3. April 30, 1906.
4. $250.
5. $35,564.94.

THE PILOTS.

Mr. DELISLE—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

(Translation). Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to re-establish the 'tour-de-rôle' system for the Montreal pilots, so that each qualified pilot may enjoy a fair share of the benefits and emoluments ?

Hon. Mr. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation). The 'tour-de-rôle' system has not been abolished but it is the intention of the department to grant licenses to the apprentices who have passed their indenture of apprenticeship, only insofar as their services will be required by the navigation companies, so as to avoid conjestion in the 'tour-de-rôle'.

PATENTS FOR CERTAIN LANDS.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. In respect of the northeast quarters of sections 3, 5, 7 and 13, in township 31, range 18, west second meridian, has the government issued patents for these lands? If so, in whose names?
2. If patents were not issued, have these lands been reserved for or occupied by any individuals or corporations? If so, who is at present in occupation ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. No.
2. The northeast quarter of three, northeast quarter of 5 and northeast quarter of 13, in township 31, range 18, west second meridian, are reserved for the Canadian Northern Railway Company on account of its land subsidy.

The department has no information as to occupation.

The northeast quarter of 7, in township 31, range 18, west second meridian, is reserved for the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company, on account of its land subsidy.

The department has no information as to occupation.

KING'S BENCH, MANITOBA.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to make any new appointment or appointments to the Court of King's Bench in the province of Manitoba ?
2. If so, is the rumor that Mr. Henry E. Henderson, barrister, Brandon, is to receive the appointment, well founded ?
3. When will the new judge be appointed ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1 and 3. Parliament has not yet made any provisions for such appointments.

2. The rumour referred to has not come to the knowledge of the government.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—JUDGE PARADIS.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What is the detailed statement of the travelling expenses of Judge Paradis since his appointment to the bench at St. Johns, P.Q.?
2. For how many days of court sittings, outside of his district, during each year, did he make special claim ?
3. During each of those years, how much did he receive under this heading ?
4. How many cases are pending before Judge Paradis to date ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice)

1. In 1901-2, $156 ; 1902-3, $246 ; 1903-4, none; 1904-5, $438; 1905-6, $528.80; 1906-7, to date, $155.
2. 1901-2, 26 days; 1902-3, 41 days; 1903-4, none; 1904-5, 63 days; 1905-6, 60 days; 1906-7, to date, 18 days.
3. In 1901-2, $156 ; 1902-3, $246 ; 1903-4, none; 1904-5, $378; 1905-6, $516.60; 1906-7, to date, $155.
4. The government is not in possession of any information on the subject.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—JUDGE R. S. COOKE.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What is the detailed statement of the travelling expenses of Judge R. S. Cooke since his appointment to the bench ?

2. For how many days of court sittings, outside of his district, during each year, did he make special claim ?
3. During each of those years, how much did he receive under this heading ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. In 1904-5, $90; 1905-6, $107.50; 1906-7, $91.85.
2. In 1904-5, none; 1905-6, none; 1906-7, 3 days.
3. In 1904-5, none; 1905-6, none; 1906-7, $91.85.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—JUDGE CHARBONNEAU.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What is the detailed statement of the travelling expenses of Judge N. Charbonneau since his appointment to the bench at Sorel, P.Q.?
2. For how many days of court sittings, outside of his district, during each year, did he make special claim ?
3. During each of those years, how much did he receive under this heading ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. In 1903-4, $474; 1904-5, $918; 1905-6, $972.25; 1906-7, $545.55.
2. In 1903-4, 34 days; 1904-5, 87 days; 1905-6, 105 days; 1906-7, 64 days.
3. In 1903-4, $204; 1904-5, $522; 1905-6, $824.50; 1906-7, $545.55.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—JUDGE CARROLL.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What is the detailed statement of the travelling expenses of Judge G. H. Carroll, since his appointment to the bench ?
2. For how many days of court sittings, outside of his district, during each year, did he make special claim ?
3. During each of those years, how much did he receive under this heading ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. In 1903-4, $156 ; 1904-5, $806; 1905-6, $600.65; 1906-07, $524.30.
2. In 1903-4, none; 1904-5, 69 days; 1905-6, 42 days; 1906-7, 40 days.
3. In 1903-4, none; 1904-5, $502; 1905-6, $322.65; 1906-7, $335.05.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—JUDGE HUTCHINSON.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What is the detailed statement of the travelling expenses of Judge M. Hutchinson, since his appointment to the bench at Sherbrooke, P.Q.?
2. For how many days of court sittings, outside of his district, during each year, did he make special claim ?
3. During each of those years, how much did he receive under this heading ?

Mr. BERGERON.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. In 1904-5, $168; 1905-6, $270.05; 1906-7, $149.85.
2. In 1904-5, 12 days; 1905-6, 31 days; 1906-7, 14 days.
3. In 1904-5, $72; 1905-6, $225.20; 1906-7, $112.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—JUDGE F. X. LEMIEUX.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What is the detailed statement of the travelling expenses of Judge F. X. Lemieux, since his appointment to the bench at Sherbrooke, P.Q.?
2. For how many days of court sittings, outside of his district, during each year, did he make special claim ?
3. During each of those years, how much did he receive under this heading ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. In 1898-9, $798; 1899-1900, $1,164; 1900-1, $834; 1901-2, $504; 1902-3, $522; 1903-4, $438; 1904-5, $328; 1905-6, $528.34; $1906-7, $82.50.
2. In 1898-9, 90 days; 1899-1900, 147 days; 1900-1, 95 days; 1901-2, none; 1902-3, 7 days; 1903-4, none; 1904-5, 11 days; 1905-6, 18 days; 1906-7, none.
3. In 1898-9, $540; 1899-1900, $882; 1900-1, $570; 1901-2, none; 1902-3, $42; 1903-4, none; 1904-5, $166; 1905-6, $128.15; 1906-7, none.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—JUDGE ROCHON.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What is the detailed statement of the travelling expenses of Judge A. Rochon, since his appointment to the bench at Hull, P.Q.?
2. For how many days of court sittings, outside of his district, during each year, did he make special claim ?
3. During each of those years, how much did he receive under this heading ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. In 1901-2, $522; 1902-3, $526; 1903-4, $522; 1904-5, $282 ; 1905-6, $515.20 ; 1906-7, $295.70.
2. None.
3. Nothing.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—JUDGE TELLIER.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. What is the detailed statement of the travelling expenses of Judge Tellier, for the years 1894 and 1895 when he had his official residence at St. Hyacinthe ?
2. Specially, for how many days sitting outside of the district of St. Hyacinthe has he made claim in the said two years ?
3. How much has he received under this heading in the said two years ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. In 1894, $1,728; 1895, $1,662.
2. In 1894, 266 days; 1895, 264 days.
3. 1894, $1,596; 1895, $1,584.

TORONTO—BRANCH POST OFFICE.

Mr. BRISTOL asked:

Is it the intention of the government to erect a branch post office in Centre Toronto, at or near Spadina avenue and College street?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The matter is engaging the attention of the department.

IMMIGRATION EMPLOYMENT AGENTS.

Mr. BARR asked:

1. How many agents are appointed by the Dominion government for the purpose of assisting immigrants to obtain employment?
2. How many in each province?
3. What is the name and address of each agent?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The immigration agents regularly employed at ocean ports, viz., North Sydney, Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Vancouver and Victoria, the Commissioner of Immigration at Winnipeg, and all immigration agents and land guides in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, make it a part of their duty to assist immigrants to obtain employment when required. In addition to these are employed 188 commission agents for the special purpose of placing farm labourers in the province of Ontario. With the permission of the House I shall lay on the table a statement of their names and addresses.

On the order:

SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES.

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:
Most Gracious Sovereign:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty for the purpose of representing that it is expedient to amend the scale of payments authorized under section 118 of the Act of parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, commonly called the British North America Act, 1867, to be made by Canada to the several provinces of the Dominion for the support of their governments and legislatures by providing that—

A. Instead of the amounts now paid, the sums hereafter payable yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures, to be according to population, and as follows:

(a) Where the population of the province is under 150,000.. .. .. $100,000
(b) Where the population of the province is 150,000, but does not exceed 200,000.. 150,000
(c) Where the population of the province is 200,000, but does not exceed 400,000.. 180,000
(d) Where the population of the province is 400,000, but does not exceed 800,000.. 190,000
(e) Where the population of the province is 800,000, but does not exceed 1,500,000.. 220,000
(f) Where the population of the province exceeds 1,500,000.. 240,000

B. Instead of an annual grant per head of population now allowed, the annual payment hereafter to be at the same rate of eighty cents per head, but on the population of each province, as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census, until such population exceeds 2,500,000, and at the rate of sixty cents per head for so much of said population as may exceed 2,500,000.

C. An additional allowance to the extent of one hundred thousand dollars annually for ten years to the province of British Columbia.

We pray that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the imperial parliament at its present session, repealing the provisions of section 118 of the British North America Act, 1867, aforesaid, and substituting therefor the scale of payments above set forth, which shall be a final and unalterable settlement of the amounts to be paid yearly to the several provinces of the Dominion for their local purposes and the support of their governments and legislatures.

Such grants shall be paid half-yearly in advance, to each province; but the government of Canada shall deduct from such grants, as against any province, all sums chargeable as interest on the public debt of that province in excess of the several amounts stipulated in the said Act.

All of which we humbly pray Your Majesty to take into your favourable and gracious consideration.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I give notice that I intend to take up this resolution on Thursday next.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Might I ask the Prime Minister whether this proposed revision of the constitution is to be strictly limited to the one matter of financial reform? Inasmuch as he has confessed several times in this House that he cannot enforce federal law, can he not obtain that power which the Minister of Justice confesses he does not now possess, when applying for this revision of the constitution?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the provincial governments were asking for a revision of the constitution in that respect, there would be more force perhaps in the hon. gentleman's contention than there is in this case.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs), moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Customs Act, chapter forty-eight of the Re-

vised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide as follows :

1. That section thirty-eight of the said Act be repealed and the following inserted in lieu thereof :

38. Vessels entering the Gut of Annapolis shall be reported and entered at such place as the minister, from time to time, directs.

2. That section forty-three of the said Act be amended by adding thereto the following words .

Provided that duty shall not be assessed on less than the invoice value of goods in any case, except on account of reduction in the fair market value of such goods between the time of their purchase by the Canadian importer and their exportation to Canada ;

Provided further, that the appraiser, or collector acting as appraiser, in estimating the value for duty may disregard trifling fluctuation in market values occurring after the purchase of the goods by the Canadian importer, and may allow a bona fide discount for cash, not exceeding two and one-half per cent, when allowed and deducted by the exporter on his invoice.

3. That section sixty-four and section seventy of the said Act be repealed.

4. That section seventy-nine of the said Act be amended by striking out the words 'twenty-five,' and inserting instead thereof the word 'fifteen.'

5. That section one hundred and fifteen of the said Act be amended by adding thereto the following subsection :

(2) In the case of goods shipped to Canada on consignment, when such goods have not been sold by the exporter thereof prior to their arrival in Canada, the owner or his agent or consignee shall deliver to the collector such documents and information as he requires, including statements showing the terms and conditions on which the goods are to be sold, accounted for, or disposed of in Canada, as an aid in the appraisement of such consigned goods.

6. That section two hundred and twenty-seven of the said Act be repealed, and the following provisions substituted therefor :

227. Every one is guilty of an offence, and liable for such offence, on summary conviction before two justices of the peace, or police magistrate, or other magistrate having the powers of two justices of the peace, to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars and not less than ten dollars, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or to both, who without written authority of the collector or other proper officer of customs—

(a) by any contrivance gains access to bonded goods in a railway car, or to goods in a railway car, upon which goods the customs duties have not been paid ; or

(b) delivers bonded or other goods upon which customs duties have not been paid, or aids or abets such delivery ; or

(c) (except in consequence of accident to the car) unloads or removes from any car any bonded or other goods upon which customs duties have not been paid, or aids or abets such unloading or removal ; or

(d) contrary to the order of the collector at any port of entry, distributes any car or cars on a track or siding not designated by the collector for holding the same at such port, when any of the cars contains imported goods in bonds or, under customs manifests to be entered at customs at that port, or aids or abets such distribution.

2. The collector at any port of entry in Canada, may (subject to the directions of the Minister of Customs), designate the railway tracks, sidings, yards and places within the limits of the port, whereon there may be placed and held cars containing imported goods on which customs duties have not been paid, pending the delivery of such goods under the permit of the collector, or their transfer to authorized customs warehouses, or their removal under customs regulations.

7. That section ninety-nine of the said Act be amended by adding the following subsection thereto :

(5) Every person who desires to export any article manufactured in Canada which is subject to a bounty from the government of Canada when for home consumption and not for exportation, including steel blooms and steel billets made in Canada, shall file his written application with the collector at the nearest customs house, for permission to export the same. Such applications shall be accompanied by the affidavit of a person having a knowledge of the facts, setting forth and describing the articles proposed to be exported and establishing to the satisfaction of the collector, that bounty has not been paid and will not be claimed on or in respect of the said described articles, or if bounty has been paid thereon, or in respect thereof, that the same has been refunded to the government,

The collector may then grant his permission for the exportation of the said described articles. If any of such articles be laden in any railway carriage or other vehicle, or vessel, for the purpose of being exported, without the permission of the collector of customs as aforesaid, the same shall be seized and forfeited.

8. That section ninety of the said Act be amended by adding thereto the following words :

Provided that an allowance not exceeding two per cent per annum, nor exceeding eight per cent in the whole in any case, may be made for deficiencies in measurement of wines and spirit in cask, arising from natural causes, after such wines and spirits have been entered for warehouse, and prior to the ex-warehousing thereof, under regulations of the Governor in Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman intend to take that up on any particular date ?

Mr. PATERSON. No. Not to-morrow.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Minister of Customs is now proposing to change the Customs law, and I wish to ask him in that connection if he is making any provision for the enforcement of the Customs Act which he is asking parliament to amend ?

Mr. PATERSON. As far as I know, the Customs Act is very well enforced.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I can show the minister, and I will show him later on, that it is not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUND.

Amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 68) to establish the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railways employees' provident fund—Mr. Emmerson—read the first time.

Mr. EMMERSON moved that the said amendments be now read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the amendments ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are not of very great import. One enables female employees to come under the provisions of the Act. Another provides that the physician shall be a duly qualified medical practitioner.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How many women are employed on the railway now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At all terminal points charwomen are employed to clear cars. I do not know how many at the different points. There is one other amendment where they leave out the words 'and are not reinstated' on page 5, lines 4 and 5. That relates to employees who have been dismissed for misconduct. Under the Bill, as it left this House, any of these men might have been so dismissed, but having been reinstated they could come under the provisions of the Act. The Senate, in their wisdom, have seen fit to make it impossible to reinstate a man who has once been dismissed for cause. There is some force in that and I am accepting the amendment, although I have known of cases in which men were dismissed, under some misapprehension of the facts, and where the matter came under review, they were reinstated. That is not now possible—that is so as to enable a man to come under the provisions of the Act or get any of the benefit flowing from the operation of this Act.

Motion agreed to, and amendment read the second time and concurred in.

DOMINION LANDS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 10—application for entry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was discussing with the minister on Friday evening the importance of having the books and records open to public inspection, either with or without the payment of a small fee. The minister, while justifying to some extent the practice which has prevailed in the past, was inclined to think that the time had probably now come when some change might be made in the practice in that regard. It seems to me that this section would be a very good place for making such an amendment.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Having gone into the matter pretty carefully with the officers of the department, I would not like to take the responsibility at present of making the change my hon. friend suggests. No doubt in some parts of the country the change would be a very proper one but in others it would not. It would depend upon the conditions of settlement and of the settlers. In a land district where the greater part of the land had already been taken up, and it was a matter merely of getting the land under entry, no doubt the provision would be quite proper. But in other parts, where new settlers are coming in and undergoing all the difficulties of pioneer life, the policy would be a doubtful one and contrary to the principle which has been hitherto maintained in the administration of the Lands Department, and would give speculative claim jumpers the advantage of using the records and books of these offices for advancing their own interests at the expense of the pioneer settler.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The objection to the present system is that it encourages speculative homestead entries.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot agree with my hon. friend that the present system encourages speculative homestead entries ; and I think he would have to agree with me that the proposition of the leader of the opposition would certainly assist speculative claim-jumping.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How could it ?

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend cannot agree with me, of course, we cannot agree—that is all.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am open to conviction, and would be pleased if the minister will allow the knowledge that John Jones occupies a certain quarter-section could possibly affect his claim to that quarter-section or facilitate any body dispossessing him. The minister knows,—or, if he does not know his agents can tell him—that when one goes to a land office anywhere in the Northwest and asks who is the homesteader of such and such a quarter-section, he is refused the information. If the occupant is a bona fide settler, his name is known, but the date of entry cannot be ascertained. Now, you cannot get it out of the heads of the people that there are hundreds of claims held for purely speculative purposes. I have always held that, in every land office there should be a plan of each township showing not only every quarter-section open to homesteading, but every quarter-section taken up for homestead, who occupies it and the date of his entry. As it is now, a man looking for a homestead finds a place with no im-

provements upon it, but when he goes to the land office, he is coolly told by the agent that it is taken up, but the name is withheld. The would be settler may have spent two or three hundred dollars going about trying to find a homestead, but that makes no difference to the agent. Who are holding all these homesteads out of settlement in the Northwest? The minister's plan will perpetuate that system but the plan of the leader of the opposition would open the land to honest settlement.

Mr. TURRIFF. The intending settler can always get information whether the land is available for entry. Any settler can go into a land office and find half a dozen township plans giving the land available for homestead entry in these respective townships.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the land that has been entered for, perhaps, two or three years, and not occupied?

Mr. TURRIFF. The suggestion of the leader of the opposition and the member for Victoria would do just what the Minister of the Interior says it would—it would lend great assistance to the men who make a business of claim jumping. If these men could find out exactly who had each quarter-section and the exact day when the six months' term was up, they would be able to cancel the claim of many a bona fide settler who might be prevented by unavoidable circumstances from coming back to his homestead exactly on time. Another drawback would be the interference with the work of the office. I have often seen from twenty-five to fifty men standing in line in the land office awaiting their turn. If any one were entitled to go in and make an examination of the books, the work of the office would be tied up and the bona fide settlers would be delayed in their business. I can understand that in some parts of the country the idea of the leader of the opposition would work well, but if you try it everywhere it would greatly delay homestead entries by bona fide settlers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) mean that there are sometimes forty or fifty people standing in line who desire to inspect the public record and are denied that privilege?

Mr. TURRIFF. They are there for the purpose of making entry and learning the lands that are most available for homesteading. But if half a dozen of them wished to go in and examine the books to ascertain what lands are available, it would certainly delay the work of the office.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see that. The person in charge of the office should be ready at all times with a statement to show what lands are available. The facts could be announced, or they could be shown on a map on the wall. I do not think there is any difficulty in that respect. But I start out with the general proposition that the public records touching the public domain of this country ought to be open to the people of this country. Is there any reason why that should not be? The hon. member (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. Minister of the Interior say that publicity will encourage claim jumping, I should think, on the contrary, that secrecy would encourage claim jumping. The only man who is entitled to cancel a claim is the bona fide settler, the man who intends to take up a claim himself. You can place as many safeguards upon his bona fides as you think fit. I cannot see that there is any argument here against publicity. As a matter of fact, the minister told us, last session, or the session before, that under this scheme of secrecy, a great many homesteads had been taken up by those who were not bona fide settlers. These claim jumpers had been able to hold up many claims year after year as against intending settlers. You cannot have a much worse condition of affairs than that described by the minister himself. The principle of publicity has worked well in the other provinces, and I do not understand that in their administration of public lands the difficulties have arisen of which the minister speaks. The hon. member for East Assiniboia and the Minister of the Interior say that this may be a good principle for some part of the country. The minister spoke of districts in which the greater part of the homestead lands had been taken up. Well, if it is a good principle there, surely it is a good principle where nearly all the lands are open for homesteading. If it is good where homesteads have been taken up and there is opportunity for claim jumping, surely there can be no argument against it where no claims have been made, and where, consequently, there can be no claim jumping. I venture to still further insist that the principle of publicity is a good principle, and ought not to be abandoned in this instance unless better arguments are urged against it than have been advanced up to this time.

Mr. LENNOX. The statement of the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) as to the people waiting in line in the land offices does not present great difficulty, I think. What you need is that there shall be a knowledge on the part of the people and of the official that there is a public record accessible to the public. Even though that record is open, the public need not avail themselves of it all the time. If you have forty or fifty making entry, the official announces whether or not a lot is open for homesteading. If the law provides that the person making the inquiry can verify the truthfulness of the answer, you will not very often have the demand made for the pro-

duction of the record. He feels that the officer dare not tell him what is not true; he knows that the person making the application can verify the answer immediately. When you have that safeguard you will have an honest administration of the office, whereas with the present law there is a feeling in the minds of the public, not altogether unfounded, that in some cases there is not an honest administration of the office and that A, B or C makes application for an entry and is told that that lot has already been taken, whereas in fact it has not been taken. Let there be a record kept, let the books of the office be open to the examination of any person who wishes to test the accuracy of the statement of an official, and you will not have a great rush of people to examine the records but every one will feel he can verify statements made to him and an obligation will be put on the official to tell the truth. There is no such obligation now, and there can be claim-jumping and fraud of various kinds. In all public business a written record should be kept open to all people who have occasion to consult it.

Mr. BARR. Secrecy in connection with the public domain is a very dangerous power to place in the hands of any body of men. Few who have had experience with lands agents will dissent from the statement that it would be well for the country to have publicity, and that so long as these matters are kept secret there is danger of the present want of confidence increasing. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) that it would be most dangerous to allow the agents full power to cancel claims or change them from one to another according to the political complexion of the applicants, and just so long as we have this secrecy there will be danger of such frauds. Therefore it would be to the interest of the government and of every honest land agent that there should be full opportunity to ascertain whether certain lands are either now available or will be available in the near future. Why should this information not be open to the public? Why should not a land seeker be able to ascertain whether certain lands would be opened within a month or three months? Is it not to the interest of the government that this should be done? The present system might be an advantage to the government if they desired to have land settled by men who would vote in a ertain way, and I believe that to-day there is too much of that sort of thing going on and that it will continue so long as the power is vested in the land agents. It would be better if land seekers would enter the land office as we can a registry office and find out how the land stands and when land would come into the market so that if those in whose names the lands are entered do not fulfil the requirements of the law, others might enter for them. If we had publicity in all these matters, it would be better for all concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. A great number of the omplaints we receive from the west are from people desirous of getting homesteads and are that, although there is a large amount of unoccupied land, they cannot secure information as to when that land was taken up. If a seeker for land knew that a certain homestead had been entered for within the last six or eight months, he would not waste time looking after it, but with land entered for two or three or five years ago, there is a chance of the conditions not being fulfilled; perhaps the land is still vacant but when these seekers go to the land office, they find they cannot enter for these lands. Surely it is not reasonable to allow any man's entry for a homestead to stand for three or four years, yet it will not be cancelled until some person applies for cancellation. Land seekers would not hesitate to apply for a cancellation of an entry dating that far back, but if they knew they were entered for five or six months before it is not likely the land seekers would pay attention to the entry because they would expect the applicant to take possession of the homestead. That is the position of affairs all over that country. I have letter after letter telling me that land has been entered for three or four years ago and that there is no person on it yet. I have brought two or three cases before the minister, or the department, one which he will remember on Saturday last, and in some of these cases it is two years since the entries were made, other parties have been desirous of having them cancelled but they will not be cancelled until application for cancellation is made and the sixty days are up during which that party has an opportunity to go on the homestead. One of the first requisites to remedy that state of affairs is publicity. In the newer parts of Ontario this was one of the most annoying things settlers had to contend with. The land seeker would get from the agent a list of lands open for settlement and would be told to inspect them and make first, second and third selections. He would return and say that he has selected a particular farm, but would be informed that it had been entered for while he was away. The agent would not say who had made the entry but years and years afterwards it was found that friends of the land agents had had their names entered in that way. It was all manipulated through the land office, some friend of the agent would purchase the right to enter and give consideration for it, whereas in reality there never was a bona fide entry. It was found that the agent had permitted improper entries to be made which could

never have been made had he been obliged to give publicity to his transactions as do all other offices dealing with the public lands. I have no doubt that the same thing has taken place in the Northwest. There was a case that came within my knowledge where a land agent accepted entry for a homestead. The party never resided three weeks on the land in his life but he held it, finally got his deed, mortgaged the land and raised money on it. If it had been known who had the entry of that land a great many people in the district would have known that the party was not living in that locality at all and that he did not intend to live in it. But it was managed so well that he got his deed for the land and afterwards mortgaged it, and it it safe to say that he could not have done that except through the connivance of the land agent. Whether the land agent was paid a consideration for allowing this to be done or not I do not know, but if parties desiring to make entry for that land had known that the duties had not been performed and had known who had made the entry previously the scheme could not have been carried out in the way it was. I have reason to believe that in many cases, through connivance between the land agent and individuals, these homesteads have been held not for five or six months but for some years and that they are being so held to-day because they understand each other and the entries have not been cancelled. The land agents will not allow a cancellation of them. If you have publicity it will bring about a different state of things, it will establish the fact that in many cases there is wrong being done and it will prevent the possibility of it. These things have remained so long hidden that the people cannot know of them. When the facts are brought to light the people will be able to take advantage of these homestead entries that were made years ago for lands on which the parties never intended to locate and the country would be settled up much more rapidly than it is being settled at the present time.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I think that at the last session of parliament the Minister of the Interior stated that it was his intention in order to put an end to what is known as fake homesteading, to have his officials make their inspection and where they visited a quarter-section and found that the homestead duties were not done, to cancel the entry without an application having been made by any other applicant to have it cancelled. I would ask the minister if that principle has been carried into effect in this legislation, or if it is necessary to have a person make application for the cancellation of an entry where the duties have not been fulfilled instead of empowering his officials to take action themselves, or if this is to remain exactly in the same position in which it used to be; that is that it is necessary to have an application made on behalf of some other party in order to secure the cancellation of an entry.

Mr. OLIVER. The law as proposed in this Bill is, in that regard, exactly the same as the law in the present Act. There is no provision in either the present Act or this proposed Bill for the case which my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) speaks of. It was thought last year that in certain parts of the country there had been considerable blanketing of homesteads and because of that special condition, under the authority which is vested in the minister, an arrangement was made which provided for cancellation on the responsibility of the department without waiting for an application for cancellation. That was a proper procedure under these circumstances but it would not have been a proper procedure to apply it all over the country. That procedure was applied in parts of the country which were largely settled, where the proportion of unprotected entries was comparatively small and where the question of cancellation was a very live and important one. But, it would not have been in the interests of settlement to have arbitrarily applied that policy of cancellation in the newer and more sparsely settled parts of the country because there is no doubt that a very severe blow would have been given to settlement; that is that many poor settlers who did not happen to have gone into the occupation of their land in time would have been deprived of their entry, they would have sustained a considerable loss and the settlement of the country would have been held back to that extent. After all it is the man who has gone out into the country, who has appeared at the land office and made entry whose land is inspected, who has paid his fee and who, so to speak, puts his life in the balance against this particular quarter-section, who is entitled to consideration and that is the man to whom we want to give consideration and to whom consideration has been given in the administration of the land law ever since there was a land law, with the exception of one short period.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not think that where a man has made an entry and has remained away from his homestead without giving any reason of his inability to go upon it the government should be entitled to cancel that entry without inquiry? If he had given reasons from time to time and they had been acceptable to the department I could understand it, but where a man makes an entry without any intention of going on the land and remains away for several years it seems to me that cancellation should take place as a matter of course. I am told that there are lots of cases where entries were made five years ago, where nothing has been done in the direction of the performance of the duties and that still

these entries are held. Does the minister think that it is proper under such circumstances to hold such land and prevent others from settling upon it?

Mr. OLIVER. In the law as it stands there is nothing to prevent the arbitrary cancellation of a homestead entry by the authority of the minister?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is that ever done?

Mr. OLIVER. Last year we entered upon a campaign in certain parts of the country where it seemed to be desirable and it was done in something like a thousand cases. We thought that the evil had grown so great that it ought to be grappled with. What I am trying to point out to the committee is that as conditions differ in different parts of the country it is right and proper that there should not be an even hand in the administration of what appears to be the same law, but that in order to secure the best results we have to be lenient in one place where we have to be stringent in another place. It must strike my hon. friend that the practice which has been in existence ever since this Dominion government was charged with the administration of the public lands of the Northwest must have some reason for it although it may not appear upon the face. It is a practice that has existed in the Northwest ever since the Dominion government has administered the lands there. There was a short time during which there was an exception to that principle when, for one reason or another, under the late government, the principle of automatic cancellation was adopted, or if not automatic cancellation, a principle akin to what my hon. friend has suggested that the claim jumper should have every facility for carrying out his work. That principle was adhered to in the administration for a few months—I do not think it lasted a year—and it was abandoned by the same government which had entered upon it and was never resumed.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the experience in the locality in which the minister says a thousand claims were cancelled? Was it good or bad?

Mr. OLIVER. It was perfectly good there.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. What I am trying to say is that under the conditions existing in some parts of the country it is perfectly right that there should be all the publicity that the hon. leader of the opposition has suggested. A statutory provision would apply to all parts of the country, whether they are suitable for its application or not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister please point out how this publicity, will interfere with this discretion to grant an extension of time for good and sufficient reasons? I can tell the minister that those who get extensions of time honestly are nearly all known, and the men we want to get at are those who are holding these mysterious sections. If John Jones has not completed his homestead duties, give him all reasonable time to do so if he is an honest citizen, but let his name be published. The publicity does not interfere with the minister's power to extend the time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is a very important one. Publicity will not interfere with the discretion of the minister, but it will attach a certain publicity to his acts, which I am certain he does not dread. Let me remind the minister that the man whom he calls a 'claim jumper' may be a bona fide settler, and the man whose claim is jumped may be a speculator. Of course there may be a case where the speculator tries to jump the claim of a bona fide settler, but 'claim jumper' is not necessarily a term of reproach. If a bona fide settler goes to the west he has a right to know whether certain land is held by a speculator, and he has a right to make his claim for cancellation and to oust the speculator. Publicity does not interfere with the discretion of the minister, and if that discretion is exercised along proper, and honest and straightforward lines, as we should assume it will be, then, publicity is better not only for the people of the country, but for the minister and the government.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. As it is now, the thing is arranged by a deal between the homesteader and the land agent. I would infinitely prefer to have it a deal between the homesteader and the people of Canada, through the minister. If by reason of illness or any other proper cause, a man is unable to carry out his homestead duties, every one would endorse the minister in giving an extension of time. But, for goodness sake let us know who are supposed to be on these lands. The adventurer has the advantage under the present system, and if the bona fide settler could find out who that adventurer is, then he would have the right to jump the adventurer's claim. As to the argument of the minister, that the time of these land agents would be taken up by the number of people asking for information, that difficulty can easily be gotten over. The minister knows as well as I do that there is very little land left in that country for homesteading, and now that the land is becoming valuable we want to get at these speculators. Let there be a map hung up in the land office, and let the man's name and the date of his entry be written on each quarter-section. Then, the bona fide settler can see at a glance what lands are available and who owns them.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The only argument advanced by the minister against publicity, is, that it will be an encouragement to the claim jumper. Well, if a bona fide homesteader made the original entry he need have nothing to fear from publicity, for if a 'claim jumper' came along the bona fide settler would have had an application in the department for an extension of time if he were not able to fulfil his duties within the statutory limit. It is the 'claim jumper' and speculator who have to fear publicity. I would prefer to see arbitrary power placed in the hands of the government inspector, rather than to have the present system continued. The homestead inspectors could know from the local land agents whether good reasons had been assigned for extension. I would not bind the homesteader down to a year, or a year and a half if he gave good reasons. If the homesteader did not make some reasonable effort to fulfil his duties, I would rather see the inspector have the authority to cancel, than to have the thing held up for years as it is now, and the speculator allowed to thrive. It will not be the bona fide settler who will be injured by publicity; it will be the speculative homesteader. It is not a new thing to hear of collusion between land agents and speculators. The hon. gentleman who last year expressed surprise to hear of such a thing as fake homesteading had their answer to-day in the announcement of the Minister of the Interior, that no less than 1,000 entries have been cancelled during the past year. I think it was my genial friend from Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) who told us he had to come to Ottawa to hear that there was any such thing as fake homesteading, but now he learns that 1,000 homesteads have been cancelled.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Does the hon. gentleman say there was any fake homesteading within my constituency? It is the only place for which I was empowered to speak.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I do not know where the cancellations took place, but I do not think there is anything in the argument of the Minister of the Interior, that publicity would be beneficial in one locality and not beneficial in another. The hon. member for East. Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) spoke of inconvenience, but the inconvenience could be easily overcome, and anyway, whatever inconvenience might ensue would be more than offset by the benefits which will be derived by bona fide settlers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The bona fide settler does not require any collusion with the land agent; the speculator does. That collusion cannot take place when there is publicity. That is the whole thing in a nut shell. What public records are kept in the land office?

Mr. OLIVER. There is a book with a description of each quarter-section in the township, the date of the entry, the applicant, and all particulars in regard to it. There are other books contingent upon that, but that is what you might call the day book.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there documents kept on file?

Mr. OLIVER. The correspondence is kept on file and the land office book contains the actual condition of every entry so far as the land agent is aware. In regard to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Marquette as to the power of arbitrary cancellation by order of the minister, that of course is in the Act as it is in effect at present, and it is a very necessary and proper power; but I think it is a power that should not be exercised indiscriminately or acted on automatically. My hon. friend is good enough to say that it would be right that the minister should have a little discretion in giving an extension of time to a bona fide settler for good and sufficient reasons; but will my hon. friend remember that during the last year there were over 40,000 homestead entries, the year before some 30,000, and the year before that some 25,000; and any of those hundred thousand entries may come under the requirement for an extension of time? This discretion is given to the minister, not to benefit the speculator or the speculative homesteader, but to assist the man who is dependent on the money he can earn by labour off the claim, in order to make good his title to it. That is a matter of fact, and the very first land Act was framed with that in view. It required residence for six months on the claim, so that the holder of the claim might be six months off it in order to earn the wherewithal to prove upon it. That is the principle of the Act, that the man may be off his claim for half the time, and it is under that principle that the country has been settled. I have known hundreds of cases of men having had to go from the district where I have lived to work in the lumber woods of British Columbia to earn a litle money; and if a man is not home on the day after the end of that six months, is his claim to be up for cancellation?

Mr. LAKE. Cannot the minister still grant him leave of absence?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, the minister can grant him leave of absence. We have to deal with men who are not versed in the letter of the law, who are living a thousand or two thousand miles away from headquarters where this leave is granted, who may not know beforehand that they will require the leave. If we are going to give consideration only to those homesteaders who have secured leave of absence from the central authority, we are going to work a very severe hardship and

cause a very severe loss to those on whom we are dependent for the building up of our country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the minister tell me this? Some claim jumper notifies the department that John Jones, of a certain quarter-section, has not been on his place for a certain length of time, and has not complied with the settlement duties. What is the procedure in that case?

Mr. OLIVER. Any person may apply for the cancellation of any homestead. If a man goes into the land office and applies for the cancellation of a certain homestead, it is not necessary that he should know in whose name the homestead is entered or any other particulars about it beyond the fact that the settlement duties have not been fulfilled.

Mr. LAKE. How can he tell that if he does not know the date of the entry?

Mr. OLIVER. If he has been observant of the land and the conditions, he will know.

Mr. LAKE. He might be a new comer.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely; he is a stranger and that is the whole argument—that the stranger shall have the advantage over the man who has settled in the country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The point I make is that the minister has to intervene. He may say, Mr. Jones has not done his settlement duties, but he has done pretty well, and we will give him an extension, and the claim jumper is turned right about. If the time of the entry were known in the neighbourhood, the claim jumper would not go in. I know of a case, and the minister knows it, in which a man, no doubt in collusion with the land agent, jumped a claim on which the holder had built a House and had broken up scores of acres. The settler got notice to leave in a few days; but the neighbours gave the adventurer to understand that if he came there he would be treated to a coat of tar and feathers. In such a case the neighbours can be trusted to see that fair-play is done.

Mr. OLIVER. In the instance which the hon. gentleman mentions the actual settler on the homestead had not made entry for it. That was the whole trouble.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He thought he had made entry. It was not his fault.

Mr. OLIVER. The books did not show that he had made entry. Under the system of publicity which my hon. friend suggests, his friend would have lost his place.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all. He would have known that he had not entered for it. That man had made his entry, but by some mistake it was not recorded.

Mr. OLIVER. As a matter of fact he did not make his entry, although he was in occupation of the place, and therefore the books of the land office did not and could not give him protection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was not an application made for it?

Mr. OLIVER. A stranger, and I verily believe a claim jumper, heard or was informed that there was land at that particular place. I do not know that he went to see the land; but I believe he knew that there was some person in occupation of it before he made entry. He then undertook to put the occupant off.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Publicity would not have injured any one in that case. Further, is not the applicant obliged to declare when he makes application that there is no one on occupation?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would be a saving clause. Publicity could not have made it any harder for that man, who thought he had made an entry, but had not.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If I understood the minister correctly, he said that the record gave the applicant's name and the date of application. I suppose if there is a cancellation, there is also a record of the date in that same book. Is there any way in which the public can have access to that record? Are they allowed to go into a land office and examine it on the payment of a fee?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no provision for any person demanding an examination of the books.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I claim there should be. I claim that the public should have the same access to the books as in a registrar's office. It would be quite legitimate to demand a fee, but I cannot see why there should not be the same provision in this case as in the case of a registry office.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister gave as a reason why we should not make a change, that this provision has been on our statutes in every Land Act up to the present. Well, it may be consequently by age but time has shown its defects. One of its results is that it keeps certain localities from being settled. Another reason given by the minister is that the power has always been vested in him of arbitrary cancelling.

Mr. OLIVER. Of arbitrary cancelling when there is default.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the statement made from the department and the question has been submitted to the department over and over again. Will he just consider the case that I saw him

about on Saturday? An entry was made three years ago and nothing done on the land ever since. A party from Ontario went up with his family seeking land. He applied at the land office for permission to cancel that claim, the entry for which was made over three years ago. But although the man in whose name the entry was made was never in the country and has no intention of ever coming there, and has not made the slightest improvement on the land, this other man, who desired to take possession and become a settler, is told that that entry cannot be cancelled except through the usual procedure of applying for cancellation and waiting for sixty days. I understand from the minister that now he can cancel at any time if he is satisfied that the facts warrant cancellation. I think that right should vest in the minister because that would remove many hardships. The operation of the present law has shown that it is defective and that publicity would largely get rid of the defects. I could cite several cases somewhat similar to the one I have given. Entries were made for parties who never intended going to the country and who were simply acting in collusion with other people. In some instances the object was to secure the advantage of grazing cattle, in others to hold the land until certain individuals came of age, in others because there was a likelihood of these lands becoming town sites. In such cases the minister should be free to cancel the entry and give the land to bona fide homesteaders. I know of instances where men went in from Ontario desirous of getting homesteads and who left the country in disgust because they could not succeed, and yet there were lands locked up through entries having been made, as long back as five years, by men who had no intention of settling, and who had never made any improvements. Does the minister think it wise that he should continue the law as it is?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I do not think the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite will cure the evil of blanketing lands. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) was good enough to say I had made a certain statement a year or so ago regarding blanketing which had since been disproved. I would like to make myself clear in that particular. The statement I made then was that I was not aware of any homestead blanketing in my constituency or province. I also said that this was a matter which, under the present law, could not be overcome. I do not believe that this change in the provision suggested by the hon. the leader of the opposition would meet the case.

Mr. SPROULE. Why?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. In this particular. The true blanketing of lands is not the holding of lands by a bona fide homesteader. A man may be unable, owing to bad health, to live out on the prairies and must live close to medical aid, and in such a case I think the minister should have the discretionary power to allow him to continue holding the land. We are all agreed on that. But what really is blanketing is when a man files a claim to a homestead, who never intends to become a settler. Take the conditions as they exist in the west to-day. Every man, regardless of nationality who has not already entered for a homestead, can go into any of the western provinces and enter for a homestead on the payment of $10. Here is where the blanketing comes in. People coming from the United States on a visit know that if they guarantee the railway company which brings them in that they intend to become bona fide settlers, they will get a return fare of one cent a mile. What evidence do they give that they intend to become bona fide settlers? They take out an application for an entry on a quarter-section. What would the publicity of that entry matter to a man living in Wisconson or Illinois? He would not care whether his name was placarded or not. The publicity would not prevent a man making an entry and his entry would hold good for a year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. McIntyre) must have misunderstood the point of my remarks. I did not advocate publicity as a panacea for blanketing. I was laying down the principle that public records respecting the public domain ought to be open to the public unless some good reason could be put forward for keeping them secret, and that, up to the present time, I have not heard any good reason against this publicity. The minister himself raised this question of blanketing and claim-jumping; and I endeavoured to point out, as my belief is, that publicity would not increase claim-jumping, but would operate against it. I may be wrong in that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. W. McIntyre) seems to think I am. But, even if I am wrong in that, the argument is still left that the records of a public office ought to be open to the public unless there is good reason to the contrary.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would like to ask the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. W. McIntyre) a question. Did he mean to say that Americans in order to get the one-cent-a-mile rate had to take out a homestead entry?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. No, not necessarily. But I said that in going to the proper officer they had the very best of evidence that they are entitled to the return fare by taking it up. And it is their right to take it up. Any passenger from the eastern portion of Canada can do the same, and that

to my mind, is a typical case of blanketing. It was not the leader of the opposition who made the statement concerning blanketing, but the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche). Like the leader of the opposition, I could not see what it had to do with the case. The statement I made still holds good.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from Strathcona is a reasonable man, and I would like to ask him : Does not he believe that the records of a public office, respecting the public domain should be open to the public unless good reason for the contrary course is shown ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I am in sympathy with the hon member (Mr. R. L. Borden) there. I have had four or five years' experience of the homestead law, but I do not pretend to know much about it as some hon. members in this House or to be an expert on the subject. I can see no objection to the statement of the leader of the opposition. But, as the minister has said, these hard and fast rules must not be allowed to increase the restrictions upon the public. The conditions in the outer districts of the west require the same freedom from restriction as heretofore. There are localities where the tightening of the administrative grip would be advisable. But there is this to be said, that the more we leave the matter in the discretionary power of the minister the more closely we come to the ideal method of administration.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is another reason why these records should be made public, and I think the minister will agree with what I am to say. Take a district in which some man has blanketed the homestead but has done no work—such a case as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) pointed out. If the records were public, the name of the holder of the homesteads in question would be known, and, if it were clear that the man had no intention of becoming a settler, his application would be cancelled. But here is the kind of thing that has often occurred within the last few years in the west, as it is charged, and I think as evidence can be brought to show : An intending homesteader goes into a village, gets in with the land men and asks where there are homesteads. He goes to the office and is told that such and such quarter-sections are vacant. He finds that these places are far from town, and, for one reason or another, are not satisfactory. He is approached by some person who tells him that he knows of a homestead that is open, but, of course, it will take a little to secure it ; if the intending settler is ready to whack up $1 or $2 an acre, the place can be secured. The would be settler makes a few inquiries and finds that his informant stands pretty close to the land agent. So he puts up his $320 and gets his homestead. If the public had access to these records, every person as well as the friend of the land agent would know which homesteads were open and there would be no trouble. The lots taken up, with the names of those who have applied for them, could be given on a map. That used to be done ; why is it not done now ? The effect of giving such information would be to open up the land for settlement without the necessity of an arrangement on the basis of $1, $2 or $3 an acre to the friend of the land agent.

Mr. PATERSON. I desire to ask a question for information. All seem to be agreed that, so far as it does not take away discretionary power from the minister, publicity is desirable. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) spoke of two cases in which quarter-sections have been held for three, four or five years, by parties who were known yet who had not performed settlement duties. If there is no publicity, how are these facts ascertained ? And are the facts we ascertained in such a way that one can rely upon them ?

Mr. SPROULE. In the first place, by visiting the land, it is easy to see that improvements have not been made. Then, it can be learned from people in the neighbourhood that the lot was taken up three years ago, or whatever the length of time may be. I have a case before the minister now in which the land was taken up three years ago, by a man in eastern Ontario, who, I am credibly informed never intended to go there. On the other hand, a man from my constituency, went up there ; and, to avoid the need of coming back for the members of his family, he took them with him. He would take up this lot if he could get it. According to his calculation—though I must say I think he is in error—it would take to about July 1 before the application can be cancelled and he can get on the lot. By that time it would be too late to put in a crop and so, he will have lost the year. I am glad the minister has the authority to act in such cases ; this is a case calling for the exercise of his authority. If there were publicity in these matters, it would be possible to write to the man who has taken up the lot asking if he intends to settle. I have no doubt there are cases in which men have entered applications intending to go, but, for a variety of reasons, have been compelled to change their minds. In many cases, these men would not object to stating their position in the matter. Means could be afforded by which on the facts being properly brought to the attention of the right authority, it would be possible to cancel the application and leave the land open for an actual homesteader. We know that these same difficulties existed in Ontario, and the same things were done by the land agents, not in one case but in many cases. The land agents made immense sums of money out of the business. I am not say-

ing that the land agents in the west are making any money out of it, for I do not know the facts, and would be sorry to be understood as making a charge when I have no evidence to support it. The present system prevents the bona fide applicant from getting a homestead owing to this want of publicity. If the policy of publicity is adopted I believe it will remedy the grievance to a large extent and will result in the settlement of many parts of the country years and years sooner than it would otherwise be settled.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The Minister of the Interior did not complete his reply to the question of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) as to the mode of procedure where a person sends in an application to cancel a homestead entry. He dwelt on the hardship it would be to the bona fide settler who, being obliged to spend half a year in the lumber woods to earn sufficient money to erect his buildings and fulfil his homestead duties, would, perhaps, have some claim jumper secure the cancellation of his application; but the minister knows that when the application for cancellation comes into the office one of the first things done is to send a notification to the man in whose name the application stands and he is then allowed 60 days in which to put in his defence. If this policy of publicity were adopted the minister would still have the discretion to decide whether that application for cancellation should be granted or not, on the strength of the defence, so there is no discretion taken from the minister, he has the same privileges as he has to-day, he need not cancel the application unless he sees fit to do so. I think the system of publicity is one that would work out to the advantage of the country as a whole and the more I think of it the more reasonable it seems to me. The minister should allow the section to stand at least until he makes up his mind more definitely as to whether or not he should adopt the suggestion.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 10, paragraph 1,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There does not seem to be anything particularly objectionable in the paragraph except the lack of what I have been already refering to at some length.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that what we have been discussing lately would hardly be appropriate in this particular section any way. Whatever conclusion we come to in regard to this matter would have to be provided for in a new section rather than in an amendment to this or any other section that I am aware of in the Bill. While it is all right to have the discussion no amendment of this kind could be appropriately made to this section.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not especially wedded to discussing it on this section, but it occurred to me that this was a proper place because we have here the reference to the land office and you are making provision for office hours and various details of that kind. I thought it desirable that this subject should be gone into now, but if the minister would prefer to leave it for the present and proceed with the section I have no particular objection.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite appreciate the importance of this question, and I have no objection to carrying on the discussion until we settle exactly what we shall do. The Bill as brought into the House ought not to be absolutely inelastic. It represents in its present form the best efforts that the department could make in adjusting the law to the requirements and conditions. At the same time it must be quite evident that a Bill covering so much ground and touching so many interests might very well be viewed from many different standpoints by many different men. Certainly the Bill cannot suffer any loss by having the freest possible discussion with the fullest possible liberty of amendment in regard to any point.

Mr. SPROULE. You say that the land office shall be open from nine to five or at such other time as the Governor in Council shall fix. Would it not be well to say after that 'during which hours the books of the office shall be open to the inspection of the public.'?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it would be very objectionable to say that the books would be open. I think it would meet every requirement that has been put forward by hon. gentlemen and at the same time interfere with the business of the office in the least degree if we provided that on the payment of a small fee an abstract of the standing of any particular quarter-section could be secured. I think that would probably answer every purpose, as it would interfere very seriously with the work of the office to let any person other than officers of the department handle the books.

Mr. LAKE. I hardly think that would meet the whole case. I cannot see that it would so seriously interfere with the working of the office if the books were placed under the inspection of any man who wanted to make inquiries, not merely as to any particular section, but as to a number of sections lying near or far apart from each other as the case might be. It seemed to me that the whole argument of the Minister of the Interior this afternoon amounted to a plea that the homestead conditions should not be insisted upon. It practically comes to this, that we are drawing up a set of

conditions under which homesteaders may go in and obtain the right to a parcel of free land; then after having spent a good deal of time, as I have no doubt we shall, in drawing up these exact conditions, the minister is of the opinion that we should not enforce them. Anybody who listened to his argument this afternoon and to the argument which was made the other evening by the minister would come to the conclusion that the great mass of homesteaders who went into that country did not carry out their conditions. I think that is not the case. I think the vast majority of them carry them out faithfully enough. I think it is a very dangerous principle to announce that the government is in no way prepared to insist that the conditions shall be carried out. I think the government should be prepared to insist that the conditions should be carried out. But, of course, I understand that there are individual cases arising in which it should be in the discretion of some central authority to give extra leave and to give some concessions to the homesteaders who may not be in a position to carry out those conditions to the letter. It seems to me that having these books open and allowing people to examine them and to make entries for certain lands on that examination in no wise makes it absolutely necessary for the minister to cancel any particular entry when it is proved to him that the conditions are not being carried out. He will be well able to inquire into the circumstances of the case and in certain instances, which I understand are provided for in this Act, if a man is absolutely unable from disability of some kind or other to carry out the conditions to the letter the minister is able to extend the time during which they may be carried out. The minister has spoken as if claim jumping, as he puts it, were a matter of great reproach. I think the secrecy which it is proposed to maintain in regard to the books of the different land offices is encouraging the very worst kind of claim jumping. There is no doubt that there is a great deal of suspicion all through that country that the land offices are in many instances used for the granting of benefits to political friends. Whether that is true, or whether it is not true—and I am not saying it is true in every instance—it certainly has given ground for suspicions that would not exist if the books were open to the fullest inspection of the public. I think it is rather hard upon the officials that they should be open to that suspicion, but it will continue beyond a doubt just as long as secrecy is maintained. It seems to me also that there would not be as great an effort made to jump claims if these books were open. For instance, there is a quarter-section of land in which no improvements have been made, where no one is living and there is no evidence of effective occupation. Every one who comes along and finds that quarter-section of land lying there, puts in his application for cancellation and all that he is told is that it is not open for cancellation. A dozen men might do that and do it in perfect good faith, whereas, if they were able to inspect the books in the land office, they would see at once that an extension of time had been granted or that some special concession had been made in regard to that special entry. There are a considerable number of cases, as the minister admitted, in which bogus entries have been made, and in a few only of the land districts, over 1,000 cancellations were made last spring. Last year we discovered that some of the land agents themselves had called attention to the fact that bogus entries were being made. If we have this publicity which we ask for, all suspicion of collusion between the officials and their friends would disappear. Apropos of that, I shall read some extracts from a letter which I have received. I shall not mention the names because I am not going to vouch for the accuracy of the statement made. I quote it as a sample of the letters I have received, and which no doubt other hon. gentlemen have received, as to bogus entries. The letter says:

> There are plenty of young men here anxious to get homesteads but cannot unless they go a long distance from the railway, while a certain family can hold their homesteads without living on them at all. One member of this family has not lived on his homestead for one week of the time he has had it, and that is over four years, while there are no buildings on his son's homesteads. There is also another man who has a homestead for the same period and has never even seen it.

I cannot vouch for the accuracy of that statement, but that is the kind of information I have received. The letter continues:

> So and so brags that he has had two or three homesteads and he will also have this one or he will tell what he knows, etc.

All this kind of thing would be avoided if people could go to the land office and see exactly how these homesteads stood. There is everything to be gained and very little to be lost by publicity. This question of claim jumping is a bogie. In nine cases out of ten the man who jumps a claim is a bona fide settler and is trying to get possession of the land which was entered for by some one else who does not intend to fulfil the conditions. In many cases claim-jumping is a very good thing, when it is done by those who are willing and anxious to earn their lands and add to the prosperity of the country, to the exclusion of the speculators. I hope the minister will consent to have these books and records open to public inspection as the leader of the opposition has asked.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. The suggestion made by the Minister of the Interior is in line with the practice we have in On-

tario. Any person, by paying a small fee in the registry office, can get the history of any piece of land from the beginning to the present day, and no one ever dreams of asking to see the books in the registry office.

Mr. SPROULE. I would point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Wright) that in the west a man may have to go a long distance to the land office, and naturally when he goes to the land office he would want to know the condition of more than one piece of land. It would be unfair to expect a bona fide settler to pay a fee to get information about the several quarter-sections of land which he might have in view.

Mr. LAKE. The proposal of the Minister of the Interior is, that a man would have to pay twenty-five cents for every single inquiry he makes. He may want information about a dozen quarter-sections, and if he had an opportunity of looking over the records he could find out what he wanted to know without giving trouble to any one.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. If a man cannot pay twenty-five cents he ought not to get the land.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) is not familiar with the law in regard to search in Ontario. The practice and the law is that the books are open to every one, who can look at the entries if they want to. It is only when you get an abstract that you pay the twenty-five cents.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The Minister of the Interior seems to be afraid that if you leave the records of the land office open to inspection the speculator will rush in with applications to cancel entries to homesteads belonging to bona fide settlers who may not have fulfilled the conditions. The payment of a fee will not hamper the speculator, because he can act in collusion with others who will each pay twenty-five cents to get all the particulars they need about entries. The argument of the Minister of the Interior is not tenable. I feel convinced that if it is well known to the public that there is this publicity about entries, in a greater portion of the cases the right will never be exercised. The mere fact of their knowing that they have this means of finding out when, where and by whom those lands were taken will no doubt satisfy them. There has not to my mind been given as yet any good reason for refusing this very reasonable request of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. OLIVER. I was under the impression that I was conceding the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition. If that was not his suggestion, let us know what it is. What the hon. gentleman has said as to the giving of an abstract opening the door to the claim jumper as much as opening the books is quite true. That is why it has not been considered the best policy to adopt that course. The reason for suggesting the giving of an abstract rather than allowing a person desiring information to have control of the books is simply to facilitate the working of the office for the convenience of the public. As my hon. friend from Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has pointed out, when there is a rush of people demanding entries and information at the land office, to allow some individual to have control of the books for such time as might suit him, would certainly be productive of great inconvenience to the public. If it is decided to be sound public policy to give out information, any person who wants that information can get it just as easily by means of an abstract as by handling the books.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not objecting to the abstract; but a person might want to get information about several lots, and he would have to pay a fee for each one.

Mr. OLIVER. The fee might be large or small, or there might be no fee. What I am suggesting is that if any individual wants to know the standing of any particular quarter-section or any number of quarter-sections, he can apply for that information, and it can be given to him on the written authority of the agent then or later. The difference between that and his having the right to demand an inspection of the books is that he can put in his application in writing, if he pleases, and the answer can be made and handed out to him at a time when the business of the office is not urgent. He will get his information just the same, and the convenience of the public will not be interfered with. The question of the fee for the abstract is a detail. There may be no fee at all, or it may be very trifling; but every object that would be attained by permitting access to the books would be attained by getting the information asked for by means of an abstract. My hon. friend has said that the idea of there being such a thing as speculative claim jumping is a bogy—that it is the bona fide settler who is the claim jumper. My hon. friends are surely not acquainted with the facts, or they would be aware that one of the greatest evils in connection with land speculation in the west during the last few years has been this. The odd numbered sections were held by the railway companies, who turned them over to speculative holders of one kind or another; and it was the principal leverage in the successful handling of these railway lands that the speculator who held a block or a section or a quarter-section, as the case might be, would go into a land office and apply for the cancellation of all the homesteads in the township. Then, having found a buyer for a quarter-section of railroad lands he would sell that subject to being able to secure a quarter-section of free homestead lands for the

buyer, which he did by means of claim jumping or cancellation. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that that was the system that was carried out and it was the worst abuse we had to contend with in the west; and to give this land speculator the inside information which enables him to get under the legitimate settler and oust him from his holding because he happens to be a few days short of the requirement, is a very dangerous practice. At the same time, there is much to be said for publicity. Speaking for the Department of the Interior and its administration, there is no desire to avoid publicity. What the leader of the opposition says is very true, that it would be better for the department, speaking only as a department, to have the publicity that is suggested. It is not in the interest of the department that we take the position we do, but it is because of the experience we have had in the administration of the land, and with a view to protecting the interest of the legitimate settler. My hon. friends have mentioned that there have been complaints from the Northwest in regard to the improper holding of homesteads. If those homesteads are held improperly, and if they know it, it is evident that it is not the lack of publicity which prevents the cancellation, whatever else it may be, because they must know that the homesteaders are in default, or they would not be able to tell the story they do. My hon. friend read a list of complaints that some person had put in. These complaints might be well founded or not. In one case, he said, a young man had a homestead, and had not been on it during the whole time he held it. Possibly under the law he did not have to be. Such cases as that occur very frequently. I think it would be well for our hon. friends to bear in mind that while they have heard complaints with regard to the overholding of homestead rights if they will consider the proportion of complaints as against the total volume of homesteads, they will see that so far from there having been general ground of objection to the system that has been followed, it is to be strongly commended. Out of about 100,000 homesteaders in the last three years, what proportion does the small number of complaints we have heard amount to? It is the success of the majority that is the test of sound policy and sound legislation, not the complaints of the minority; and when the satisfied majority is of such great proportion and the complaining minority of such small proportion, it seems to me there is ground rather for continuing the practice as it is than for changing it. However, as it would relieve the department from suspicion, which our hon. friends are certainly doing their best to foster and increase, I would be quite willing to provide for the giving of information as it would be called for from the offices.

Mr. LAKE. I do not think the minister is justified in saying that the members of the opposition are doing their best to foster and increase suspicion against the land agents and offices.

Mr. OLIVER. I might alter that by saying that they are doing their worst.

Mr. LAKE. Of course the hon. gentleman is well known to be very bitter in some of his opinions but I insist that he is absolutely unjust in the charge he has made. He must be singularly ignorant of what is going on throughout the country if he does not know that there are lots of complaints. I am not prepared to say personally whether these complaints are well founded or not, but I propose to read a reply which the hon. gentleman gave himself to a question I put to him on the 28th of January last regarding the manner in which a certain homestead had been protected by the department, although one man after another had put in applications for its cancellation. And I suppose others will go on putting in applications for cancellation so long as they are not certain how long this land is to be protected by the department. This is the answer I got:

The southwest quarter-section 24, township 21, range 8, west second meridian, was entered for as a homestead by Thomas E. Bradley on the 30th October, 1902. On the 29th January, 1905———

Rather more than two years later.

On the 29th January, 1905, application was made by Jacob Ley for an inspection with a view to cancellation. The entry was protected until the 16th March, 1905. Application was made again October, 1905 and on the 25th of that month the agent at Regina was instructed to have a report on the homestead by the inspector. That report showed that there was a frame house of the estimated value of $50 on the land and that eight acres had been broken. the inspector recommended that the entrant should be notified to comply with the regulations or forfeit the entry. The entrant was notified that unless a satisfactory explanation of failure was given within thirty days the entry might be cancelled. He replied that he was going to put crop in, do more breaking and erect a stable right away. The entry was protected until the 1st November, 1906, and the entrant was again notified that failure to comply with regulations would result in cancellation. On 19th November a sworn statement was received from Valentine Unterschutz stating that having examined the quarter-section he found no building thereon; that not more than five acres had been broken, and that no cultivation had been done in the past two years. On 26th November, John Bradley, father of the entrant, wrote stating that his son had been living with him on a homestead two miles from the quarter-section in question, which the inspector at Brandon had told him would do in lieu of living on his own homestead.

I have a statement to the effect—which I shall not vouch for—that that was not the

case and that Thomas E. Bradley was not living with his father at all.

On 22nd December, 1906, the father was notified that cancellation proceedings would be abandoned but that his son must faithfully comply with cultivation duties next season.

That is a simple statement of the case. I have no doubt whatever that the department has been besieged with applications for cancellation, and on very good ground. The people know that the homestead duties have not been done, there are a large number of young men in the neighbourhood wanting homesteads, and naturally they put in applications for cancellation. But if they knew how long this entry was going to be protected, they would wait until that time expired.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what bearing the case cited can have on the question under discussion. In that case there certainly seems to have been all the publicity necessary to warrant the applications for cancellations. This afternoon my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen opposite were strongly of the opinion that the minister should have discretion with regard to extending the homestead privileges. Well, that discretion was exercised in that particular case. What is my hon. friend complaining about? Does he not want the extension or the publicity?

Mr. LAKE. I consider that when an extension is given for cause, that should be shown in the books of the land office. I would like very much to know what were the reasons for the extension of time in this particular case. There must have been very strong reasons, considering the failure of the entrant to carry out his duties. The minister apparently was ready to grant an extension of time simply on the promise that the homesteader would do better another year. Although I am in favour of giving some discretion to the minister, still I think that an extension should be given only for some definite cause, such as disability from illness.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not familiar with the case in question, but from the facts recited by my hon. friend, this young man was entitled to hold his land because he was living with his father. Therefore the fact that he was not residing on the land itself during three years is not a warrant for cancellation. The fact that the improvements he made were not large was against him, but on the other hand this boy may have been one of a class I have mentioned before. He and his father may have been struggling as best they could to get along, and perhaps the boy's time was put in on his father's place so that the improvements were there. That of course would not be a compliance with the law, and I assume my hon. friend would insist that, under such circumstances, the entry should be cancelled. Otherwise he would not bring the matter up before the House. But that would not be according to the principles on which we have been successfuly administering the public lands. The young man was living with his father.

Mr. LAKE. If the hon. minister had followed what I read, he would have seen that the homestead inspector did not report that the young man was living with his father. There was no claim made in that connection until the father wrote the department and said that the young man was living with him. I have other statements to the effect that the boy was not living with his father.

Mr. OLIVER. At any rate the father said that the boy was living with him. I do not know that I would be prepared to cancel the entry until I found that he was not living with his father. Another point I would draw attention to. At one time there was a small house on the place and afterwards there was none, which would indicate that the house had been destroyed by fire.

Mr. LAKE. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. That may not have been the case but that was probable. At any rate I do not think that the story, as my hon. friend has told it, would be a fair reason for cancellation. I do not know what the real merits may be. But, on the merits of the case as my hon. friend has told it, there is no ground for his claim that lack of publicity hindered the carrying out of the letter of the law. Nor is there ground for his claim that the law was improperly administered or otherwise than in accordance with the interest of settlement.

Mr. LAKE. The fact that it was stated that a house had been upon the place, which house afterwards disappeared, rather argued that the shack which was worth about $50 was hauled off to another quarter-section to do duty as a house for the entrant's father and brothers—for he had a father and brothers taking up homesteads in that neighbourhood. Certainly if the house had been destroyed by fire the homestead inspector should have so reported. It would have been good reason for the extension of leave in the case.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that there appears to be a desire to discredit the land agents. Personally, I had no such intention, nor did I say a word against the agents. I merely called attention to existing difficulties. The minister said also that the fewness of complaints showed that the matter was hardly worthy of consideration. As to that, I think it would be a low estimate to say that every member of this House has received at least ten complaints a year, in the vast majority of which he

has not asked the minister for redress. One goes to the department with these matters, and, if the department will take hold of them there is no need to trouble the minister about them. Taking the average that I have stated, this would mean that over 2,100 complaints have been made each year, which would be a pretty respectable portion of the whole. To show that my estimate is below the mark, I may say that last year I received not less than thirty complaints, and, in addition, I have received information from parties who have travelled the country desiring to get homesteads, but who found that the country was blanketed, so that they could not homestead except a long distance from the railway ; and, after travelling about the country, they left the Northwest altogether. Some of the parties to whom I have referred settled in British Columbia, and, in some cases, I have had complaints concerning similar difficulties there. Receiving so many complaints from honourable and trustworthy men, we cannot but conclude that there must be something wrong in the way the homesteading system is carried on. I think the difficulty is in the length of time that people are allowed to hold a homestead without reasonable cause. As I said, cases have been called to my attention of parties holding homesteads for three, four, and even five years. The minister says this was not done in secret as evidently the facts were known. It is true that the neighbours in these cases knew the facts, but strangers travelling about the country seeking a homestead would pass over forty of these blanketed homesteads before they could get one to settle upon. Men living near these blanketed homesteads have told me that even though the duties were not performed within six months or even within a year they would not apply for cancellation ; but when the duties are two, three or four years in arrears, they have no hesitation in applying. But they tell me that when you go to the land office you are confronted with another difficulty—you do not know the name of the party holding the homestead or his post office address. In many cases the holder is an eastern man. He may have entered with the intention of going back to reside, but circumstances have caused him to change his plans. If he could be reached it is not unlikely that he might frankly inform any person interested that he had no intention of returning. What I contend is that if the man's signature could be obtained to a statement of the facts, this, on being called to the intention of the land agent should be a reason for cancelling the claim. Publicity would be, to some extent, a remedy—we do not say that it would entirely remove the grievance. But, if it enabled the intending homesteader to locate more quickly and more satisfactorily, as we believe it would, then, publicity in these matters would be a good thing.

Mr. PATERSON. Are we not getting a little away from the subject ? The remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), it seems to me, would lead to the conclusion that more explicit instructions, so to speak, should be given to the minister as to the discretion which he shall exercise. As I understand the suggestion of the leader of the opposition, the effect of it would be that information should be available as to how each lot stands. But the minister has pointed out, from his knowledge of the working of the department, that to allow any one who wished to go through the books would greatly interfere with the business of the office. I am told that there are only fifteen land offices and as there were about 40,000 homestead entries last year, this would mean an average of between 2,000 and 3,000 for each land office. One can understand that if the entries in the books were to be open to the inspection of every one, business might be seriously retarded. But I understand that the minister seriously proposes that an abstract should be made giving the information without the need of throwing the books open to every one's inspection. Does not that meet the difficulty ?

Mr. SPROULE. What I said was in answer to the observations of the minister that there appears to be a desire on our part to prejudice the case of the land agents, and that the grievance did not seem to be a substantial one. Surely I had a right to reply as there was no intention or desire on my part to say anything against the land agents, and as I have had so many letters making complaints in regard to this matter of homesteading.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not dispute the number of complaints the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has received, but I think that if he goes over them, he will find that at least seventy-five per cent ask for greater leniency in the administration of the law, as against twenty-five per cent asking for greater stringency in its administration.

Mr. SPROULE. They are not quite in that proportion but there are a good many.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend will find it is about that way. In regard to the difficulty of people finding land, it is hard for everybody to be suited, and the fact that hundreds or possibly thousands of people go to the Northwest every year and do not find land to suit them is no indication either that there is no land or that the land laws are not satisfactory. I myself emigrated to Manitoba in 1873. The farthest settlement in Manitoba then was 100 miles west of Winnipeg. Everything beyond that was open and it was pretty open between Winnipeg and that farthest west point, called at that time Palestine. I remember very

distinctly that a number of my fellow passengers on the steamboat down the Red river had gone to Manitoba particularly to look for land and they returned to Ontario not having been able to find land to suit them. If that was the condition then—and it was the condition then—it is not to be laid against the form of the land laws or their administration or even against the character of the country that a man may go to the Northwest now and not find land or conditions to suit him.

Mr. LAKE. I have just come across a letter in regard to the Bradley homestead of which I spoke. It is from a gentleman in whose statement I have the most absolute trust, I am sure that he believes every word he writes, and he lives quite close to the homestead in question. This letter will show what ground there was for the argument the minister used just now for leniency in this case. The letter is as follows :

Rosemount, February 13, 1907.

Mr. R. S. Lake, M.P.

Dear Sir,—Yours 30 to Kirkaldy to hand re Thos. Bradley. Southwest quarter in 24—21—8 was entered for in fall of 1902. In summer 1903 about five acres broke. Geo. Kirt put crop on said five acres and broke two or three acres more as rental in 1904. In fall of 1905 Bradley built shanty and slept on place a week or ten days; that is all he ever done. In fall of 1906 he drawed shanty on his father's place, northwest quarter 34—8, which was taken up the same fall, 1902. John Bradley made a false statement when he said his son Tom was living with him ; the shanty was taken on the old man's place and Tom was there a few nights. His home is with his father in Manitoba near Griswold. Cannot give you postal address, but that is where Bradley is supposed to have two homesteads, and it is said the boys had entry in Lake Dolphin.

Yours truly,
H. G. FORBES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister suggests as I understand that publicity in this matter should be provided for to this extent that on payment of a small fee an abstract should be given in respect of any homestead.

Mr. PATERSON. Just as in a registry office in Ontario.

Mr. OLIVER. It does not matter about the fee, it might be provided that simply on application the standing of any homestead would be given to any applicant. By putting the matter in that way at a time of congestion in the office when a number of people were applying for entry if any one of these people was given access to the books which the officers would require to advance the business of the other people, the other applicants would be delayed ; whereas by my suggestion, application for the information could be made by letter or on a slip of paper and when the rush at the counter was over the officials could procure the information, which would be received by the applicant in a thoroughly reliable form and the business of the office would not be seriously delayed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You could have printed forms for the purpose at each office. That I think would be an improvement on the present system. I would suggest that the minister allow this to stand so that he may consider our suggestions and we may consider his, and take the matter up again.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it would perhaps be appropriate to put a separate section before the section providing for homestead entry and if agreeable I would be prepared to draft such a section along the line I have suggested. The only question is, should there be a fee or not ? My own idea is to have a small fee to prevent inquiry without a purpose, not for the sake of revenue but to prevent impertinent or useless inquiry ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Appropriate provision should be made to secure the delivery of a correct abstract. I do not mean penalties for inadvertence, but some provision that the officer should be bound to deliver a correct abstract under a penalty of some kind.

Mr. OLIVER. That would be quite proper. That is another advantage I saw in providing for an abstract, that you could hold the officer responsible, whereas if you allowed the outsider to come in and look at the books he might get a wrong impression.

Mr. LENNOX. I notice in looking at the forms that the affidavit form 'D' is not in accordance with the provisions of section 9 as introduced or amended. I suppose the forms will be gone over later ?

On section 10, paragraph 2,—what constitutes entry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That section is very peculiarly worded. It seems to be so expressed that one cannot tell whether or not a man who puts in a perfectly regular application in respect of a homestead which is vacant secures a statutory right in case the officer, for some reason, does not see fit to accept it. I think I mentioned this to the minister the other evening. The statutes of similar character to which I have been accustomed put the applicant in this position that if he makes a perfectly regular entry in respect of a portion of the public domain that is open for entry, then it does not make any difference what the officer does or does not do, that man by those acts secures a statutory right. I would like to see this subclause so expressed that there could be no possible doubt about its meaning. I imagine that the minister would agree to the principle that I am putting forward. The act of an

officer should not be allowed to interfere with the right of a man who had done everything necessary under the law to make secure that man's right in the public domain.

Mr. OLIVER. That is quite in accordance with the intention. According to the present law a man secured his right by making an application, but there was no provision made that it was unquestionable evidence of his having taken the necessary means to secure the statutory right. So, we are making provision in this section, that, having made his application, the receipt of the agent may be absolute evidence of his having secured the statutory right. We thought we took the necessary step beyond what the statute was before when we declared that the agent's receipt was the evidence of the right of the applicant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose there are two men who have an application ready for the same homestead. One man steps forward, presents his application and tenders his fee. The officer says: I cannot accept that just now; I cannot give you a receipt at the moment. Then the other man steps forward, presents his application, pays his fee and the officer accepts it and gives him a receipt for it. Under the provisions of this statute the second man would have the prior right. I think that the man who comes first with his application and money ready to tender should have the prior right and that no act of the officer should interfere to postpone the claim of the man who comes first. That is what I would like to see made absolutely plain on the face of this statute. But, I doubt very much if it is plain on the face of this statute as it has been drafted.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct that in the wording of the Bill as we have drafted it, if the second man got the receipt, he would have an unquestionable right to the entry?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. It is the intention of the Act that whoever gets the receipt shall have the right and that is the evidence of his right. The difficulty of the law where No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 or No. 4 made application for an entry was that the question as to who had the right to the entry would have to be tried out afterwards. We thought that was inadvisable and that whoever got the entry should have the evidence of that entry and should have the right and that if a wrong were done it would be better that they should stand it than that there should be litigation as between these different parties. Of course I do not ask some of my incredulous friends opposite to accept the statement, but I beg to assure them that an agent who gave No. 2 his receipt when No. 1 was entitled to it would not have any further opportunities of giving receipts to anybody on behalf of the Interior Department once it came to the attention of the officers of the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN What would you do for No 1 ?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, we could not do anying for No. 1. But, we think it is better that whoever gets the entry should have it and should have the evidence of his right than that there should be a question as to whether No. 1 or No. 2 or No. 3 had the right. We thought it better to have it settled then and there and beyond dispute than that there should be any question about it.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that is a very bad plan and I think it is very unfair that you should leave it in the hands of an officer to issue a receipt in a case where a manifest wrong would be done and to say that the receipt of the agent should be acknowledged as evidence of the entry. What I submit is that it should be provided that the date and the hour at which applications are received should be recorded and that the person, who, being eligible, makes the first application, shall receive the entry no matter what the officer does and no matter whether the applicant gets a receipt or not.

Mr. PATERSON. If the officer would do a wrongful act such as was suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition could he not make an incorrect record?

Mr. LENNOX. I would make it the law that the officer shall record the date of the application. A man might put in an application, it might not be a good one at all but he would make the application and when he made it the day and the hour should be recorded upon it. Whoever makes the first application, being a party eligible to make the application, would be the party who would be held entitled to the entry.

Mr. TURRIFF. These applications are made in person at the counter by the applicants for homestead entries. If a man is eligible for a homestead entry and the land is available the application is entered. He makes a verbal application at the counter, and the agent takes his name, enters it in the book, takes his fee and gives him a receipt.

Mr. LAKE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to suggest that that is not absolutely correct because a good many entries are made through the sub-agent.

Mr. TURRIFF. I was just going to point out that in some cases the entry is made through the sub-agents. Under this Bill an entry may be made before the sub-agent. The application will be noted down. The sub-agent, at the expense of the applicant, may wire to the agent to ascertain if

the land is available. If the agent wires back that the land is available the entry is closed there and then. Under the present regulations entries are not made by agent. A man cannot appoint another man as his agent to make an entry for him so that it does away with a great deal of the difficulty that my hon. friends on the other side seem to think may arise under this paragraph of section 10.

Mr. LENNOX. The difficulty is in the wording of the statute here.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not think there would be any difficulty at all because a man coming to make an entry does not put in an application but he makes a verbal application From my experience there has never been a single case of where two men came in together to make an entry and the man who came in second was allowed to make the entry over the head of the man who had applied before him. The agents are a good class of men and no agent would do a thing like that. If he did he would be reported to the department by the man who was first on hand to make the entry, the homestead inspector would be sent out to investigate the case and if it were proven that the agent had deliberately given a homestead entry to a man when there was another man right before him and that he had refused the entry to that land he would be dismissed at once.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you not add to the clause some expression like this: That the local agent or officer acting for him shall be bound to accept a regular application made for a homestead entry? You do not even express that in this clause.

Mr. OLIVER. There will be no objection to that if my hon. friend thinks it is necessary, but I do not think it is necessary at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why not?

Mr OLIVER. For the reason that the agent is there to accept the entry, he is there to take it according to the law and he knows that if he does not take it according to the law, if any man has a grievance against him because of improper dealings, he is subject to the loss of his position. It seems to me that that is as good a safeguard as we could have.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The trouble is that you do not express that in the statute. You do not say anywhere in the statute that it shall be the duty of the officer to accept the application and to give a receipt. You say that his acceptance shall be a necessary part of the entry, but you do not provide that it shall be his duty to accept.

Mr. OLIVER. No one has greater respect for the legal acumen of the leader of the opposition than I have, and I would ask him to be good enough to suggest the words which would carry out his view.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I present this as carrying out my idea, though no doubt the wording can be much improved. I would insert after the word 'made,' the following words so as to make it read :

When application is so made, for land then open for homestead entry the local agent or officer acting for him shall accept the same upon payment of the said fee and shall give the receipt hereinafter provided for.

Then I would continue with a new sentence :

The acceptance by the local agent or officer acting for him of the same and of the fee shall constitute entry, and the receipt shall be given, &c.

Mr. MILLER. I hesitate to make a suggestion after the leader of the opposition has spoken, but it seems to me it would be better to have the section read, by inserting the following words before the words already printed :

Applications properly and legally made, with fee paid, shall be accepted in the order received, and when application is so made, &c.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would carry out the same purpose and is very well expressed.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall have the section amended according to the ideas expressed.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to submit to the attention of the Minister of the Interior the following case. Some time ago a gentleman left Ontario to select a homestead for his brother. The land agent in the west was ill at the time, but the person acting for him instructed the brother in the west to write to his brother in Ontario to send the money on to the man acting for the land agent, and he would make the entry for the homestead. The brother sent the money by post office order and not hearing from the acting agent he wrote to him and also to the department at Ottawa. I discovered that the man's name was not entered, although his money had been received. After the land agent recovered from his illness the man was out of the office, and the gentleman who sent the money could get no satisfaction. He is not permitted to apply the money on another homestead. The land which was selected for him was in a favourable locality, but another party having entered for it in the meantime he could not get it. He is out of both his money and his homestead.

Mr. OLIVER. If these facts are correct he is certainly entitled to his money back.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what I would think. I have the receipt for the post office order that was sent by this man, but I have been unable to ascertain whether the

money was received by the agent, it has been received however by the man acting for him.

Mr. OLIVER. I will say here very distinctly that if the money can be traced to any officer of the Interior department, or to any one acting for an officer, I will guarantee that gentleman gets his money back. But, of course it will have to be so traced.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is a letter from the man in the land office acknowledging the receipt of the money. I went to the Post Office Department here, and ascertained that this man had signed the receipt for the money in the post office and received it.

Mr. OLIVER. If it be as my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) represents, the man will get his money back. I do not want to be found guilty of keeping a man's money without giving him value for it.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), in order to make an argument against my suggestion, said that the application was made at the counter and was verbal. In this very section it provides that the application has to be put in the form set out in a schedule to this Act.

Mr. TURRIFF. He comes to the counter and asks about a quarter-section, and if it is available, he applies for it there and then and the agent fills out the paper and the applicant signs it.

Mr. LENNOX. Then the time it is received should be recorded.

Subsection 2 allowed to stand.

On section 10, subsection 3—application to subagent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There does not seem to be anything particularly objectionable in the principle of this subsection ; but why should it not provide simply that the application shall have priority according to the hour at which they are received by the subagent ?

Mr. OLIVER. The subagent merely receives the application and forwards it to the head office of the district. The entry at the head office is that which has effect.

Mr. LAKE. I would suggest that provision be made for a reply from the head office. The subagent is authorized to wire at the expense of the applicant. It would be a great convenience to the applicant in many cases if a return wire were provided for. Otherwise he might have to wait for several days to get an answer.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is a good suggestion.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Is there any objection to providing that the abstract shall be furnished by the subagent as well as by the agent ?

Mr. OLIVER. It would be impossible for the subagent to furnish it from his own books. The complete books are kept only at the head office.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I understand that, but there appears to be no provision to entitle the applicant to receive an abstract from the head office through the subagent.

Mr. OLIVER. We have not made provision for the abstract yet. We propose to have a new section.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. When that provision is being made, the point I mention might be taken into consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You are using the word 'accept' in a somewhat peculiar sense. You do not mean that the subagent shall 'accept' in that sense at all. What he does is to receive, not accept. The application can be accepted only by the agent at the head office.

Mr. OLIVER. That is right. That wording is because of the difference there may be between the time that will be required for the applications to reach the head office from different points. There is no way of providing for fixed or stated times, because in some cases there may be a mail only once or twice a week and the route may be very roundabout, while in other cases there may be a daily mail and a very direct route.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Still the subagent may, through negligence or intent, fail to send off the application at the earliest possible moment, and in the meantime the applicant might be jockeyed out of his entry. Why not provide that the subagent shall transmit the application by first mail or forthwith ?

Mr. OLIVER. The telegram fixes the date on which the subagent receives the application, and that fixes his responsibility. There is no use of putting a provision in the Act to punish the subagent for not forwarding the application when it is the intention of the department to punish him in any case if he does not do his duty and forward the application by the first mail.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is the man who makes the entry who is being punished perhaps by the loss of his land. The telegram is of itself an entry, but it is not an entry that can be accepted until the application arrives at the land office, and if the subagent held that for some time, it might be the means of the applicant losing the land.

Mr. OLIVER. Undoubtedly ; but how is my hon. friend going to make a provision that will compel the subagent to do his duty any more than the control which the department has over him ?

Mr. LENNOX. There is no provision here that the subagent shall forward the application. It seems to me that it should be provided that he shall forward it forthwith.

Mr. TURRIFF. The instructions to the subagents, when appointed, cover all that, and I think just as strongly as if they were in the Act.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no objection at all to putting words in the Act, but our purpose in drafting it was not to load it with more words than are necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it should be provided that the subagent shall forward the application forthwith to the head office. That means by the first mail, or without unnecessary delay. I wish to suggest what I think a necessary amendment in the concluding words of this section, which I think should read in this way: 'and the application, if received by the local agent within such period, shall be regarded as received and accepted at the time of the receipt of such advice.' You see the word 'receiving' is of no importance. The officer must accept it. It is the acceptance that constitutes the entry. You must state that it shall be regarded as accepted, otherwise you do not comply with the provisions of the previous clause.

Mr. LAKE. Form 'K' which is referred to in the schedule might give the order as well as the date. That would be a check on the subagent.

Mr. OLIVER. No objection to that. It is rather difficult to make satisfactory drafts on the spur of the moment. I have taken notes of the suggestions made and will be prepared to submit careful drafts of the proposed amendments at another stage. When we are discussing each provision, we see it only in the one light and we do not see its effects in more than one direction, but each provision may touch many different points, and it is better that we should see that one does not conflict with the other.

On section 10, subsection 4,

Every application for entry shall be made by the applicant in question, except where cause is shown to the minister for allowing entry by attorney or agent, and he directs accordingly; and, in the event of such entry being allowed, application shall be made in either of the forms (f) or (g) in the schedules of this Act, and the affidavit in support thereof shall be in the form (h) in the said schedule.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What kind of cause is meant?

Mr. OLIVER. Since last spring we have not accepted any cause, but before last spring the principal cause was that a man wanted to have the entry made by his attorney or agent. I have been considering the matter and think perhaps it is well not to make provision in the Act, but by departmental regulation, that entry may be made by one of the members of a family for the other members, so as to allow the father to locate for his sons or one of the sons for his father and brothers. I do not think it would be advisable to go beyond that. The reason why I would prefer a departmental regulation is that should abuse or difficulty be found to result, the privilege can be withdrawn, whereas if we embody it in the statute, we cannot withdraw it without the authority of parliament. Last year it was by means of these proxy entries that the greater number of blanket homesteads took place, and in order to straighten out matters we thought it advisable to absolutely suspend the privilege.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend prefers departmental regulation to order in council.

Mr. OLIVER. In such a case. I think it would be just as effective and answer every purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you mean a general departmental regulation made in pursuance of this statute or a departmental regulation embodying simply the usage of the department?

Mr. OLIVER. I mean that under this clause, I would be in favour of allowing members of the same family to act for each other, but I would not be favourable to making a provision to that effect in the statute because the practice might lead to abuse and it might not be safe to have it made permanent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. An order of the Governor in Council may not be necessary, but it seems to me you should have a departmental regulation general in its character and made by virtue of some power conferred upon the minister by this statute.

Mr. OLIVER. This section would be the power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not provide for any power to make a general regulation but leaves each case to the discretion of the minister.

Mr. BRODER. Why not deal with it in this way? If the father of a family is going out to that country, let him locate for his sons as well as for himself. Under the law now, they must all go out. Why not give the father a permit from the department in Ottawa to go out and locate for the family and that permit would have to be accepted by the agent out there. If the father did not carry out the conditions upon which he got the permit, the department would deal with it. Or the permit could be given to one of the sons.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I have in my mind to-day, and my impression was that

the authority contained in this section was sufficient.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think that this is a clause which has given a good deal of trouble. Previously it was too general and now it is too restricted. Do I understand the minister to say that he is going to allow the entry by attorney or agent to be extended to the family, so that one member of the family can enter for the other ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am considering that proposition.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is as far as you are going.

Mr. OLIVER. As far as I am thinking of going at present. Although a great deal has been said in favour of granting entry by attorney in many cases, I am a little afraid of it. We have absolutely restricted that privilege during the past year and I do not think we have suffered any serious result. My own inclination would be to continue without any relaxation, but many representations have been made to me on the line taken by my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) and I would be willing to experiment to that extent. I thought it would be a very desirable thing for our eastern Canadians and I would be willing to make the experiment for a time with the view to accommodating such people.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think I have had more complaints in connection with this clause than in connection with any other. I hope the minister will go further than to say that he will consider it and will assure us that it will at least be extended to members of the family. I think it a hardship to expect a father and all his sons to go up and apply for homesteads. The father or one of the sons should be allowed to enter for other members of the family. I shall be much disappointed if we are not granted that at least.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY For once, I am able to agree with the stand taken by the minister The reason the amendment was made, if I recollect well, was that we found that in the new provinces many homesteads were being blanketed. As I understand it, the Department of the Interior sent out their officers to make an examination, with the result that about 2,000 homestead entries in the office at Regina alone were cancelled—I do not say that I give the figures with exactness, but I understand that the number was in that neighbourhood. My hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) looks at this matter from the eastern standpoint, and probably I am looking at it from the western standpoint. He desires that the man from Ontario should have the opportunity to get land in the west for himself and his sons. On the other hand, we in the west want whoever makes a homestead entry to occupy the land and cultivate it. The hon. gentleman can see that, if his suggestion is carried out, every man going into that western country will be met by a real estate agent and asked if he has sons in the east, and if he has, the agent will induce the man to get the permit from the department which will enable the agent to blanket these even numbered sections of land, with the result that we shall get back in a short time to the condition of affairs which existed about a year ago. I think there are cases in which this privilege should be granted, cases in which it would be a hardship to prevent a man who goes into that country from applying on behalf of members of his family as well as of himself. If good cause were shown why exception should be made, I think a special permit should be granted; but I am opposed to a broad resolution being put through allowing the father in every case to put in applications for his sons or relatives. In cases where it is allowed, it should be protected by proper regulations and a case should be made out satisfactory to the minister or the land office. My observation, as I have indicated, is that the abuse in this case arises from the operations of real estate agents who have these applications made on behalf of relatives by parties coming in. Then, when a bona fide settler comes in, he is told that there are no lands in the district open for homestead, but that if he will buy railway land or some other land, he can get it for $6 or $7 an acre and that arrangements can probably be made by which he will have the privilege of making a homestead entry on land alongside. This is the sort of thing that has kept the land vacant and has driven settlers back from the railways. And these people cannot understand why there should be so much vacant land between them and the railway track. This makes them discontented and causes them to be an adverse influence on immigration. Any precaution which will restrict homestead entries to those who will settle on the land is a wise precaution.

Mr. BRODER. My hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) makes my contentions wider than I made them. The cases I spoke of were those of bona fide settlers who only desired to secure the land. The case I had in mind was that in which the father or one of the sons would go up and select the land and make the entry with the idea of all moving to the place within a month or two. I do not think the land should be kept open for months—that is not my intention at all.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister intend to insist upon having this personal application in each case? Or, what does he mean by the expression 'attorney or agent' in exceptional cases ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am looking for light on that particular subject, and I am not being disappointed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would this be an exceptional case ?—A gentleman from the county I have the honour to represent went to the Northwest and wanted to enter homesteads for himself and five sons. One of the boys was with him. The man was told that he would have to bring his other four sons if he wanted to enter homesteads for all. The result was he had to telegraph for the four boys, who went up and made their entries. But, as these four could not remain over for the winter, they had to return to Ontario with the intention of going back to the Northwest again in the spring. It seems to me that the father should be allowed to enter the names of his sons in cases such as this.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose that the minister's idea would be carried out by inserting after the word 'minister' the words 'in accordance with general regulations made by him.'

Mr. OLIVER. That was my idea. But, as I said, I am looking for light on the subject. While the amendment in the form suggested by the leader of the opposition would meet the views of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) and the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner), and I suppose, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), I take it, it would not meet the views of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) I thought that the section might remain as it is simply allowing for a special case on the responsibility of the minister.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How could the homesteader in the far west get word to the minister 2,000 miles away in a special case ? Why not say that the father should have the privilege of entering for his son ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The objection I have is that every man who goes out there will be interviewed by real estate agents to see if he has not sons in the west and he will have the new comer blanket claims for 6 months and keep other people away.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not think there will be that danger. There is no doubt that a great deal may be said for the system we have had of allowing entry by agent; it helped a great many people to get to that country and it is absurd in such a case as that represented by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that a father should not be allowed to enter for all his sons, because the Act provides that they do not have to go on their homesteads for six months, and there is no good reason why they should all have to go out there and make an entry. Under the old system where entry was made by agent the man who wanted the entry made had to apply either to the commissioner's office here or to any agent in the west and have some one appointed as his agent to apply.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Why did they abolish that ?

Mr. TURRIFF. Because it was abused, largely by land speculators from the United States, who had bought railway lands. It was not abused by men from Ontario or Quebec going in with families.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. There are still land speculators there and railway lands.

Mr. TURRIFF. Certainly, but the sons or fathers applying to have relatives make entry for them would have to state in their application that it was their intention to take possession of the land and become bona fide homesteaders, so I do not think the hon. member for Calgary need fear that if that little latitude is given by the minister any bad effects would come. I think it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would point out that in addition to immigration from Ontario or Quebec we have had very considerable movements from the United States to the Northwest. In the district of Humbolt there has been a large immigration from St. Cloud, Minnesota. That colony came in in 1903. Most of the entries in that case were made by the promoters of the colony and so far as I am aware there was no abuse of the system. I sincerely hope the minister will go as far as he says he is considering going, and I believe there may be cases where there are colonies coming to this country that it might be advisable to authorize an agent to act in their behalf.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister wants power to make general regulations I should think he should insert some such words as I have suggested; otherwise I think we would be confined to dealing with each individual instance.

Mr. OLIVER. While the words here indicate dealing with each individual instance. I would imagine they are broad enough to cover a general regulation. Of course it is a question yet as to whether we should make a general regulation or decide each individual case on its merits.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Under this section the minister alone will be the arbiter, no officer of the department—

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes, the section places the responsibility directly on the minister so there is no question about his responsibility.

Mr. LENNOX. I would think the section very narrow as regards the minister's power and that it is assumed that some exceptional circumstance must be shown. I do not think it would authorize the minister to adopt a policy as regards certain classes

of persons, as regards families, etc. It would apply to such cases as a man becoming ill at Winnipeg and not being able to make entry. I think the suggestion to permit one member of a family to enter for other members is reasonable, and I can imagine many cases where it would apply, as for instance the case of a father with sons in remote parts of the United States who wished to have them return to Canada and settle near him. He would not want to bring them over unless he could be sure of getting homesteads for them near his own.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why not provide that right in the section ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it better not to make this provision in the Act because as already stated and as has been shown in the discussion to-night there are differences of opinion as to the advisability of doing this. If we insert a provision in the Act, then if we have made a mistake we cannot remedy it, and we do not want to be tied to an unfortunate experiment. I would think it better to trust the discretion of the minister in working out the solution of the problem to the best possible advantage. Another consideration is that to make complete provision for handling these exceptional cases in the Act would make it very cumbersome, whereas that could be covered by departmental regulation ; in that way we could make special provision for special cases, whereas in the Act all cases would have to be treated alike, without regard to their different merits.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister amended subsection 4 ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, not so far.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would suggest that it should read after the word 'accordingly', 'or except where a father makes entry for a son or a son for a father.'.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Brother for brother ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. The paragraph would read in this way :

Every application for entry shall be made by the applicant in person, except where cause is shown to the minister for allowing entry by attorney or agent, and he directs accordingly, or except it may be determined by departmental regulations that entry may be made for an applicant by a member of the applicant's family.

Mr. OLIVER. That would cover all the points that have been raised and if agreeable to the House I would be willing to accept it. The objection to making the provision mandatory, as my hon. friend proposes to do in the case of a family, is that the department then has no liberty in working out special requirements which it might be very desirable to do. A member of a family who would be entitled as a matter of right to entry without his presence would then have all the rights and privileges that he would have if he had entered in bodily presence. I do not know that that is always advisable for the reasons set forth by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). What was in my mind in proposing to deal with this question with respect to a member of a family was that I would permit entry by a member of a family for the benefit of the whole family, but the members of the family who were not present in their own persons to make entry would be required to be upon their homesteads within possibly a shorter time than if they had come and made entry themselves. I would not give the same relief from actual residence as if they had entered in their own presence. My idea was that if they were given a special privilege in the one case they should be held more tightly to the residential requirements in the other case. If we gave them entry without requiring their presence we should all the more strictly require their absolute residence upon their homesteads. I would prefer to not embody that provision in the Act because I think we will be able to work it out.

Mr. LENNOX. You could do that in working your discretionary power in extending the time.

Mr. OLIVER. If left free to deal with the matter I think that we could possibly meet the views of the hon. members for Dundas (Mr. Broder) and the hon. member for Calgary. If we embody it in the Act the position as sketched by the hon. member for Calgary will stand and it will be not a fortunate position at all.

Mr. ALCORN. It would seem to me that it would be better to deal with this case by general regulations than to place the burden upon the minister of investigating particular cases and therefore that it would be well to strike out the words 'except where cause is shown to the minister for allowing entry by attorney or agent, and he directs accordingly' and inserting words to this effect :

Every application for entry shall be made by the applicant in person unless otherwise provided by general departmental regulations.

Then the minister could frame regulations which would meet the cases which have been discussed here.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me that there might be a case where an applicant must be laid up by some temporary illness or accident. His friends are going west, perhaps not members of his family who would be entitled to make application, and yet it must be a case that was deserving of special attention.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the desirability of having this provision as it is in the Act now, although it has not been acted upon the past year, is emphasised by the fact that it permits the locating of a colony. Personally I am not particularly favourable to colonies, but sometimes there are occasions when it is desirable from the standpoint of the public interest to assist the location of people in the vicinity of each other, and this provision as it is could be used for that purpose. I am inclined to view with favour the proposition of the hon. member for South Grey having seen it written out. He proposes that the clause shall read :

Every application for entry shall be made by the applicant in person, except where cause is shown to the minister for allowing entry by attorney or agent, and he directs accordingly, or except it may be determined by departmental regulations that entry may be made for an applicant by a member of the applicant's family.

We could then, under the departmental regulations, make such provision as he thought fit in regard to the handling of a family entry.

Mr. LENNOX. The terms upon which the privilege would be granted.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, we could provide in the regulations the terms upon which the privilege would be given by which means we would probably be able to get over the unfortunate condition sketched and sketched truly by the hon. member for Calgary.

Mr. ALCORN. Then I see no reason for leaving in these words 'except where cause is shown to the minister for allowing entry by attorney or agent, and he directs accordingly'. That throws a responsibility upon the minister which he need not assume. If departmental regulations are made and are made general to cover all the cases, every person who goes to locate knows that he has to locate subject to these regulations and not otherwise. What I think ought to be avoided would be the presenting of special cases to the minister and having each adjudicated upon by him according to the special circumstances of the case because the minister might be deceived. Representations might be made which were not in accordance with the facts. If they are general regulations every body has to come under these regulations.

Mr. MILLER. I have in my mind the case of a man who went to the west to look up a homestead location. He had gone to the expense of visiting that country, he had paid his fee and obtained his receipt, but owing to a mistake that had been made in the office of the land agent, which every body admitted to have been a mistake, when that man returned to Ontario he found that he could not obtain the land and permission was given to him to make another entry without going back to the west to make it in person. It seems to me that that was a very proper instance in which such a privilege should be given. This might possibly occur again. It is only one of many instances that might arise.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No person suggests that certain exceptional cases should not be dealt with, but we want to try and get the regulations passed in such shape that they will not be abused. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) has stated certain isolated cases in which he knows of people having gone up from his own section of the country and having suffered inconvenience by reason of the fact that they could not make their entry by power of attorney. But, he does not seem to view it from the standpoint of the men who have had to go miles back from the railway track to locate because there were homestead entries covering every quarter section for miles back from the railway.

Mr. MILLER. I quite realize that privileges are being abused but I think that provision should be made to meet exceptional cases.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall subsection 4 of section 10 be carried ?

Mr. OLIVER. With the amendment suggested by my hon. friend from South Grey.

Or except it may be determined by departmental regulations that entry may be made for an applicant by a member of the applicant's family.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be improved by saying :

Or except under departmental regulations providing that entry may be made by a member of the applicant's family.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 11, disputes between applicants for same land.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a pretty wide kind of discretion; perhaps the minister is suggesting it as a sort of a joke ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is a joke that has been the law for twenty years ; it must have whiskers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Customs should be jealous of these extraordinary powers ; he should at once demand that the customs tariff should be in each instance what he may deem proper.

Mr. PATERSON. It is pretty near that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Pretty near.

Mr. PATERSON. I mean the Customs Act is pretty near that.

Mr. LENNOX. In section 60 the minister's discretion is subject to the subsequent

order of a judge. This is quite as broad a power without any right of appeal.

Mr. OLIVER. This principle has been embodied in the law for a long time. The proprietary rights of two persons respectively claiming entry to a piece of land, are not of any great monetary value, and I presume the enactors thought it better to have a quick and final decision on a matter that involves no serious loss to either party, rather than have delayed proceedings which might entail very great loss to both. It may not be good law but it is good practice.

Mr. LENNOX. It goes further than the old statute. All the minister could do under the former statute is to allow the person who made the first entry to be considered as the owner unless, he determined there should be no entry at all in reference to the homestead. According to the note here, this would give much wider discretion.

Mr. OLIVER. The note is not full enough to give a correct idea. If you will compare this with the original section 35 of the Act of 1886, the minister is given power to withdraw from both parties a piece of land on which two pioneers have settled, and as to which they dispute as to the right of entry. This section does not go so far. I think that would be unfair to both parties.

Mr. ALCORN. I think it advisable that the minister should confine himself to taking power to settle the dispute as to whom the entry shall go when that dispute depends on the validity of the proceedings in regard to entry. But, where a dispute involves matters of fact—as to for instance, the claim of a squatter to a piece of land—requiring the taking of evidence, that might more properly come before a court in some way such as by a summons taken out before a local judge.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 9 makes adequate provision for preserving the rights of the first settler on unsurveyed land. It is not admitted in this Act that there is any question as to that, and the minister has no authority in regard to it. If there is any dispute as to that it must be settled outside the department. The new Act says that the man who is first on the quarter-section is the one who is entitled to it. There is no dispute in that case. Section 11 is confined to disputes which may arise in the Act of obtaining entry or matters connected with that, and the minister should have the decision of such disputes.

Mr. LAKE. It may become a matter of doubt as to who was the first to squat on the land. I have under my hand a case of that kind. A man wanted to get entry for some land which had recently been surveyed and thrown open for entry, and he found that some one else had been ahead of him with a squatter's right, but he says the man never was on the land at all, that one of his sons went out and located it. How is the minister to determine who has the right of entry ?

Mr. OLIVER. Under the new Act the minister does not assume to determine. That is a matter to be determined by the courts. We simply undertake to give entry to the man entitled to it by priority of settlement, and the question of priority of settlement must be settled outside of the department.

Mr. LAKE. I understood that clause 11 did give the minister the sole right of deciding in a matter of this sort.

Mr. OLIVER. If the minister has the right, does my hon. friend object to it ?

Mr. LAKE. No. I think it advisable that the minister should settle the dispute, but subject to an appeal.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg to assure the House that I do not wish to assume or to have placed on my shoulders an arbitrary authority. I quite appreciate the serious character of such responsibility ; but it is a very old saying that justice delayed is justice denied, and a quick decision of such a dispute is better for all parties than a slow decision, even though the quick decision might not have all merit on its side. The Bill lays down clearly in section 9 that the first settler shall have the entry. Section 11 gives the minister authority, in case of dispute, to decide that matter. I do not see that anything better could be done, unless there is a right of appeal to the courts. I do not know that we can prevent a case being brought before the courts ; but I do say unquestionably that the sooner a dispute of this character is settled finally, the better for everybody concerned. In the old Act it was provided that the responsibility might be shirked ; it might be put upon the minister or the Dominion Lands Board or the Commissioner of Dominion Lands or some person appointed by the Governor in Council. We do not propose anything like that. We make a definite provision that the minister shall have the responsibility of deciding, and deciding on the lines laid down in the Act.

Mr. LAKE. Probably in nearly every case the minister's decision would be accepted ; but there may be cases in which there would be a great deal of hardship if his decision were accepted, and I think that for these cases there should be provision for an appeal.

Mr. McCRANEY. I hope our hon. friends opposite will not insist on having an appeal from the decision of the minister. I am convinced that few things would do more harm in the west than to impose upon the settlers coming in, some of them unable to

speak the language we speak, the possibility of a lawsuit in the nature of an appeal in matters which might be decided finally by the minister.

Mr. ALORN. I suppose that in any case the decision of the minister would be binding where all the facts were before the department and the department was not deceived. If an applicant could show that the evidence which had been placed before the minister was untrue and that he had acted on a misapprehension of the facts, his decision would not be final. Unless all the facts were before him, his decision would not stand.

Mr. OLIVER. Provision is made in subsequent sections that if an award has been granted through misrepresentation or fraud it may be cancelled. Therefore while the jurisdiction remains in the minister there is every opportunity given to annul any decision on evidence being offered.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The minister takes the objection that any appeal if allowed to a dissatisfied applicant is going to delay the proceedings; cases have arisen in the last year or two in which a decision of the department has practically overruled a decision of a court of law in the province of Alberta. In one case a man named Griffith bought cattle from a man named Walker, and Griffith entered on Walker's homestead and made improvements, and then brought an action for specific performance, in which he failed. Walker being unable to transfer his homestead. But the department took the ground that they would cancel Walker's homestead entry, as he had received Griffith's money by misrepresentation, Griffith supplied the department with statutory declarations, copies of which Walker has never been given so that he has never been able to get at the evidence on which the department based its decision. This is one of the number of cases, in which the holder of a homestead entry would be glad to have the decision of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) reviewed and be given the opportunity of placing his statement of the facts before the department. I do not anticipate that in a great number of cases there will be an appeal or a lawsuit, but there should be a cheap and speedy remedy in cases of dispute. In many instances the decision of the minister is not his at all but simply that of some official in his department, and it seems to me that the aggrieved party should have the right to have that decision reviewed by a judge of the Supreme court in the district where the land is situated.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not versed in legal procedure, but I would ask my hon. friend if it is not possible under this Bill to have such a decision reviewed by the Supreme Court.

Mr. McCRANEY.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I would not care to express an opinion offhand, but have cited a case which came under my own notice. I might put on 'Hansard' a letter writen to the department in answer to one received from it, so that the minister may look the matter up for himself. The department had written to Walker—who was the man who originally entered the homestead and who had sold his cattle to Griffiths—that he must settle with Griffiths and get off the land; and the letter written to the department on November 19, 1906, is as follows:

File No. 733455.

Dear Sir,—We are to-day in receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant, herein. We are afraid that we failed to make ourselves understood in our last letter to you.

We have already endeavoured to come to a satisfactory arrangement with Mr. Griffith. We have offered either to pay him in full for his improvements or to take a reasonable sum for surrendering the homestead to him. Both of these propositions he has refused and the only counter-proposition that he has made is that he would be satisfied to have Walker get off the land and surrender his rights to him absolutely without consideration. Can you suggest what we can or should do under these circumstances? It takes two to make a bargain. We cannot compel Griffith to make any arrangement with us and he has shown so utterly unreasonable a disposition in the matter that we are quite satisfied that we will never be able to get him to adopt any other stand than the one that he now takes.

We are honestly and sincerely desirous of meeting your views, but your last letter does not give us much encouragement to think that you appreciate our efforts. We are quite willing to have some official of your department act as an arbitrator or are willing to fall in with any other reasonable suggestion that you are ready to make looking to an amicable settlement of these matters, but if you simply say, as you have said to us twice, now that we must make a satisfactory settlement with Griffith, and that gentleman is determined to make no arrangement of any kind with us, what can we do?

We must confess that the position your department has taken in this matter is utterly inexplicable to us. You have decided to take away a man's rights behind his back without giving him any chance whatever to meet the case with you against him, beyond telling us that we must make arrangements with Griffith, which, according to the tone of your communications, means we must simply do whatever Griffith tells us to do. This may be British fair-play, but to us it has an appearance of something very different from that.

I understand that the evidence upon which the department based its decision consisted of statutory declarations put in by Griffiths, the man who had lost the case he brought before a judge of the Supreme Court. I understand also that no copies of these declarations were furnished Walker so that he has not the remotest idea what evidence is in the department. So that the department gave a dicision which forces

Walker practically to abandon his land, and gave that decision without letting Walker see the evidence or giving him an opportunity to contradict it. That is why I object to this power being given the minister, and why I say there should be some opportunity afforded to a dissatisfied homesteader of seeing the evidence brought against him before the department.

Mr. OLIVER. If Mr. Walker is anxious to have the evidence, he should certainly be put in possession of it. This seems to be a case in which the department is reviewing the decision of the Supreme Court rather than the Supreme Court reviewing a decision of the department. I do not know however that a single instance is evidence that the principle enunciated in this section is an improper one. Any one who is familiar with the variety of disputes which come before the department for settlement will agree that it would not tend to the good handling of the land or the welfare of the disputants to provide facilities for litigation. I might call attention to an instance which occurred not far from Edmonton. There was a dispute with regard to a church and a church site. There might have been an acre of land involved and the building might have cost $500, but the dispute as to the ownership arose some six or eight years ago and is about to be argued before the Privy Council. Up to the present the costs have amounted to some $8,000 or $10,000. I submit that to furnish opportunity for disputes of that character is not in the public interest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, but on the other hand this is an extremely wide power and might be so interpreted as to give the minister the right to intervene and settle a dispute which had resulted in litigation between the parties. I thoroughly appreciate the importance of settling trivial disputes quickly and saving the parties expense, but there are other considerations also important. One is that no man should have his rights determined without being heard. That is even more important than reducing the cost of litigation. This provision would seem to empower the minister to determine the dispute upon the hearing of only one of the parties or without hearing either of them or to do anything he saw fit upon such evidence as he saw fit or without any evidence at all. The power is given in the widest possible terms. Even if we can see the necessity for vesting some power in the minister, it ought to have some limit. The case just alluded to by my hon. friend from Calgary is an example in point. People who have obtained judgments of the court in their favour are liable to have the fruits of that judgment taken from them by the minister. Surely the Bill should be modified so that that would not be possible.

Mr. ALCORN. I do not pretend to have a special knowledge of these matters, but would merely make a suggestion. Would it not be possible, as a modification of this section, to provide that, where a substantial dispute arises before the minister, before he gives his decision, either party should have the right to demand that the evidence of both sides should be taken before a superior court judge of the district in which the land is situated, and forwarded to the minister? It seems to me that the fault, in a great many of the cases I have heard of, has been the manner in which the evidence is placed before the minister. It is done by statutory declaration or other methods of that kind. Any one conversant with the manner in which such evidence is collected will know that there is no great difficulty in getting people to make statutory declarations which by no means represent the whole truth. The hearing before the judge that is suggested would not be a trial but simply a taking of the evidence on both sides. It would be more likely to be properly taken than if collected by irresponsible people from irresponsible people.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think that hon. members have no idea of the number of these disputes that come before the department. A majority of them are trivial, but they arise in a hundred and one different ways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of what nature are they?

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, for instance, there is the case of priority of settler. Two men may settle on the same quarter-section, and as the lines are more or less obliterated they are not aware and a dispute is almost sure to arise. Both of them have settled before making entry. One goes to secure entry and finds that the other man is living on the same quarter-section. That is only one of many cases. But, although so many disputes arise, I suppose there are not half a dozen in which the decision has not been accepted, both parties making arrangements to go to work without loss of time one of them getting another homestead. If the right were given to go before a judge, it would not be only the party against whom the decision was given that would be injured, but the other party as well, because having no security of tenure he would be prevented from going on with his ordinary farming operations. Of course, it would not be reasonable to say that in the many hundreds of cases decided there are not wrong decisions. But, even a wrong decision is usually better than delay. I have heard a good many men say, in the old days, in cases which have been kept for two or three years before the department, that it would have been better for them to have a prompt decision against them than to have had a delayed decision in their favour. To overcome the disadvantage of one wrong decision in hundreds

of cases, I do not think it would be advisable to facilitate delay. In a clash of interest both parties are apt to feel warmly on the subject and are ready to carry the matter into court. It would be better even to have a wrong decision at once, and allow both the parties to get to work without delay.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The hon. member for East Assiniboia seems to be under the impression that the suggestion made from this side is that there should be opportunities for litigation afforded to parties claiming a homestead. But as I understand it, what is proposed is some summary proceeding to be instituted by the party who is dissatisfied with the decision of the minister. Under this proceeding the party would have the right to summon the other side before a Judge in Chambers, and have the evidence taken and reported to the minister.

Mr. PATERSON. Would not the judge, in all probability, come to the same conclusion as the minister ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. In that case, the loss would fall upon the applicant. But, at least, he would have the satisfaction of knowing that somebody besides the minister had thought the other party had the right to the entry. I think this would be the interest of the department itself, for every day letters are received here from the west written by people who think they have been wronged by the enforcement of the regulations. Only to-night I answered such a letter, the case being this : The party wrote to the officer here to learn if a certain quarter-section was open for homestead entry. The answer came from Ottawa that there had been an entry, but it had been cancelled and the land was open. On the day of the receipt of that letter, the 21st of January, the party receiving it went to the land office at Olds and made an entry and sent his fee of $10 to the land office. In two days his money was returned and he was told that another party had entered on the 20th of January, at the head office of the lands branch in Calgary. In this case, if the suggestion made were carried out the party would have the right to apply to bring the matter before the Judge in Chambers and to have the application of the other party produced. It is not as though every decision of the minister would be brought before the Judge in Chambers or whatever other authority was appointed for this purpose. But the effect would be to satisfy people by showing them that they have not been unfairly treated. For I must confess that many who complain do so upon no very sufficient grounds. I do not say that there are not cases where the parties have a right to be dissatisfied, because I know there are such cases ; still, I do not think there are as many who have been unfairly treated, as would be indictated by the number of letters we received from that part of the country. The evidence should be accessible not only to satisfy the people beyond question that they are entitled to every consideration when the title to 160 acres of land is brought in question, but also in order that they may be satisfied that a proper decision has been given in their case by the minister or the official to whom he delegates the power to give a decision—because the minister does not contend for one moment that he will pass upon one tenth of the applications that are received ; I doubt if he would pass upon five per cent, and whilst he may delegate his power to a very competent official, the people of the country I am sure would be more satisfied if they had the right to see the evidence which was brought in by the other party which enabled the minister to make a decision.

Mr. ALCORN. In answer ot the observation of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) I did not propose that the judge give a decision at all. My object is to see that proper evidence is submitted to the minister, that the minister is not imposed upon by statutory declarations or evidence of that class gathered in bar-rooms or similar places and given by irresponsible people so that the department is deceived. My proposal was that the taking of evidence only should be delegated to the county judge and as in the case of commissions issued by a court, have a time limit placed upon the commission as to when the evidence would be returnable to the department. It would seem to me that some process of that kind would be very efficacious in leading the minister to a true decision on the facts.

Mr. PATERSON. Would the minister not seek for information on the point before giving this decision ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I dare say he would but you should provide that he must. For instance the Minister of Customs has the right to fine people who according to his belief have been guilty of infractions of the customs law but, the person who has been fined can decline to accept the decision of the minister and then he is relegated to the courts. The minister fines him in the first instance but the man has the right to appeal to the law of the land.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There may be some trival cases where this is not necessary, but there may be serious disputes involving $1,000 or $5,000, and this section permits the minister to deal with such disputes without hearing either one or other of the parties, or by hearing one party and not the other, on any kind of evidence or without evidence; it gives absolute uncontrolled discretion to settle that dispute in the way he sees fit. That is a pretty large discretion.

Mr. PATERSON. The dispute is only with regard to the entry for a homestead, but if a man thinks he is unfortunate in the decision of the minister he can get another homestead. It is really not a very serious case. It is pointed out on the other hand that if he has the right to appeal he is really worse off from a monetary point of view if he wins than if he loses. It is only the right of entry, it is not the only homestead in the country, there are hundreds if not thousands of others, he may lose that one ; but if he went to court he would stand a chance of losing and in any event, even with the proposal of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn), he would be involved in expense. I cannot imagine the minister arbitrarily deciding a case without full information through some channel in which he would have confidence.

Mr. McCRANEY. I think the fact is being overlooked that most of the settlers who come in are very poor people and that by the time they have reached their destination they have very little in hand. It seems to me that if disputes would arise which would necessitate their appearance before a judge the result would be altogether in favour of the wealthier party. Probably the first thing that would have to be done, in fact as a matter of necessity it would have to be done because these people are not familiar with our forms, would be to consult a lawyer. Many people who have no knowledge of our profession or methods would hesitate to undertake the initial stage. I think we would find that the experience of such a practice would be that in very many cases indeed a man having little or no means would simply drop out of the contest. The working out of such a scheme in the portion of the country in which I live would mean that as my town is not a judicial centre the parties to such a proceeding would have to go either to Prince Albert, fifty miles away, or to Saskatoon, forty miles away, that is supposing some system of district judges is arranged for. All these things involve expense and delay and I hope the suggestion of an appeal to judges made by the member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) will not be entertained.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. McCraney pays a very delicate compliment to the legal profession when he says these people would be deterred from engaging in litigation because they do not understand the profession or its methods; the ordinary criticism would be that they would be deterred if they did understand.

Mr. ALCORN. These applications are for new homesteads which are worth a considerable amount of money.

Mr. McCRANEY. These people though have not the money to put up.

Mr. ALCORN. They are dealing with a valuable asset. My proposal would at all events give them a chance to place evidence properly before the minister and not have a decision arrived at practically without evidence or on manufactured evidence.

Mr. OLIVER. Our friends have overlooked the fact that they are suggesting a very serious change in procedure. A certain procedure has been followed for thirty years, there has been no serious objection to it and it seems to me it is desirable—while I am not Conservative altogether in my methods or politics—that we should have good cause shown before we depart from the principle that has obtained for so long and under which there has been certainly a very satisfactory administration.

The point has hardly been brought out that the question to be decided by the minister in this case is not a right in fact but only a right in expectation. If the minister were called upon to decide as to property rights actually acquired that would be a different matter, but he is not called upon to decide upon property rights actually acquired, he is called upon to decide upon rights in expectation or property in expectation and there is, I think every one will agree, a very wide difference between property in expectation and property in fact.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you call it property in expectation ?

Mr. OLIVER. Until the entry is secured it is only property in expectation. There is no expenditure upon it, there is no interest in it, there is no right to it. It is only the expectation of a right that there is a dispute about. It is because of that fact that an apparently arbitrary power has been left in the hands in which it is and the leaving of that arbitrary power in these hands has proven very generally satisfactory. It is not that it is giving permission to divide people's property at the will of the minister, but it merely gives the minister power to decide as to which claimant to that right or expectation shall have the property.

Mr. LENNOX. This section applies to what are properly called squatters.

Mr. OLIVER. No, it applies to parties who are making entry. Squatters are provided for in section 9. Their applications would come in under this, but their rights are all very specifically provided for in section 9 so that you can hardly consider that they come in to this question in dispute. I will give the House an instance of disputes such as those which arise and which call for decision: I am sorry that the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) is not present as it was he who brought this case to my attention. A young man from the constituency of the hon. member for Dufferin

goes up to the country west of Battleford, he gets an entry for a quarter-section, he decides that he has to return home, he abandons the quarter-section or he leaves it at any rate and it becomes open to cancellation. Another young man from the same constituency applies for an entry upon this land. The one who entered first is then in Ontario. He receives notice that his land is up for cancellation. It is impossible for him to get back on it in time to prevent the cancellation. He asks for an extension of time. He is given an extension of time but in the meantime the agent on the ground has given the other man the entry. Then, No. 1, having received authority to enter, goes on and finds No. 2 in possession and holding the entry. There is a dispute between these two parties as to which has the right to enter. It is a difficult question to decide, and it seems to me that there would be no object to be gained by leaving that question to any other tribunal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the time extended before the second man got his entry?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but the local agent did not know that the extension was given.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Have both of them made valuable improvements upon the quarter-section?

Mr. OLIVER. They both have valuable improvements upon the quarter-section and they are both in occupation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which way have you decided?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not settled it yet. I have asked for a report from the inspector and I propose to settle it on the basis that whichever one has the more valuable improvements will get the homestead. If it were decided by the Supreme Court I do not know that a more equitable decision could be arrived at. Of course, the man who gets the quarter-section will pay for the other man's improvements.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not look over the second subsection of this section when I made my remarks before. It might be more than the mere homestead upon which nothing has been done. I see that the question of improvements is mentioned also. I supposed that it was simply a question of the right to the entry the application for which is mentioned in the second subsection.

Mr. ALCORN. It seems to me that the case mentioned by the hon. Minister of the Interior is precisely one to which my suggestion would apply. Here are two contending parties and the decision depends to some extent upon the value of these improvements. The minister intimates that he will give his decision according to a report made by a homestead inspector. It seems to me that a judge should investigate the facts, get the truth and present it to the minister who would then have something on which he could rely and he would not be depending upon the mere report of a homestead inspector.

Mr. OLIVER. It is more important to both of these young men that they should have a decision within the next three or four weeks so that whoever has to leave the quarter-section will have the whole of the coming summer to look for another location than that they should have the decision within six months or a year's time.

Mr. ALCORN. Nobody is suggesting that this question should be kept open for a year or six months. Surely the minister could have the evidence taken in the way that I have spoken of. The evidence could be taken in one or two days.

Mr. OLIVER. The nearest judge is about 150 miles away. Either the judge would have to be brought there or they and their witnesses would have to go to the judge.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. They are appointing district judges.

Mr. OLIVER. They are not appointed yet and I do not know that they will be appointed in time to settle that case. At any rate that is not the question. The condition is as it is and to call in judges of the Supreme Court of these provinces to settle these cases would simply mean unending delay and I think my hon. friend from Calgary would bear me out in that statement.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I cannot agree with the minister. I think that if this procedure were followed this dispute would probably have been settled some time ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long has it been up?

Mr. OLIVER. Since last fall.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why, that is worse than the courts.

Mr. OLIVER. Not worse than our courts.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The minister must not try to create the impression that we are advocating that this should be left to the ordinary courts. The suggestion is that there should be some summary and inexpensive procedure to enable these people to get a decision upon a point on which they are dissatisfied with respect to a ruling by the Minister of the Interior. I am surprised that my hon. friends opposite from the new provinces have not taken more kindly to this suggestion, because I venture to state that if they were asked to give the record of the correspondence they receive from that country it would show that 50 per cent of the correspondence that

they do receive is from dissatisfied homesteaders who are continually asking them to go to the department and get some decision that has already been given overruled or who desire to be assisted in some other way.

Mr. TURRIFF. Even if in the two new provinces they appointed five district judges, as I see by the papers they have some thought of doing, there will be settlements in both provinces that will be one hundred miles or more away from the nearest of these judges. In that case it would be an expensive matter either having the judge coming to their point or they taking their witnesses to where the judge was residing.

Mr. ALCORN. We are not legislating for the present moment. This is the consolidation of the Dominion Lands Act and it is likely to be to some extent permanent. No doubt in that country there will be district or county judges and they will be quite numerous enough, it seems to me, to answer all the requirements of the suggestion that I have made. We are not dealing simply with the position as it may be today. All dealings with courts must involve a certain amount of time and expense. The time will come when there will be plenty of judges in that country and the distance is not a great bar in that country at all events. Possibly in one case you would travel forty miles to get a judge and possibly fifty miles another. It is not a matter involving a great deal of expense or time.

Mr. McCRANEY. It is a very considerable matter to men who have got very little money.

Mr. ALCORN. I am simply providing that where a dispute arises the parties have the right to demand such an investigation; they need not demand it if they do not wish.

Mr. PATERSON. You leave it to the minister to decide in the end?

Mr. ALCORN. I want to have the evidence taken before the local judge and sent to the minister who will decide upon it.

Mr. PATERSON. Could not the homestead inspector take the evidence?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The Minister of Customs does not know the average homestead inspector when he makes such a suggestion. I have heard a land agent state that some of the reports sent in by some of these homestead inspectors, are disgraceful. Some of these men are almost illiterate. If they are all of the character of one or two of them I know, they should not be entrusted with such an important duty, because the greater number of their reports are based on partisan grounds.

Mr. McCRANEY. If one party to the transaction was served with notice, it would be compulsory for him to appear before the judge or he would lose the homestead.

Mr. ALCORN. If one party demanded that the evidence be taken, of course it would be compulsory for the other party to appear.

Section 11, subsection 2—Disputes between applicants for same lands.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Is the minister going to divide up quarter-sections under this clause? Where is the land available now?

Mr. OLIVER. Under the old provision they could only get a full quarter-section if it were adjoining, but now they can get it elsewhere.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If a settler is 20 acres short, has he to go 10 miles away to get that 20 acres.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what it means.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not let one of them pay for the improvements and give him his quarter-section elsewhere?

Mr. OLIVER. It could be decided in that way but there are cases in which it would inflict hardship.

On section 12,—Time for perfecting entries.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This means that in future there shall be no extension of time beyond the twelve months from the date of entry?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think this would inflict great hardship, and I believe the minister should have wider powers than are given him here.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister is yawning, he is tired, and I think we should stop here. There is a good deal of contention ahead.

Mr. OLIVER. It makes no difference to me, I am quite willing to adjourn. The old section provides that there may be six months extension, and at the end of the twelve months if the entry is not perfected it shall be voided. Under this section we do not propose that the entry shall be voided automatically, but we provide that no one has authority to protect it beyond that time. In the old Act there was a subclause which provided that in the case of immigrants from elsewhere than from the North American continent the Governor in Council might extend the time for perfecting the entry from twelve months from the date thereof.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would not like to see this clause passed in its present shape. I think the last two lines following the words, 'after six months' should be left out. Cases will arise where it would be advisable to grant protection to the deserving settler even after twelve months, and although the

old Act was as the minister has read it, it was never lived up to. So far as my knowledge goes, no bona fide settler ever lost his homestead on account of not having perfect the entry within twelve months. As a rule no extension of the time should be granted after 12 months, but where you have 40,000 entries in a year this clause will work hardship on many a deserving and struggling settler. Suppose he has 50 acres broken, and because of illness he is not able to take up absolute residence, it would be a great hardship if these were no power to grant to the bona fide settler an extension of time. I do not think any harm could be done by giving the minister authority to do so.

Progress reported.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 119) to revive certain patents of the Nichols Copper Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate the Travellers' Indemnity Company of Canada.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 121) to incorporate the Ottawa Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Turriff.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. WM. PATERSON moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. PATERSON. The third reading of the first two Bills on the order paper; then, if Mr. Fielding is back, probably the iron bounties in Committee of Ways and Means. If he should not be back, we will go into Committee of Supply, and Mr. Emmerson will make his statement on the Intercolonial Railway.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 19, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—SECOND READINGS.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse) moved :

That the following Bills (from the Senate) having been reported upon by the examiner of petitions for private Bills as having complied with the requirements of the ninetieth rule, be placed on the Orders of this Day for a second reading.

Mr. TURRIFF.

Bill (No. 125) respecting the Lake Superior Power Company.

Bill (No. 119) to revive certain patents of the Nichols Copper Company.

Bill (No. 121) to incorporate the Ottawa Life Insurance Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this procedure regular ? As I understand it the Bills should have been sent to the examiner before being read a first time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The question is whether or not a Bill that has passed the Senate, must, before it is read a first time in this House, be referred to the examiner of petitions for private Bills. In this case, these Bills have been read a first time before being sent to the examiner. The proper procedure would seem to be, in the absence of a special provision, that the same rule should be adopted with regard to Senate Bills as in regard to any Bill introduced into this House, namely, that before being read a first time they should be submitted to the examiner and reported on.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand it, these Bills were read a first time and then submitted to the examiner of petitions for private Bills to see whether the petitions were correct.

Mr. SPROULE. This procedure gives us very little time to consider the principle of a Bill. We jump from the first reading into the second reading before the principle of the Bill is considered at all. In this case the Bills come from the Senate, but if this procedure were adopted in regard to Bills introduced in the Commons, they might be read a second time before we would know anything about them.

Mr. SPEAKER. This motion is merely that they be placed on the order paper for the second reading.

Mr. SPROULE. The motion is that they be placed on the order paper of 'this day,' and so they might come before us to-day.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 126) to incorporate the Bonaventure and Gaspé Telephone Company, Limited.—Mr. C. Marcil

REPRESENTATION OF SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That the report of the special committee to which was referred Bill (No. 51) to adjust the representation of Alberta and Saskatchewan in the House of Commons be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

THE ADULTERATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) to amend the Adulteration Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Bill makes one or two amendments to the Adulteration Act. They are in respect to the appointment of assistant analysis. Under the law as it exists we have power to appoint a public analyst and one chief analyst. There are in the department several assistant analysts who really, according to the law as it now stands, have no legal status. It is simply to correct that error in the law that the amendment is proposed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WINNIPEG TERMINALS—CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 128) respecting the Winnipeg terminals of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the object of the Bill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The object of the Bill is to provide for union terminals at the city of Winnipeg. The details are embodied in an agreement entered into between the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Provision is made protecting the interests of the eastern division of the Transcontinental line of railway in the event of the government operating the road under the circumstances than as provided for in the Act relating to the leasing of the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Motion agreed, and Bill read the first time.

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to return to the question which I referred to yesterday as a matter of urgent public importance. I have given notice to Mr. Speaker of the matter which I propose to discuss.

Mr. SPEAKER. The subject which the hon. member wishes to bring up is :

The immediate necessity of providing efficient communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and the extreme danger of those on board the government steamers attempting to perform the service.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman have leave to speak on this question ?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall for a few moments draw the attention of the government to the imminent danger to life and property aboard the government steamers attempting to perform the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I proposed to discuss this question yesterday but was baffled in my attempt to bring it before the House. I then gave notice of my intention to bring up the question to-day and I am sorry the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is not in his place, especially as I had given notice. However, I am glad to see that the premier is in his place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So is the minister.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Oh yes, I see he has just taken his seat. I am sure the minister is aware, if he has paid any particular attention to the telegrams that must be in his department that the winter service to Prince Edward Island this year is the most deplorably inefficient that we have had in the last ten years, and I am sure that it is not for want of calling attention of the department to their neglect that this condition exists. A few years ago we directed the attention of the government to the inefficiency of these two boats and the department at that time told us that they were about to provide a third steamer which would supplement the other two and if possibly they would fulfil the obligation which the Dominion government undertook thirty-four years ago, but which during those thirty-four years they failed to perform. I need not, but I think I shall, inform the House of the serious condition of affairs that has prevailed in that province for the last fifteen or sixteen days. I may inform the House that these two steamers, having sometimes one hundred passengers aboard, have been locked up in the ice for as many as five or six or seven days without any relief, the passengers in danger of their lives, the boats in peril and the freight aboard the steamers in danger of being lost. I think I am fully justified in again calling the attention of the government to this condition of affairs in order that they may take this question into much more serious consideration than they have hitherto done. I shall refresh the memory of the House with press comments on some of the things which have happened in that province in the last fourteen days. I have

here an extract, not from a Conservative, not from an independent paper, but from the organ of the government in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 'The Patriot'. This extract reads :

The fact that there are some one hundred passengers on board the 'Minto' now stuck in the ice south of Pictou island and have been there since last Tuesday, naturally leads to the inquiry as to the ship's accommodation.

There are nine state rooms with two berths and settees each or with accommodation for twenty-seven persons.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, a boat out in the straits surrounded by floes of ice with ninety-four passengers and with sleeping accommodation for only twenty-four passengers out of ninety-four of the passengers, men and women, aboard. These men and women are huddled together on board that steamer in peril of their lives. The item continues :

Then around the dining saloon are settees capable of being converted into beds and will accommodate nine persons.

In the after part of the ship is a compartment with men's bunks without bed clothing, but containing mattresses, and this will accommodate from sixteen to twenty persons.

Taken altogether there is sufficient sleeping accommodation for between fifty and fifty-five passengers. Still there are one hundred on board. The crew, all told, number forty and have their own accommodation.

There are actually only nine staterooms on the boat, accommodation altogether for twenty-seven passengers. Here they are caught in the ice for days and days, men and women, and the government appear to treat it with great apathy if not callous neglect. I think the time has come when the matter should be more earnestly attended to. It may be as my hon. friend from York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) said yesterday, after he had made a speech six or seven times the government will at last pay attention to him. It may be a case similar to that mentioned in the scripture here the unfortunate woman approached the judge and the judge at last consented to give her justice because as he said :

Though I fear not God, neither regard men, yet because of this woman's importunity I will give her justice.

This will represent the case of Prince Edward Island and the government. I think the minister is sympathetic, or that he was before attaining office, and I hope he has not become unsympathetic now. I shall read further. Here is an extract from a newspaper published in Boston, from which it appears that the neighbouring republic takes more interest in the affairs of the island than does this government :

Charlottetown, March 5, 1907.—Forty passengers of the government steamer 'Stanley' have been marooned on Pictou Island since last Friday. They include a theatrical company and the Abegwelt hockey team. The government steamer 'Stanley', used in the winter to keep up communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, got caught in a dangerous ice field about a mile off Pictou island last Friday. . . On board the 'Stanley,' besides the theatrical troup and the hockey team, were fourteen lumbermen. Not relishing the prospect of remaining on the vessel for an indefinite time, or landing on Pictou Island, they set out for the mainland, fifteen miles distance, over the ice.

Mr. A. MARTIN.

They walked over floes of ice for miles. Where had they to go ? To a small island in the Straits of Northumberland, half way between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, where there were a few fishermen with small huts. Just think of forty passengers having to leave the boat, as a last resource to save their lives, and take refuge in this small inhospitable island. Here is a description of what they suffered :

The fourteen struggled for hours but before half the journey had been covered they were well nigh exhausted. The woodsmen staggered on, their faces badly frost bitten and their bodies cut and bruised by numerous falls. When at nightfall, they reached the mainland, all were in a pitiable condition and needed medical assistance.

This is not all. I have here something further :

Special by wireless.

Passengers called to the ice-boats in fear of ice-jam—but danger averted :

On board 'Stanley' in Northumberland straits, November 13.—Owing to the dangerous position of the steamer at four o'clock to-day, the ice-boats were launched and passengers and crew called to the decks, fearing serious results from an ice-jam, which however was happily averted. The steamer is now stuck three miles off Murray harbour. The ice is the heaviest ever seen by the oldest navigators, and is piled up into heaps of gigantic blocks four feet thick.

This is another experience quite different from the first one. Here is a list of the passengers :

Reverend J. H. Bates, Mrs. Bates, Miss M. Bates, J. D. White, Mr. and Mrs. Otis, Joseph Salter, North Sydney, H. D. McEwen, Morell, Capt. E. C. Rhude, Montague, W. R. Aitkin, Bank of Nova Scotia, D. S. Biggs, Toronto, J. C. Clark, Miss M. Clark, Mr. and Mrs. C. T. Godfrey and two children, A. G. McLean, J. B. McDonald, East Point, E. Hessian, Claude Davidson, Thomas Higginbotham, John McLean, Mrs. Joseph Morrison, Marion McDonald.

In the evening a mass meeting was held in the saloon and strong speeches on the tunnel by the Reverend Mr. Bates, Messrs. Salter, McEwen and Captain Rhude. A resolution advocating the same was passed unanimously.

This is a fair sample of what the people of Prince Edward Island and the public generally have to put up with because the government will not keep faith with Prince Edward Island. I have some other extracts

equally effective. If such things were happening in Russia, if we were informed in this House that up in the northern seas, north of Russia, there were about 100 people out in a boat in danger of their lives, this House would likely pass a resolution of sympathy. But this government appears to be utterly indifferent to Prince Edward Island. I asked the minister not long ago if it would not be judicious to send down the 'Montcalm' or some other boat to the assistance of those boats, and the answer I got was that the 'Montcalm' was engaged in another service. I have since been informed, however, that she is not performing any service whatever.

If what we ask on this side were done, this condition would not prevail in that province. A few nights ago we discussed this question. I was not very well on that occasion, suffering from pneumonia, so I could not remain until the end of the debate, but I have read the speech of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), and all he had to say to the people of Prince Edward Island was 'be loyal.' Submit, he said, to every oppression and indignity, but do not utter the word, close up your mouths, bear everything in silence, your duty is not to complain. Why, even a slave when he is whipped is allowed to cry out, but the people of Prince Edward Island have to suffer in silence. I think, judging by what I know of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that if he were living in that province he would not be very quiet. I do not know that in 1837 his compatriots and dear friends in the province of Quebec were very quiet or as quiet as we are in Prince Edward Island. I do not think that some other members on that side who accuse us of disloyalty would be so very uncomplaining, and meek, and humble, under similar circumstances. They say that we have no right to talk about separation. Let me bring to the attention of the House, what happened not long ago in the city of Edinburgh. At a meeting held there not long ago to protest against the disbanding of the Scots Greys, the only regiment of cavalry in Scotland, Lord Rosebery said:

> We are living under the benefits of the Treaty of Union, an instrument of general character which stripped us of much if it gave us much; but the time may come when, if this friction continues, the Scottish nation may be compelled to examine more strictly into the benefits received from the Treaty of Union.

Is there anything in that stronger than is said in Prince Edward Island? What we said, and what we say now, is that, if the contract between Prince Edward Island and this Dominion is not carried out, we will take our own course. First, we will appeal to the King, who has a high sense of justice, and I think that appeal will give us separation or compel the government of the Dominion to fulfil its compact with us. As I said, the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) before he assumed office appeared sympathic with Prince Edward Island. He took the part of the oppressed, as he claimed to do when he spoke on behalf of the half-breeds of the Northwest. I wish he would make now a similar appeal on behalf of the people of Prince Edward Island; it would be a proof to me that he has not forgotten how to support the cause of the weak and oppressed. I would like to read to the hon. gentleman what he said for the half-breeds of the Northwest; and I think when these words are recalled to his memory he will declare: I am the same Sir Wilfrid Laurier that I was before 1896, and I will stand up for the people of Prince Edward Island, whose cause I supported before I became Prime Minister. Speaking in defence of the half-breeds of the Northwest he said:

> All these years they had been petitioning and petitioning, begging and begging, knocking and knocking at the door of the government, and the goverment never lifted a finger to come to their rescue.

And this is applicable to the case of Prince Edward Island. Then Mr. Laurier, now Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister of Canada —all honour to him—went on——

> This, I say, and I say it, coming from a province where less than fifty years ago, every man of the race to which I belong was a rebel, and where to-day every man of that race is a true and loyal subject. . . . I say give these men justice, give them their rights, treat them as for the last forty years you have treated the people of Lower Canada, and by and by throughout those territories you will have contentment, peace and harmony, where to-day discord, hatred and war are ruining the land.

And a Prince Edward Island writer after commenting on these words says:

> The following year, Mr. Laurier, when indicting the government for execution of Riel used the memorable exclamation, 'Too late! Too late! Too late! Witnesses of the scene will recall that between each of the orator's pauses, there seemed to be an age, that a silence of death brooded over the House, broken only by the terrible monosyllables which summed up the whole drama of the insurrection.

I believe that the Prime Minister is warmer hearted than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and I cite this to bring to the right hon. gentleman's recollection the sympathy he felt in his younger days for those who were oppressed. Now, let me remind him of what he said before he assumed his present high position as to what he would do for Prince Edward Island. I read his whole letter on a previous occasion, but here is a part of it:

> Every man who has given any attention to the condition of things and to the interests involved by the island entering into confederation must admit that such a tunnel must be

constructed if the thing is reasonably practicable.

This promise was made in 1892. The people of Prince Edward Island, I think, gave him a good deal of support, on account of that letter. I do not think he could get the same support there to-day; his following there is dwindling away because of his change of position. I have here an article written by a gentleman with whom he is very familiar, and who if I am not mistaken, has written a biography of the right hon. gentleman. This article is in the form of a letter which appears in the Boston 'Evening Transcript.' It deals with the question of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

It was in this unmitigable sense that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, before he took office, construed the agreement.

The agreement referred to is that made respecting the entry of Prince Edward Island into confederation. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he interprets that agreement in the same way as the Prime Minister does. If so he has a very poor way of carrying out his interpretation. Here is what the Prime Minister said about the clause in that agreement which provides for the maintenance of efficient steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland:

He said: It is a direct, binding and solemn undertaking that the government of Canada will maintain communication between Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial Railway. There is no provision there that the Dominion of Canada would try to do it; there is no suggestion that there might be too much ice in certain cases.

I need not dwell upon that, though I by no means quoted the whole of it, and were I not so anxious to avoid taking up the time of the House I might well place before you other quotations from this letter. I turn now, from that part of the case. As I have already said, I was disappointed in reading over the reply of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In that reply there was not even one ray of hope for Prince Edward Island. It was simply an opportunity for the hon. member for King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes) a few days afterwards, to ask in this House, whether or not a third boat would be provided. The only thing that the minister did in his speech was to abuse the province, but he did not give the people any real ground for hope. And in answer to the question as to the third boat he stated that the third boat would be supplied. You may build your third boat—you have to or you will have an insurrection down in Prince Edward Island. I am glad you are going to build your third boat.

But in the meantime you have to do more. We were promised in this House, a few sessions ago, that a survey would be undertaken for a tunnel. We think the tunnel is practicable, and that it is the duty of the government at once, this session, to provide in the estimates for a survey, and to call for tenders. If the tenders are too high, they need not be accepted. But you must satisfy the people of Prince Edward Island that you are going to take up this question in earnest. The people, as I said, are leaving that province by thousands. Within the last twenty years 18,000 people have left that province; and counting them worth $2,000 a head—the Doukobors are estimated to be worth $1,000 a head, and the Prince Edward Islanders should be worth at least twice as much—that makes $36,000,000 that have been lost to Prince Edward Island. If these men had remained they would now be contributing to your revenues. When the tunnel is completed I am convinced that the whole country will gain by it, and Prince Edward Island will be satisfied that Canada is after all honourable. There ought to be some honour in this country; a country that can afford to spend $150,000,000 on a transcontinental railway, of which nothing was said at the time of confederation, that can afford to spend $100,000,000 on a Georgian bay canal, that can build a railroad to Hudson bay, and run tunnels under the Lachine canal, a government that can afford to build a bridge at Quebec costing five or six million dollars, of which nothing was said at confederation—surely such a government can afford to incur the necessary expense to fulfil its bargain with Prince Edward Island, a binding agreement, as the Prime Minister himself has admitted, a bargain that has stood for thirty-four years without being implemented. Now I have perhaps spoken too long, but I do not think I could have said less; and my two colleagues are here ready to speak on this question also.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have not much to say in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Martin), because I notice that his remarks to-day are simply a repetition of those he made the other day. Of course, I do not find fault with him for trying to justify the action which he and some of his friends on the island are taking in talking of secession. That is their right, and I have nothing to say with regard to that. I will remark, however, that my hon. friend did not supply the House with the very important information which reached us yesterday and which was communicated to him.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Allow me to say that I called up the minister's department about half-past two o'clock and asked what telegrams they had from Prince Edward Island. They said they had none to-day, but there was one yesterday. I asked if they could supply me with copies of all telegrams for the last six days, and I said I would

like to get them before three o'clock ; but I did not receive them.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is very unfortunate. My hon. friend will take my word for it, because yesterday I gave him the information myself. He asked me whether we had any more information, and I told him that the 'Minto' had reached Pictou. That is information which reached us a few minutes after the discussion which took place in the House.

Mr. A. MARTIN. About half-past two o'clock yesterday I asked the department for information about the boats. I was told that the deputy was not in but that they would get me the information ; and the person at the telephone went away to inquire, and coming back he said there was nothing on Saturday. Of course I accept the minister's statement, but it is evident that something was overlooked, and perhaps the person at the telephone may not have understood.

Mr. BRODEUR. I inform my hon. friend officially now that yesterday afternoon we had a despatch that the 'Minto' had arrived about two o'clock for coal at Pictou, and would leave on the first chance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long has she been out?

Mr. BRODEUR. About eleven days I think.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Sixteen, I think.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may be wrong, I know the boats were caught in the ice for a certain period of time. This has been a very exceptional year. According to the reports which have reached us, the ice was packed this year in the straits of Northumberland in much greater quantity than has been usual; and there were heavy winds from the north which drifted the ice in unusually large quantities into the straits and prevented the boats from crossing as they had been accustomed to do. But from the beginning of the winter we had a very good service until a few days ago, everything had gone on in first-class order. At one time the weather was so fine that the boats, for a short time, could go to Charlottetown, and from that time the service was absolutely regular until this short period of time. My hon. friend complains that we are not taking the proper steps to cope with the situation. I think that is an unfair charge to make against the department. We are taking all possible steps to grapple with the situation.

We must not forget the situation in which Prince Edward Island found herself when she came into confederation. At that time there was only a winter service, maintained by small row boats running between the capes. It was then agreed that we should perform an efficient steam service, which was started a few years afterwards by the construction of a wooden boat; and later on, an iron boat, the 'Stanley,' was built and put on the service. Now there are two boats plying all the time between Georgetown and Pictou. But not only are we keeping up that steam service, but, recognizing that it might happen in very severe winters that the service would be temporarily interrupted, this government have engaged a crew to run small row boats, whenever the steamers can not run, between Georgetown and Pictou. We engaged these row boats, for a couple of months, and they were running the other day so effectively that the mail service has not been interrupted, nor has the passenger service been interrupted, because people on the island could cross over to the mainland on these row boats. Besides when passengers on the 'Stanley' were unable to complete their passage to Pictou, by being caught in the ice, we provided to send them back to the island, if they wanted to go back, and to pay their passage on the Prince Edward Island Railway; and if they wished to go on to the mainland, we had these row boats to take them free of expense. So you see, Mr. Speaker, we are making all possible efforts to cope with a very difficult situation. But we are not going to stop there. I know the situation is very difficult, I know it is difficult to find boats strong enough to break the ice and at the same time to resist the tides and the winds, but we are going to study the question once more and see whether something further cannot be done.

My intention is, when I go to Europe, to take with me some technical officer of the department and perhaps one of the captains of these boats who know exactly the situation there to see whether in the North Sea or in the Baltic we can find any ice-breakers which are built strong enough to meet the situation which now exists. That shows that we are making every effort possible to meet the situation. Some years ago we secured the services of a naval architect who made a design for a powerful ice-breaker, but unfortunately the ice-breaker which was recommended by this naval architect could not be utilized because the draught required was more than the depth of water over the Pictou bar. Since that time the government have taken means to dredge the Pictou bar in order that we should have the necessary depth of water to permit of a more powerful ice-breaker being put on the service. That shows that the government and the department are not sparing any effort in order that we may provide the island with a most efficient steam service. When this contract was made there was no statement to the effect that we should have ice-breakers. At the time that we provided the island with two ice-breakers it was not contemplated that ice-breakers should be provided. But we have done it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What was contemplated ?

Mr. BRODEUR. An efficient steam service.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Well.

Mr. BRODEUR. At the same time it was pretty well understood that the system of row boats should be continued because all those who had some knowledge of the service, all those who knew anything about the situation, realized fully that it was absolutely impossible at all times to meet it and my hon. friend knows very well that has been the situation. Of course, I cannot blame them for criticising the government. They seem to be there for that purpose, but there is one thing that strikes me and it is that if they would use their energy in trying to work with us to find out some system by which a better winter service could be provided and not spend their time in simply criticising the action of the government I think they would be doing something more in the interests of their electors. I do not blame the hon. member for Queen's for doing that. It is a part of his duty to criticise the action of the government, but if he loves, as I suppose he does, the people of his island, I would like to see him devote a little more time to studying seriously the situation with us than in trying to find fault with the action of the government.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up very much of the time of the House, but the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) got up a few moments ago and accused my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Martin), who made an excellent speech this afternoon upon this subject, of rehashing something that he had said before. On every occasion that I have heard the minister speak he has rehashed some excuse that was neither palpable nor palatable to the people of Prince Edward Island for the conduct of his own department and this afternoon he has done the same thing. He went back to confederation. He said that when the island came into confederation it had row boats, and that therefore it ought to have row boats now, and that because the government had given us one or two steamers that have not fulfilled the terms of confederation we ought to be grateful. I think the hon. member who has spoken from this side of the House has discussed the case very fairly and very fully. He has pointed out that the people of Prince Edward Island were not satisfied that they had been dealt fairly with and I do not know that he threw any more blame upon the present minister than upon other ministers and other governments who have gone before. Prince Edward Island did come into confederation under the terms that my hon. friend from Queen's has pointed out. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in this House has admitted that the terms of confederation were not carried out. We were to have efficient steam communication winter and summer and it will be very well understood that the steam communication that we were to have winter and summer could not be supplied by row boats, and it has not been supplied by the boats which the minister and his predecessors have put upon that route. He talks about putting these fine boats on. I pointed out in the House a few days ago that since confederation the government have spent on boats for the carrying out of its contract with Prince Edward Island some $300,000 or $400,000, and that these boats are not only needed for the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, but that they are also needed for the carrying on of the marine and fisheries work all over Canada. Now, we are very grateful that the minister has, even at this late date, after promising us for the last four years that a new boat would be constructed, stated that he is going over to the old country, and I trust that the new boat that he will have constructed will be built in some of the best yards in the United Kingdom and that he will not bring over a second-class boat as was done in the case of the 'Minto.' I do not intend to take up very much more time. The minister has been primed to tell this House on each occasion that the affairs of Prince Edward Island have been brought up in regard to communication that they have done everything possible and that everything has gone on smoothly except at this time. It is just occasions of this kind when the whole machinery is stopped, when the commercial relations of Prince Edward Island are paralyzed, when people are out for sixteen days at a stretch at the risk of their lives, that call for something else than what has been given us in the matter of communication for the last thirty years, and it all goes to point to the fact that something else must be done. The right hon. leader of the House said the other day, in reply to a question I asked him, that he was not averse to doing something else, that he was not averse to taking up this question of a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland and finding out exactly what could be done. I think that on an occasion of this kind, after the experience we have had, there is no more suitable time than this session for the minister to put in his estimates an amount necessary to institute proceedings, and I would prefer to have the right hon. gentleman rise in his place and give us some assurance rather than have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries try to salve over the situation in the manner that he

has attempted to-day. I trust that this may be but another occasion to impress upon the mind of the right hon. gentleman the necessity of further means of communication being provided and that he will not hesitate this session to institute such measures as may be necessary to bring this matter to a proper conclusion.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queen's, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to the great loss that has been caused to the travelling public since the detention of these steamers. I had a letter the other day from a gentleman who went on board the 'Minto' on the 4th February. He was on board that steamer for eight days, and then he walked back from the steamer ten miles through slush and on the ice to Pictou. He told me that his loss by reason of the detention and on account of the extra expense he was put to amounted to about $100, and he estimated that since these steamers were detained there had been at least 500 people detained on both sides of the straits.

If these people were put to an expense of $100 each, it would be a loss to the public of $50,000. I do not think that estimate would be fair, but I will put it at $30,000 loss to the travelling public by reason of the detention of these steamers, and $30,000 would pay the interest on a steamer worth $1,000,000. When the minister considers that not only have the travelling public suffered, but that the business men of Prince Edward Island, of the maritime provinces, and of Ontario and Quebec are also at great loss. he should not hesitate one moment about endeavouring to perfect the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I repeat that in my opinion, steam communication by vessels will not fulfil the terms of the union. You must carry out these terms to the letter. It is no use for the minister to state in this House, that in 1872 we had row boats and that row boats are good enough for us to-day. When we entered into confederation we believed that the Prince Edward Island Railway system would be connected with the railway system on the mainland, and that is what we want now. The terms of union can only be carried out by building a tunnel under the straits of Northumberland, and thus connecting the railway system of the island with the railway system of the mainland. That is the only possible way and that is the way that should be adopted. It is all very well for the minister to say, on every occasion when this matter is brought to the attention of parliament, that the government has done well by Prince Edward Island. Neither this government nor any previous government has done well by Prince Edward Island, and the great loss which is accruing to the people of that province and to the mercantile communities on the mainland, is so increasing year after year, that the time has come when the people have a right to demand from the government, that this communication should be perfected without delay.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). Everybody will admit that the present system of communication between Prince Edward and the mainland is not such as we would desire. But, the existing conditions present natural difficulties which are undoubtedly hard to overcome. We all realize that, we must further realize the fact—and it is a fact—and our friends on the other side of the House may just as well realize it as we do, that the present government has done very much indeed to improve the facilities for crossing the straits of Northumberland in winter. We know as a matter of fact, that since the present government came into power they have constructed a larger and more powerful boat than the 'Stanley,' thus giving two boats on the service instead of the one which we had previous to 1896. We have the further fact, that the government, through the right hon. the Prime Minister, has given us a promise that during the present session a sufficient amount will be placed in the estimates to provide for the building of a still more powerful steamer, and one calculated to better cope with the difficulties of navigation. We also know that the small boat service by the capes has been greatly improved since the present government came into power. It is only reasonable that we should recognize these things, and that we should acknowledge what this government has done so far. I know very well that our friends opposite contend, that neither the Conservative government nor the present Liberal government has done all that might be done. Perhaps not. Of course, if a government came into power in this country that was reckless of expenditure, they might expend a great deal more money on this service than has heretofore been expended, but I question very much whether the parliament and the people of this country would sustain any government in such a course. I believe, however, that this parliament will cordially approve of the government doing all that can reasonably be done to meet the existing conditions, and I am satisfied that the present government, will do that. I have been urging on the government during the present session that steps should be taken at a very early date to obtain full detailed information with regard to the best means of keeping up winter communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, if it should be found that it is impossible to procure a steamer which will be able to do the work.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What do you want to keep on getting steamers for; we have had two or three already?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. My hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) need not be so captious. I would remind him that the chief newspaper supporting the Conservative party in Prince Edward Island, within the last month or two, urged that the government should take immediate steps to construct another ice-breaking steamer, and stated, that if that were done it would go a long way towards solving the problem. And now, when the government proposes to meet this suggestion of that prominent Conservative newspaper, even that is not satisfactory to gentlemen on the other side of the House. I am afraid that the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, in this regard, is not the best or the wisest course. I believe, Sir, that the best course is to present our claims in a reasonable light to the people of Canada, to this parliament, and to the government; I believe that a reasonable presentation of the facts and a reasonable demand on our part will have the best effect. I know that the government is considering the matter, and I fully believe that before prorogation we will have an assurance, that the government, having looked carefully into all the circumstances, have decided to make provision to obtain such information as will enable them to state to the people of Canada, whether or not it is possible to provide other means than steamers to maintain communication between the island and the mainland.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Does the hon. gentleman think that between now and prorogation the government can get the necessary data before parliament as to the construction of a tunnel?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I do not think they could do anything of the kind, because I am quite satisfied it will take several months to obtain that information.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are you quite satisfied they are going to do it.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's). The Minister of Marine has been kind enough to attempt to disparage my remarks by stating that what I said to-day, I had already said some weeks ago. If he will compare my speech to-day with my speech then, I think he will find that he has made a mistake. However, the Minister of Marine to-day has delivered exactly the same speech as he delivered about a month ago, and he sang the old song, asking the people of Prince Edward Island to be loyal, and to suffer in silence all the afflictions that the government are imposing upon them. The Minister of Marine seems to think that at this late date, Prince Edward Island can get along with small row boats, and that while every other part of the country is making progress, Prince Edward Island must be content to stay in the background. I am astonished that any minister of the Crown should entertain such an idea. He told us that he had never received a suggestion from this side of the House. I gave him one suggestion from this side of the House and told him that it was useless for him to direct those boats from his department here. I told him several times that those boats would have to be put under the charge of some competent person in Prince Edward Island who knew the conditions so that they would not be wiring back and forth to a department which does not appear to be very anxious to perform the service, a department whose head says to-day that there is no promise of steam communication, a department whose head thinks that row boats are good enough for Prince Edward Island, and I am astonished that the hon. member for King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes)—I should not be astonished because this is not the first time he has stood up as the humble apologist of the government——

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. There is no apology needed under the present circumstances, I may tell my hon. friend.

Mr. A. MARTIN. It may be needed by-and-by. The hon. member for King's says he is urging the government. Why, when he went home for the Christmas vacation that gentleman wrote a letter to the 'Patriot' from which I quoted, and he said in the 'Patriot,' with vain glory, that he had the promise of the minister that a third boat would be built and that the minister was going to submit it to his colleagues. That was three months ago, but after the minister had spoken a month ago the hon. member had to go down on his knees and ask the government again if they were going to build a third boat, after he had stated in Prince Edward Island that he had the promise of a third boat. He says that we are not taking the best means. How long has he been here? What means has he taken? If we are not taking the best means who has taken them? Have the best means been taken? What means does he suggest? This promise has been repeated here since confederation and the situation of affairs to-day, notwithstanding the minister's boast, is not a great improvement on what we had when we entered into confederation. I say to the minister's face that his ice boats and those steamers are of no direct benefit to Prince Edward Island. The people of Prince Edward Island are leaning on a broken reed when they depend on these boats in time of stress; when we want to ship our produce we find that the boats are tied up, and I believe if an estimate were made for the last twenty years of the benefits received by the province from those boats and of the loss occasioned to the province by depending upon these boats the account would be pretty nearly square. The hon. member undertakes to speak for the minister, why did not the minister speak for himself? He says that before prorogation

something will happen; why did not the minister stand up and say that? Why is it that the hon. member for King's is the apologist for the minister?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say to my hon. friend that he was not in the House the other day when the Prime Minister said that provision would be made for that purpose.

Mr. A. MARTIN. But the Minister of Marine did not say it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought it was not necessary to convince my hon. friend of that when it had been stated; I thought that one statement of it was sufficient for him, but I shall repeat it if he wishes.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Very well, why was it then that the urging of the member for King's was required? The hon. member for King's says he was urging the government and he undertakes to speak for the government and to say that before prorogation something will be done.

Mr. BRODEUR. And he has been meeting with success too.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Why did not the minister do that? At the same time the member for King's said he had the word of the Prime Minister. If he had the word of the Prime Minister why did he not rely on it? Why does it require his urging if he has the word of the Prime Minister? Evidently he discredits the word of the premier in the same way as he discredits the word of the Minister of Marine when he told the people of Prince Edward Island last fall that a third boat was to be put on, and notwithstanding that put a question on the order paper asking if a third boat was going to be built? That is all I have to say about it.

Motion (Mr. A. Martin) negatived.

APPELLATE COURT FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to interrogate the Minister of Justice in reference to the creation of an appellate court in the province of British Columbia. I desire to ask him if the following statement which appears in the Vancouver 'Daily Province' of Saturday, March 9, is correct:

> Notification to this effect has been forwarded to Hon. A. B. Aylesworth, Minister of Justice in the federal cabinet, by Attorney General Fulton. The Dominion government has also been notified by the provincial authorities that before legislation constituting the court will be passed the federal power must assent to the appointment of two judges to be named by the provincial government.

I desire to ask the Minister of Justice if any such representations have been made to him by the Attorney General of British Columbia or any other member of the provincial government, and if there is any such correspondence will he lay it on the table of the House?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I have simply to say that I have received from the Attorney General of British Columbia official notification of the intention of the legislature of that province, during its present session, to consider a measure for the establishment of a court of appeal for the province, but any statement, in a newspaper or otherwise, that from the attorney general or any member of the government of that province any proposition has been made to me as to the constitution of the court, once it is established, is a statement absolutely without foundation.

CONSOLIDATION OF ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether or not the government proposes to consolidate the orders in council up to date? They were consolidated in 1889 and the consolidation was found very useful. Some members of the bar have written to me from different parts of Canada inquiring as to whether or not I knew anything of the intention of the government in this regard and therefore I venture to ask the Minister of Justice whether it is under contemplation.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The matter has not been under consideration recently but I am very pleased to have the suggestion from my hon. friend and certainly will take it into careful consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The consolidation of 1889 was found very useful indeed; the examination of a great number of volumes of statutes to find a particular order in council sometimes involves a great deal of delay and inconvenience.

EXPORTATION OF ELECTRIC POWER.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 60) to regulate the exportation of electric power and certain liquids and gases.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I have a telegram from the hon. member for East York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) requesting me, as it is impossible for him to be here today, and as he has given notice that he intends to move an amendment on the third reading, to ask that the government leave this motion over until to-morrow, when he will be here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have no notice at all of any such amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, it is here, at page 2311 of 'Hansard.'

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have an amendment to propose to clause 5 and I wish to read it so that the minister may consider it. It provides for the very thing that this commission has suggested in their report. My amendment is:

That after the words 'Governor in Council' in clause 5, the following words be added: And has provided and is maintaining transmission lines in Canada capable of efficiently serving as many people in this country as can be served by such licensee in any foreign country, and also capable of serving as many people in Canada as may from time to time require power.

That is his notice of motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a speech from the hon. member?

Mr. SPROULE. He has given his notice from his place in the House.

Mr. PATERSON. He should be here then.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He should be here, go on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I wish to move the following amendment:

That the order for the third readng be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by conferring upon the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada the power of licensing and of regulation which, by the terms of the said Bill, are conferred upon the Governor in Council.

I have already stated to the Committee of the Whole my reasons for this motion. So far as the general provisions of the Bill are concerned, I am not entirely satisfied with clause 5, and I did have some intention of moving an amendment with regard to it; but I have no doubt whatever that the provision giving the powers of regulation and license to the Governor in Council is not in accordance with the lines on which we should proceed. The council which advises His Excellency is not an expert body; it is a political and a transient body. It is about as incapable a body to deal with a business proposition of this kind as one could reasonably imagine. More than that, the Governor in Council as well as the minister, in working out a measure of this kind, would most necessarily be called upon to deal with the business interests of political friends and opponents. It is inseparable of course from our constitution that such a body should be called on occasionally to exercise functions of that kind; but I am convinced that the proper course, owing to the tendency which is to be observed in legislation adopted this session, is that these powers should be conferred upon the Governor in Council to as small an extent as possible. In respect of matters of purely governmental administration are concerned, those powers must sometimes be conferred upon the Governor in Council; but so far as matters such as are dealt with in this Bill are concerned, that does not seem to me necessary or desirable. We have taken a step in advance by constituting a Railway Commission and conferring upon it very important powers which were formerly exercised by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. It is true, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) observed the other day in reply to myself, that there are still certain powers of jurisdiction upon appeal preserved to the Privy Council. But I am not sure that the preservation of such powers is desirable. At all events that particular fact does not very much touch the argument I am now advancing. The powers of licensing and of regulation conferred by the provisions of this Bill are not necessarily matters of governmental administration. They are exactly in the same category as the matters which have already been referred to the determination of the Board of Railway Commissioners. That board has jurisdiction of very wide reaching effect in respect of transportation and railway, telephones and express companies. I have already suggested, and would suggest again, that its jurisdiction has outgrown its name and that it would be very proper and wise to reorganize that commission by extending its jurisdiction and increasing its numerical strength and working powers. It would be also wise to give it a new and more comprehensive name—to call it, for instance, the Public Utilities Commission instead of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. It may be and no doubt will be said that the work now developing on that commission is quite as great as it is able to deal with effectively. That, however, is an argument, not against the proposal I am now making, but in favour of a reorganization of that commission. It has occurred to me that it might be desirable to have that Railway Commission, when reorganized, work in two divisions—one division occupied more particularly with administrative matters and the other with matters that might be called judicial. However, that is not the question before the House at the moment. The question before the House, under the amendment I propose, is whether or not it is wiser to entrust extensive powers of this kind—powers which must be exercised under difficult and delicate conditions—to a partisan and transient body such as the Privy Council or to a permanent non-partisan and independent tribunal such as the Board of Railway Commissioners. For my part I am strongly inclined to the opinion that whether this or any succeeding government be in power, it would be much wiser to entrust powers of that kind to an independent commission and not confide them to the cabinet or the committee of the Privy Council which advises His Excellency. For this reason I beg to move:

That the order for the third reading be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by conferring upon the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada the powers of licensing and of regulation which, by the terms of the said Bill, are conferred upon the Governor in Council.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The proposition which my hon. friend has just made is one that was to some extent discussed while the measure in question was in committee. In fact, I might say it was so fully discussed that there is little need for me to add anything to what was then said. One of the practical difficulties in the way of referring the administration of this measure to the railway board has been already indicated by my hon. friend in introducing his amendment. The railway board is at present fully occupied with the work now devolving on it. In fact it is rapidly becoming a matter of practical consideration whether the board ought not to be reorganized and increased in number in order that it may successfully discharge the work for which it was appointed. But we are not yet at any rate in a position to recommend to the House—as a project which has been sufficiently considered and in regard to which plans have been sufficiently matured—the reorganization of that board and the increasing of its numbers. We are going on for the present with the board as it is now constituted. And, with the number of members of the board and the amount of work which falls practically to be done by that commission at the present time, it stands confessed that there could not be added to the duties of that tribunal such a body of work as, at all events in the beginning of the administration of this measure, would necessarily be entailed by it. Under these circumstances, if there were no other answer to the proposition that my hon. friend has made, it seems to me that that alone is sufficient. The board, with its present amount of work and as at present constituted, is working wholly up to the limit of its powers, and to add new duties of a burdensome nature would simply necessitate some part of the proper work of that board not being attended to as fully and as carefully as is to be desired. But there is in addition, a circumstance, to which I certainly feel disposed to attach much more weight than does my hon. friend—the circumstance, I mean, that, if this duty were imposed upon the Railway Board, there would seem a necessity to create some appellate tribunal, to provide somewhere a place where one dissatisfied might resort by way of appeal from any decision of the board to which he took exception. I do not know any place where any dissatisfied applicant, or any one resisting an application who is dissatisfied with the result, could be sent except where appeals upon all questions of fact from the Railway Board at present go. I need not remind you that that appeal which, under the provisions of the Railway Act, lies from discretions of the Railway Board to the Governor in Council, is by no means a dead letter or a right of which litigants do not freely avail themselves, nor can I say that appeals from that board are not frequently heard by the Governor in Council under the Railway Act. If the amendment which is proposed were adopted, and there were added, as would seem to be the necessary corollary, the right of appeal on questions of fact to the Governor in Council which now exists under the provisions of the Railway Act, we should be no further forward, but should be in the position of matters in which we now are under the provisions of this measure as it has been presented for the third reading.

In these circumstances, the objections I have referred to seem to me sufficient without more. But the grounds upon which my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has supported his proposition to substitute the Board of Railway Commissioners for the Governor in Council deserve a word of comment. My hon. friend thinks the provision of the Bill on this point is undesirable; he thinks it dangerous that the power to issue licenses under the provisions of this statute should rest with a body which he refers to as a transient and partisan body. But is there anything anomalous in that? Is it not the proper, as well as the ordinary way of transacting the public business of this country? The issuing of a license of any description is the act of the Crown advised by the Crown's constituted advisers, The issuing of licenses for any purpose controlled by any particular department of the government proceeds upon the recommendation of the minister charged with the responsibility for that particular department; and, whether the licenses are of great importance, as in many instances we see on every side, or whether they are of minor consequence, in every instance they proceed from the Sovereign through, and acting upon, the advice of his appointed minister. The issuing of timber licenses—not, perhaps, so immediately important in the administration of the affairs of the Dominion as in those of the provinces—is an instance in which the governments of various portions of this Dominion are charged with a responsibility certainly as important and probably of much more consequence to the interested parties than that which will fall upon the government of the Dominion in the administration of this particular Bill, if it is passed in its present form. I do not mean to say that we have not heard in the past that governments or ministers in the issuing of licenses to cut timber, or for the sale of intoxicating liquors or for other purposes, have been influenced by political or partisan motives.

These charges are made. The ministers who administer the departments concerned necessarily run the risk of criticism of that character, and they take that as part of the responsibility of their offices. But, because these charges are made, we do not find propositions advocated that the administration of the public business of the country should be taken out of the hands of those who are appointed for the very purpose of administering these portions of the public business and given to some different tribunal. And I see no difference in principle. As I said a moment ago, the issuing of licenses, whether in regard to these larger and more important business transactions I have referred to or to the smallest matters, where the issuing of a license is of the most formal character, whether a license for the sale of postage stamps or a license issued so much as a matter of course as a license to contract matrimony—in every case that one can conceive of where the issuing of a license is necessary under statute, the license is issued by the Crown upon the advice either of some minister or of the body of ministers as a whole; and, to create an exception in this matter would seem to me something not needed, unless it be done upon the ground upon which it is put, that there would be always the suspicion to which members of the government would be open that they would be influenced by political friendship, for this, that, or the other person interested. And that, as I say, is a liability which ministers incur from the moment they undertake the administration of the affairs of the country, and there is no more reason to expect these charges to arise from this line of business than from any other. There is also the fact, manifest upon consideration and to be taken into account, that the investigation of the circumstances in regard to which information would inevitably be necessary before the application for a license under this statute could be intelligently disposed of is something which needs the assistance of the skilled and scientific people who must either be engaged for the special purpose or must be found already attached to the various departments of the government. If this duty were put upon the Railway Board, that board would of necessity be entitled to the assistance of skilled experts in the particular line of scientific inquiry involved, and it would necessitate, as it would seem to me, not merely the additional amount of work which it would place upon that board, but equally the engaging and maintaining of a staff of engineering assistants of a character which the present board is not now possessed of, but such as, on the other hand, can readily be utilized in the different departments, or some of the departments of the government.

Aside from these considerations which occur to me at the moment, there would be this additional difficulty, which possibly has been contemplated, but which has not been alluded to, and in regard to which I do not quite understand what the proposition of the amendment would be. We are by this Bill proposing a double measure of control upon the export of electricity and of fluid from this country. We are proposing not merely that any producer who desires to export must first obtain a license entitling him to do so, and that the amount which he so exports, or for which he has a license, should be limited to the surplus which he produces and which is not needed in this country; but we are also providing as a means for enforcing our control over the quantity of export, that by proclamation export duties may be imposed upon any producer who is not complying with the requirements of the law; whereas any producer who is complying may be relieved of the incidence of such duties. Those duties, it is proposed, are to be imposed or removed, are to be varied or reimposed, as occasion may require, upon proclamation, to be issued, of course, by the advice of the Governor's Council. It would introduce at once confusion in the administration of this measure if we were to put the licensing power into the hands of a separate tribunal from that which is charged with the responsibility of taking action of the character I describe, in the event of the conditions of the license not being complied with by the licensee. We are in this clause, with regard to the imposition or removal, as the case may be, of export duties, adopting the same course which this parliament sanctioned a few years ago in the case of nickle and other commodities, in regard to which export duties were to be imposed, if it was thought necessary, by action of the Governor in Council. There seems no other tribunal to which the right could be assigned to decide whether or not occasion had arisen for the imposition of export duties than the Governor in Council, and with the responsibility placed upon the Governor in Council in connection with the working out of this Act, it would seem the only natural thing, and not incongruous with the similar duty of deciding upon the terms under which export should by license be permitted, that the imposition of the duty should rest with the same body. For these reasons I prefer the provisions of the Bill as drawn, and must oppose the amendment of my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I say a word in explanation of my position with respect to what the minister has just now mentioned. The Governor in Council, of course, must deal with export duties. As I understand section 10 the power to impose export duties is in aid of, and ancillary

to, the power of regulation. Well, it can be used as ancillary to, and in aid of, the enforcement of regulations by the board, just as it can be used under the present provisions of the Bill. So it did not occur to me that any difficulty would arise in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the minister's argument was very logical when he said that the power here asked for by order in council was like that granted in respect to leases of timber lands or agricultural leases. That is largely departmental work, and the Minister of the Interior grants these leases under the regulations of the law and they relate to the public domain. Then the minister says that there is a contention that political influence will be brought to bear. Is there not greater danger of political influence being brought to bear upon the government with regard to these licenses than there would be upon the Railway Commission? I would imagine so because the Railway Commission is not obliged always to keep in the good graces of the people, as a government is. The Railway Commission is independent of the electors, and can go on and do their duty as they judge right and proper. Then the minister says it would necessitate the board employing one or more experts, if this power was given over to the board. Well, who is going to inform the government if it is not the board? The board would make a recommendation to the government to grant the license by order in council, and in either case the board would require to be informed, whether they acquired that information from one or more experts. The board could be responsible for looking into the subject carefully and getting such information as would justify them in recommending to the government that a license be granted. It seems to me the board is the more proper body to deal with this question than the government, and that it would inspire greater public confidence.

Amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden) negatived on division.

Mr. SPROULE. I put a question to the minister who had this Bill in charge, and he did not deign to reply except by a nod of the head, which I consider was scarcely courteous when a request is made on behalf of an absent member, and in absence of any intimation that the government are disposed to move the Bill, and give a member an opportunity to move a motion of which he has given notice. I take the opportunity to move it now. I move that the order for the third reading of this Bill be not gone on with now, but that it be discharged, and the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding the following clause in amendment:

That after the words 'Governor in Council' in clause 5, the following words be added:

And has provided and is maintaining transmission lines in Canada capable of efficiently serving as many people in this country as can be served by such lines in any foreign country, and also capable of serving as many people in Canada as may from time to time require power.

I make the motion for this reason: While on the American side there are ample lines for conveying power, in Canada there are practically none. It might be contended that, if it was proposed to transfer more power to the American side than was being used in Canada, they have no appliances for conveying power in Canada, and therefore the supply of power to Canadians would be prevented because there are no lines to transmit power to them. We take for example the need that might occur in Galt which town might require power from this company. They know that there is no line to transmit power to Galt. They desire to have a certain quantity of power and after they have reached this conclusion I imagine that it would be almost unnecessary to apply to the company to grant them this power because of the small quantity they required and that the company would not be very likely to build transmitting lines to supply such a small quantity of power; whereas, on the other hand, if they were across the line the quantity of power that would be required would be much larger and the lines would be already built. Therefore, the Canadians might suffer because of the fact of no transmission lines having been built in the country. It is for that reason that I make this motion.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) answers that I would like him to be kind enough to reply at the same time to a question I would like to put to him. Perhaps the point has been explained in committee, but I do not remember. It is in reference to section 4.

Subject to any regulations of the Governor in Council in that behalf, the minister may grant licenses, subject to such conditions as he thinks proper, for the exportation, &c.

What I wish to understand is this: Several companies are at present exporting power to the United States. They will require, if I understand the case rightly, a license. The regulations will not be particular ones but the regulations will be general ones which will be applicable to all companies whether they are exercising the right now or getting the right afterwards. Am I right in that?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Referring first, as I may be permitted to do, to the question which has been put by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), my idea would be that the

regulations of the Governor in Council mentioned in section 4 would be general regulations applicable, so long as they remain in force, to all applicants for licenses and applicable certainly to existing companies, which, under section 3, would require to have licenses. The regulations having been promulgated, each individual application would be considered by the Governor in Council subject to these regulations, and subject to the special circumstances of each individual case.

Mr. HAGGART. That modifies it considerably—subject to such conditions as may be applicable to each particular case. What is the meaning of that—that there will be other regulations than the general regulations ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That was not in my mind at all. What was in my mind in using the words mentioned was simply that the facts and circumstances of each particular applicant, the amount which he was supplying at the time of the application to Canadian consumers and the amount of the surplus which he had would differ from the same circumstances in regard to another applicant, and that the amount any particular applicant would be licensed to export might for these reasons differ materially from the amount that another applicant would be licensed to export.

In reference to the motion which has been presented to you, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) I would like to say first of all that certainly on my part, and I am sure on the part of every one on this side of the House, there was no thought of discourtesy when my hon. friend, at an earlier stage of the proceedings this afternoon, referred to the notice given by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) as appearing at page 2311 of the unrevised 'Hansard.' That was a notice given verbally in the course of the discussion upon the second reading of the Bill or in the Committee of the Whole, as long ago as the 29th of January. The Bill, upon that occasion, stood for the purpose expressed at the time of referring these two particular clauses to the government of Ontario for an expression of any views that they might care to give. The Bill was resumed last week and passed through committee. I am not, at the moment, aware whether the hon. member for South York was then there or was not here, but if he was here there was no mention at that time made of this proposal on his part and if he was not here he must have seen, if he looked at the proceedings of the House, what had taken place, and if the hon. gentleman was not satisfied or if he had intended to follow this matter at all he should have made some intimation of that intention on his part.

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

Mr. SPROULE. It was not that fact because it is not necessary to give notice at all inasmuch as this is a public Bill, but what I referred to was the fact that I held in my hand a telegram from the hon. member for South York requesting that owing to his unavoidable absence we should leave the third reading of the Bill until to-morrow. There was no answer given except a nod to go on with the Bill.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. As I said, I disclaim, in so far as I am concerned, any intention to be discourteous. I was engaged at the moment in endeavouring to find the statement to which the hon. member for East Grey had referred, and when he gave me the reference to the page in 'Hansard' I was engaged in turning it up because it came to me to-day as an entirely new matter and I had not any recollection of it. However, under any circumstances, I do not see that there is any reason why the business of the House should be delayed by the accident that the hon. member for South York is not here. If we were to delay upon that account we would delay upon a great many occasions.

In regard to the amendment which is proposed let me say, Mr. Speaker, simply that it attempts, I submit, to be specific, where it would be wiser to leave things in general terms. The clause as it stands conveys the exact meaning intended by the framers of the Bill. It provides that the amount which henceforth shall be permitted to be exported shall be restricted, that whereas heretofore there has been no restriction whatever on the amount which any producer might export for sale into the United States, in future, there shall be a practical restriction upon it and that the amount which in future the producer can export shall only be such amount as is not needed at that time in this country. We express that meaning when we clearly say that the license may provide that the amount to be exported shall be limited to the surplus after the licensee has supplied for distribution to customers for use in Canada power to the extent defined by the license at the price and in accordance with the conditions, rules and regulations prescribed.

We are intending to permit the taking out of the country only such amount as there is no use for in the country, and in the circumstances we should be restricting the general terms which this section lays down as a rule of guidance for the tribunal issuing the license if we were to add that the quantity to be exported should be limited to the surplus, after the licensee had provided and is maintaining transmission lines in Canada. The practical effect of it would be, as to existing companies at all events, that until they had provided and were maintaining some transmission lines—I do not know what the extent of them—but

some transmission lines, they would be forbidden to export anything at all. Well now, where is the necessity for that or where is the propriety of it? At the present time, at Niagara—with regard to which alone there appears to be discussion of the present proposition—we have one of the three companies maintaining a transmission line over which it is supplying substantially all the power which is consumed at present in Canada. Apart from such local needs as there may be in the immediate vicinity of Niagara Falls, it is only one of the three companies that is maintaining any long distance transmission lines. If this amendment were inserted in the Bill, it would at once preclude either of the other companies from exporting anything, because the language of the amendment is that even their surplus cannot be exported until the producer has provided and is maintaining transmission lines in Canada capable of serving as many people as would be served by that licensee in the United States. If there is one producer finding his market in Canada and content to continue finding his market in Canada, and if the prices at which that one producer is supplying Canadian needs is reasonable and satisfactory, what object is there in preventing the unused surplus of other producers going abroad? I am unable to suggest any, and it would seem to me, with all deference to any hon. member who may have an opposite opinion, that it would be inadvisable to limit ourselves, or to tie the hands of the licensing tribunal, by preventing them from issuing a license permitting export, unless there was the condition of things which this amendment describes.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a person from a remote town applied for power, and he was told he could not get it because they had to build transmission lines, unless they charged him a higher rate. Would he not be likely to stop negotiations for obtaining that power? Then the company might say to the government: we have not been able to sell this power in Canada and we wish to export to the United States where we have customers and existing transmission lines. Would the power company not be much more likely to sell its power in the United States where it already has lines, than to endeavour to sell it in Canada where it would have to build transmission lines?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I would think that the condition of things described by my hon. friend would be exactly such as the licensing tribunal would inquire into and deal with in a just and reasonable way.

Amendment (Mr. Sproule) negatived on division.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Before the Bill is read a third time I wish to make one more effort to sustain the rights of the people of Canada. I make a last appeal to have inserted in the Bill an amendment such as was indicated by me in the discussion in committee. I therefore beg to move, seconded by Mr. Cockshutt:

That the order for the third reading be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by adding after the word 'Council' in the sixth line of section 5, the words following: In which it shall always be provided that no license shall be issued under this Act unless the licensee shall employ and actually use in Canada during the whole of the term of the license a quantity of power or fluid (not theretofore employed or used) equal to the quantity licensed for export; also that no further licenses whatever shall be issued when there shall be less surplus than twenty-five thousand horse-power immediately available.

The amendment is the same as I proposed in committee and I shall not weary the House with any repetition of the reasons I then gave for advocating its adoption. But new light has come to us since that discussion in committee. I was surprised to find that after the majority of the committee had, at the instance of the government negatived my amendment, a very important communication was laid on the table by the Minister of Justice, and which had the committee known of its existence I think they would have voted for the amendment in the interests of the country, and irrespective of party politics. I refer to the letter written by the Premier of Ontario to the Minister of Justice and which will be found on page 4761 unrevised 'Hansard.' If hon. gentlemen should vote for this amendment which I now propose, it is not too late to prevent that injury to Canada which Mr. Whitney in his letter gives such strong notice of. The letter is dated February 28, 1907, about three weeks ago, and it says:

Under agreements with three companies we are entitled to have used in Canada, when called for, one-half the power developed by them.

These three companies, as has been admitted by the Minister of Justice, are practically all that are now concerned in creating this power. And Mr. Whitney has an arrangement with these three companies to-day, that arrangement being that they shall do what my motion seeks to compel them to do. If my amendment be adopted we are therefore not asking these companies to do any unreasonable thing, notwithstanding anything that the Minister of Justice may say. Is it unreasonable that we should provide machinery to compel these three companies to live up to a solemn agreement made with a province of this Dominion? We find now that the Premier of Ontario has informed the Minister of Justice, that the province of Ontario is always to have for the Canadians one-half

the power which is produced by these three companies. Without knowing that he had that agreement, but having an idea that some such arrangement would be the very least we should require from the producers of this power, I proposed my amendment. I, of course, had my own opinion that no exportation should be allowed at present until we saw if the power companies were able to develop Canada with the power they had, but I thought that we should at least insist that the Americans should not get more than one-half of the power that Canada was producing, and that the producers of this power should be compelled to assist Canada to an extent at least equal to the assistance they gave to American industry. I was told by the Minister of Justice that he proposed restriction was not reasonable, but now I find that there was this letter from the Premier of Ontario which shows that the only companies who could accuse us of being unreasonable if we limited their export had agreed with the premier, the government and the people of Ontario that they would always have at least one-half the power they create available for use in Canada. Then comes my amendment that we should at least insist that for every unit of power which we allow to be exported, Canada shall be built up by power to the same extent being furnished for the creation of industries in this country.

Having heard from the Minister of Justice last week when my amendment to this Bill to the same effect was before the committee that not one-tenth of the power being created would be used in Canada, I made inquiries and I have information from a gentleman who certainly knows, and who has given more attention to this question than possibly any one else, that is the Hon. Adam Beck, who as minister in Mr. Whitney's government has charge of this question, that one-half of the power which we will be permitted to develop under our proposed agreement with the United States has already been applied for. By the agreement proposed by the joint Waterways Commission the production of power on the Canadian side is limited to 200,000 horse-power, and I find that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission has at this moment applications from the districts served by it for 100,000 horse-power, one half of all that we can develop under the proposed agreement; so that instead of a consumption of one-tenth in Canada there are now applications for 50 per cent. Thus I do not see the unreasonableness of the suggestion that we should have retained in Canada an amount of power equal to that which is exported. If that is to be considered unreasonable let us so understand it, but the only visible ground for calling the suggestion unreasonable is that some one in this House undertakes to provide by legislation means to protect Canada and to assert that Canada is not to exist entirely for the benefit of the United States.

On a motion which I made early in the session it was demonstrated that we are to be allowed to create only a little more than one-half of the total development of power at Niagara Falls, and my suggestion is that we shall not allow more than one-half of that one-half to be exported from Canada. The Minister of Justice says that at present there is no market for all of this power in Canada. How are you to get a market if you take all the goods to be sold away to another market? If the market in Canada is to be an empty void you cannot expect people to go to that market to buy. If all power is permitted to be exported there will be no inducement to any one in Canada to create industries or to invite others to do so. If it is supposed to be fashionable to be so good to the United States that Canada should always hand over everything she has to the United States for fear of being called unfriendly, I am dead against such an attitude, but whether that is, or is not the position it is time the government woke up and undertook in the legislation which they frame, to protect Canadian industries and to see that Canada is built up. We have no safer way of protecting those industries than by some such legislation as is proposed by my amendment. It has been strenuously urged by the Minister of Justice two or three times as a reason for the passing of this legislation that until his Bill was brought in there was no limit on the exportation of power, but I point out that there was a contract between the people creating the power and the government of Ontario that they actually could not export more than one-half of what they produced. Then the minister comes along with federal legislation and there is this very serious question; if this Bill should pass without our enacting some such amendment as this of mine then this federal legislation could be used to override the bargain made between the province and these people who are developing power and we would be told that the Dominion government had permitted the exportation of the power, and as the two governments have not agreed on it the federal authority is supreme and the bargain with the province to a large extent would be overridden, the power companies would not be bound by it. This would be a very plausible argument and a likely result in a court of justice.

Mr. Whitney's letter gots on :

> Should any arrangement be made with the United States affecting the quantity of power to be developed on the Canadian side of the Niagara river, or should one or more of a number of other contingencies occur, our position would be a very complicated one indeed.

Now I propose to relieve that complication. Mr. Whitney does not know when he writes that whether the Waterways

Commission report is to be adopted or not, but there it is before this country, a document laid on the table of this House, awaiting the sanction of parliament, a bargain made by people authorized to make it, subject to approval by parliament, limiting this power. Let us assume, and I hope this will not occur, that the government intends to adopt that arrangement made by this Joint Waterways Commission and that it will be ratified by treaty between Great Britain and the United States. Mr. Whitney points out that if this is done and the quantity to be developed on the Canadian side is limited :

Then our position would be a very complicated one indeed.

I propose to remove that complication by having an enactment which will prevent the government being embarrassed by such a complication so that they can say to any people applying for leave to export : How much are you developing now, go on and furnish as much for Canadian consumption as you propose to export and then you can get permission to export accordingly. If we do not pass such an amendment it means that the government do not intend to protect the people, and it may be said when the people want to deal with the government under this statute and find the government has voted down such a proposition as I am advocating, they have a reasonable right to come to this government and expect them to not regard such a qualification.

It is reasonable for every one to suppose that they intend, if they see fit, to allow the whole of this to be exported. Under those circumstances, the government, not having proposed any other way, no other proposition being made by any one supporting the government to protect the Canadian people, I think it is my duty to insist on this amendment, and make one last effort to protect our people in this matter. I beg, therefore, to move the amendment which I have read.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. When this amendment was proposed in Committee of the Whole last Wednesday it was very fully discussed, and therefore I shall not delay the House by going over that discussion, beyond reminding you, Mr. Speaker, that this measure does not concern the Niagara peninsula alone. I think it was pointed out last Wednesday by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) that there was within his constituency one case, at any rate, of the production of electric power, in which the total production was far less than the 25,000 horse-power this amendment proposes should always be retained in this country. I rise, however, merely because reference has been made to a letter which, on that occasion, I read at the request of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition—a letter addressed to me by the Premier of Ontario some three weeks ago. We have been told this afternoon that there is something new in this letter, that it contains a piece of news which, had the committee been aware of it last Wednesday, might have brought about an entirely different result. And that piece of news is that agreements exist between the government of Ontario on the one part and the three electric producing companies at Niagara on the other part, under which the government is entitled to have utilized in Canada, when called for, one half the pewer developed by these producers. I have only to say that the existence of such agreements has been public knowledge for months—I might say for years—in fact, ever since these agreements were entered into. The agreements in question are referred to over and over again in the reports of the Waterways Commission, which have been on the table of this House for months, and they are to be found, if not in the statutes of Ontario, at all events in the published orders in council and records of that province. What the legal effect of these agreements may be is not for me to say. All that I am desirous of pointing out is that whatever the contractual obligations resting upon these companies may be, those will certainly not be in the slightest degree interfered with by the measure of restriction upon export which this Bill proposes to impose.

Mr. SPROULE. If you give them the power to export, and they avail themselves of that power to the detriment of that agreement, which would prevail—the provincial or the federal?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am unable to see the slightest conflict. They are under contract with somebody—I do not care whether with a government or an individual—to dispose of their product in a certain proportion. That contract, if it has any validity at all, is enforcible by the courts ; and without reference to our permission, under this Bill, to export a larger quantity, their contractual obligation must be observed or they must take the consequences.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister say that if we pass a statute which renders it unnecessary for them to do that, that will not be held a reasonable defence for their not doing it? If we pass an Act relieving people from their obligation under a certain contract, can they not plead that Act as their defence?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. If anybody were proposing to pass an Act of parliament relieving any individual or company of any contract, that would be a different story. But we are doing nothing of the kind.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is the effect of what you are doing.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bell Telephone Company were relieved of their obligations under an Ontario law by virtue of federal authority. They pleaded their rights under the federal authority to ignore the obligations under the provincial Act.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. My hon. friend is referring to an altogether different thing. In the case of the Bell Telephone Company there was incorporation by Act of the Dominion parliament and also an independent incorporation, in slightly different terms, by Act of the Ontario legislature. It was therefore a question for the court to determine upon what terms the company was incorporated. There was no conflict of authority between the Dominion and Ontario legislation in the sense that either was superior to the other. It was simply a question, the one being earlier than the other, whether the provisions of that earlier legislation were embodied in the subsequent legislation.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to clearly understand what effect the regulations may have. Suppose a license were granted to a company to export power, and that company entered into contract with companies on the other side, and suppose the Dominion government were to alter from time to time its regulations, thus affecting these contracts which the company had entered into. Might not that lead us into this difficulty, that a foreign country might insist that our contractual arrangements with individuals in that country should be carried out?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The regulations are one thing and the license an altogether different thing. The regulations will not enter into any details as to individual cases, or the amounts which any individual producer may deal with either in Canada or the United States, but they will provide the rules under which any producer may make his application for a license. The licensee will obtain his license pursuant to those regulations. By his license he will be told: You must supply a certain definite quantity for consumption in Canada, but any amount beyond that you may send wherever you can find a market. His license authorizes him to export that surplus; but by section 4 of this Bill that license is revocable upon reasonable notice and without cause. All that is necessary is to give the licensee such length of notice as is reasonable under the circumstances, and, subject to that condition, the license is revocable at will. Every licensee will take his permission to export with the distinct warning before his eyes that the license may be revoked upon reasonable notice—three months, three weeks, or whatever it may be—and any contract upon which he enters with a consumer in the United States will be entered upon with the danger open before his eyes that, if the Canadian demand increase, he must supply the Canadian demand first, and that his license is liable to be revoked and a new one substituted, in which the amount of his permissible export is reduced. That is my idea of the practical working out of the statute, and I cannot see that the issuing of a license will interfere with the contractual obligations, whether in this country or in other countries, into which the licensee may have entered.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there anything in the Act that the license may be revoked?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Oh, yes.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). This matter was fully discussed on a perivous occasion, so I do not intend to take up more than a few moments. Speaking a week or so ago upon this question, I had not by me the figures showing the cost of transmission lines per mile. Since then I have looked up the figures and desire to point out to the minister the difficulties there will be in the way of the existing companies placing the power in the market within a reasonable radiating distance of Niagara—say London on the west and Peterborough on the east—which points, I believe, would be found as far distant as it would be wise to go. It is difficult to give a hard and fast estimate of the cost of transmission lines. The cost of the right of way is one of the principal factors, and, of course, these values vary according to the country through which the transmission line is to go. But we have certain data on which we can place a fair estimate in regard to the proposition now under discussion—this Niagara power question. Take the Niagara-London line and the Niagara-Toronto line, one already constructed and the other in the course of construction. These are through the ordinary territory of Ontario, so that they will cost about what other lines in the province may be expected to cost. The distance from Niagara to London, I believe, is 123 miles, but it will be sufficient for the present purpose if we count it at 120 miles. From Niagara to Toronto is 80 miles. This makes a total of 200 miles of transmission lines. The figures I have shown of the detailed cost of the Toronto-Niagara line make a total of $1,235,000 in round numbers, and the Niagara-London line will cost about $1,607,000. The total cost of the two lines is $2,842,000, or about an average of $15,000 per mile. This includes right of way, towers, insulators, copper, lighting arresters, switches and telephone lines. The minister will see at once that it is a pretty large proposition for the power companies to entertain—an expenditure of over $3,000,000 to cover only

a part of the district which they ought to cover; if they were to afford the facilities they ought to afford it would cost, probably, $4,000,000 to take in the territory within reasonable radiating distance of Niagara. On the other hand, to put the power across the Niagara river would only require about a mile of transmission line. It would be easy to put 100,000 horse-power across the river at Niagara. The expense for construction of line would probably not exceed $25,000 to carry 100,000 horse-power, which is the quantity that I base my calculation upon.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) allow me to ask him a question? Will it not cost as much mile for mile to build lines on the American side as to build them upon the Canadian side?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think it likely that it will cost as much on the American side as on the Canadian side. But may I remind the hon. minister (Mr. Aylesworth) that the transmission lines already exist on the American side and all they need is coupling up. With very slight expenditure a great power can be transmitted over the lines that already exist. If there were no lines, I agree with the minister that it would cost as much to deliver the power in the United States as in Canada.

Mr. CONMEE. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) a question? Who owns these lines already constructed on the American side? And does the hon. gentleman think that the company would be allowed to use them without charge or would they expect to pay as much as though they owned them?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am not in a position to state who are the owners, but I understand the likelihood is that contracts will be let to the owners of the present transmission line, one of whom, I believe, is in close union with one of the companies on our side. Therefore, it is likely that all the power will be sold to one or other of the transmission lines in New York state.

Now, I wish to point out to the minister that the quantity of power used in Ontario will depend largely upon the price; the lower you make the price the greater will be the demand. But the way to make dear power is to export your surplus. In that you can easily keep the price to $40 or $50 a horse-power, which is about what we have been paying, and which is too much. Within two miles of where we sit there is a very large industrial concern which has a contract for power. I have figures concerning it from a gentleman who is interested, and I think I may venture to use these figures; hon. gentlemen can rely upon their being accurate. This concern has an agreement with one of the electric companies on the Ottawa river to supply 500 horse-power at $15 per horse-power per year, with a twenty-four hour day. This is the price delivered at the factory. On the other hand, in Toronto the people are paying $40 and $50, or, for small units, a great deal more. In Brantford we pay as high as $100 per horse-power per year for small units, and I do not think that it can be had in any quantity for less than $40 or $50. You cannot get a large market for electrical power at these figures. But we have figures which I quoted to this House last year showing the actual cost of producing the power at Niagara. I showed that in 100,000 horse-power units the power could be developed at $5 per horse-power, that price to include a sinking fund that in 40 years would purchase the works. These, I admit, are lower figures than any of the companies are willing to give. But the engineers who prepared these figures for the commission of which I have the honour to be a member, went into the matter with the greatest care. Hon. gentlemen will remember that we had a debate on the subject at that time and that all were not willing to accept my figures. So I said to the engineers: Your figures are disputed in the House of Commons. I said, gentlemen representing some districts in which transmission is a great factor, notably in the Niagara district, dispute the figures, and, I said, can you give me any evidence that these figures are correct, that the thing can be carried out? He said: I cannot give you any further evidence than this, but I am willing to say that if you will find the capital to build these transmission lines, we will take the contract at the price that will do it. That was one of the most reputable firms in Canada, one of the best firms of engineers in the city of Montreal who made that statement to myself after the discussion in this House, saying that they were prepared to take a contract that would enable them to produce 100,000 horse-power units at Niagara Falls at a basis of $5 per horse-power for twenty-four hours per day per annum.

Mr. HAGGART. With no allowance for value of water-power?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. No, simply the cost of the works and all the necessary apparatus for producing the power. The water-power has been paid for at a very small price by these companies, an average of about twenty-five cents per horse-power per annum. So really after you have paid for the water-power it would not cost more than twenty-five cents or fifty cents extra for your horse-power per annum. Therefore, you have a basis on which you can work. If you begin with a basis of that kind your market will be extended almost indefinitely. I think Mr. Whitney's figures read by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) would be corroborated within a

very few years, and probably within five years at the utmost, this 200,000 horsepower that he speaks of could be utilized in that part of the province of Ontario. If you allow them now to carry to the United States at low prices and make arrangements for five or ten years, I fear you will check the development that might take place in our part of the province. For that reason I appeal to the minister to allow something like this amendment to be added. If he is not quite satisfied with the wording of the motion it can be modified, but let it contain the principle involved in the amendment of the member for Lincoln. I think it is in the interest of the people, it is in the interest of the industrial community ; and I believe the day is near at hand when our radial roads, and perhaps even our railways now run by steam, will require all the power that can be generated at Niagara Falls under existing conditions, providing the recommendations of the Waterways Commission are carried out.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth)). The minister seems to think that it would be a hardship if this amendment were adopted. Let us see what the proposition is. There are four large companies now, three at Niagara and one at Decews Falls. Two of these companies, one at Decews Falls and one at Niagara, are Canadian companies, with Canadian capital entirely, I believe. These two companies are supplying the cities and towns of Canada. The other two companies are American companies with entirely American capital, and they are exporting practically all their power to the other side of the line. Now, what would be the position if this amendment were put into effect ? The two patriotic Canadian companies that are serving Canadians would be in a position at once to export a quantity of power equal to that which they are using on this side, which would be about all they can make. The other two companies would be put in this position, that it would be necessary for them to develop in Canada some means of applying this power, and that would bring into the field two strong competitors, two rich companies, who would commence to compete for supplying power to the various industries in Canada. Would not that be a great achievement for this government ? What more important or more useful thing than to bring into the field two rich and powerful companies, compel them by such legislation as this to compete for the application of power to the industries of Canada ? As my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has just said, no great amount of power will be used unless it is cheap, and the way to make it cheap is to bring companies into competition with each other. It may be said that these two companies are now exporting large quantities of power, and it would be a hardship to cut them off at once. Well, give them two or three years to put in operation in Canada one-half of what they are now exporting, and the balance in two or three years, giving them a reasonable amount of time in which to put into operation in Canada an equal quantity of power to that which they are now exporting. The effect would be enormous. Nothing could be devised by this government more advantageous to the province of Ontario than a measure which would bring about the cheapest possible power, and bring it into thousands of uses where it is not now applied and never will be applied unless it is made cheap, and unless other strong companies are compelled or induced to start operations. It seems to me an amendment of this kind should be put into the Act.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lancaster).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barr,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Christie,
Cockshutt,
Elson,
Fowler,
Gunn,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
MacLaren,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Morin,
Paquet,
Perley,
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Worthington.—38.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carrier,
Cash,
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Cyr,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin (Nicolet),
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Ratz,

Emmerson,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Hall,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Laurence,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Robitaille,
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—102.

Amendment (Mr. Lancaster) negatived.

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

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

QUEBEC ORIENTAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) respecting the Quebec Oriental Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What lines are comprised in this Bill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A portion of this railway will be in New Brunswick and a portion in Quebec, the intention being to connect with the Baie de Chaleurs Railway at Matapedia. In the Railway Committee, after full discussion, it was declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That declaration is not necessary if part of the railway is in one province and part in another. I do not understand how that can be, since it appears from the preamble that the company was incorporated by the Quebec legislature.

Mr. EMMERSON. A portion of it goes through New Brunswick.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This cannot be the same undertaking, because no one province would undertake to incorporate a company to build a road in another province. We are repeatedly getting instances of this kind in this House. First, the provincial legislature incorporates a company to undertake a certain work, then, a few years afterwards, the same company comes to this parliament and asks for legislation, and that the work be declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. The fullest explanation should be given in such cases, because it is difficult to understand how a work which for ten or twenty years has remained a provincial work, suddenly becomes, without any apparent cause, a work for the general advantage of Canada. We should be jealous of interfering with legislation which is properly within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. Up to the present, this certainly has been within the jurisdiction of Quebec. Yesterday it was a work provincial in its character ; to-day it is a work for the general advantage of Canada. This sudden transformation is altogether beyond my comprehension.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Bill is reprinted as amended by the Railway Committee and it will be found there that this railway goes through Bonaventure county and in the northern part of New Brunswick. It will be necessary to have a Dominion charter therefore.

Mr. LENNOX. We are not giving them a Dominion charter.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is practically that. The company was originally incorporated by the legislature of Quebec but in consequence of the route selected it was necessary to have legislation here. The Railway Committee now examines very closely into the question of jurisdiction.

Mr. LENNOX. The Railway Committee does ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. A large number of these railways are incorporated in connection with other lines. It is seldom that any railways are now projected that are not Dominion in their character. All the railways along the line of the Intercolonial Railway are designed to connect with it, and it is desirable that in all cases where possible, the connecting lines with the great trunk systems, should be under Dominion jurisdiction. The reason is obvious ; we have established a Railway Commission and it would be anomalous if the jurisdiction of that commission were confined to one portion of a system, and did not include its connections. I make the statement the Railway Committee is very jealous in that regard. They examine very closely every Bill and no incorporations are granted, no Bills are approved by that committee, unless it is shown that there are very strong reasons why the legislation should be granted by this parliament rather than by the provincial legislatures.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Railway Commission may have looked into this very carefully but the minister does not seem to give what I regard as a very intelligible explanation of it. If this undertaking is in respect of a railway that runs from the province of Quebec into the province of

New Brunswick, which is partly in one province and partly in the other, there is no need for this declaration. The road, under such conditions, is a road over which this parliament has jurisdiction and is not a road over which either of the provincial legislatures' would have jurisdiction; that I think is perfectly plain. Therefore if what the minister states is to be accepted as absolutely correct, this section should be struck out as unnecessary, but it does not seem to me that that can be an accurate explanation, because if you look at the section you will see that it provides as follows:

The railway works which the company has been empowered to undertake and operate are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.

According to the preamble of the Bill the company has been so empowered by the legislature of Quebec, and I do not think that legislature would undertake to give a charter for the construction of a railway partly in the province of Quebec and partly in the province of New Brunswick. Therefore the matter remains as much a mystery to me as ever. If the first explanation of the minister is to be accepted there is no need of this clause. If that is not to be accepted then we are relegated to the position which I first mentioned, that is we have a railway which has been dealt with up to the present time as a provincial work by the legislature of Quebec, and why is it that this parliament is now to exercise jurisdiction? Because the road is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada? Why is it any more to the general advantage of Canada now than it was two years ago?

Mr. EMMERSON. They got their powers from the Quebec legislature. A survey was then made and they found that the only possible route to connect the termini was through New Brunswick and they come to this parliament for this legislation, and under section 4 as it will be seen in the amended Bill:

4. In lieu of the line of railway described in section 7, chapter 82, of the statutes of 1903 of Quebec, the company may lay out, construct and operate a railway of the gauge of four feet eight and one-half inches from a point on the Intercolonial Railway at or near Rivière du Loup, in the county of Temiscouata, to a point on the Intercolonial Railway at or near Matapedia, in the county of Bonaventure, passing in a northeasterly direction through the counties of Temiscouata and Rimouski, and through the northern part of New Brunswick and through the county of Bonaventure, in the parishes of St. François d'Assise and St. Alexis de Matapedia, in the said county of Bonaventure, reaching St. Laurent de Matapedia along the banks of the Matapedia river.

That takes it through both provinces. They found in locating the railway that it was necessary to do that and therefore they came to this parliament seeking these further powers.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may say that another reason for asking Dominion legislation is that this road is intended to be amalgamated with the Atlantic and Lake Superior and the Baie des Chaleurs road. These lines have already been authorized by the Dominion government and it is proposed that this line shall form part of that system. I believe arrangements have been made to take them all over and form them into one line, from the Gaspé basin along the shores of Gaspé, including this line with a branch to Edmundston, and it is desirable that all should be under Dominion legislation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not see the reprint of the Bill, and I think section 4 as read by the minister, which shows an undertaking partly in one province and partly in another, is sufficient to justify the exercise of jurisdiction by this parliament; but I still do not see the necessity of section 1. I have this further to remark about it, that the Bill as reprinted seems to go very much beyond the Bill as originally introduced and I would like to know from the chairman of the Railway Committee whether any caution is exercised in respect of the advertisements and public notices which are required? A notice which would be sufficient for the Bill as originally introduced would certainly not be sufficient for the Bill as it now appears in the reprint, and it would be a very easy matter for any promoter of a Bill to escape the difficulties which would be occasioned by lack of due advertisement if in the Railway Committee he could add an undertaking which is not mentioned at all in the first instance. I would like to know whether or not any attention has been paid to that consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may say that no amendments are made to a Bill in the Railway Committee that do not comply with the notices given. Amendments are often made in the committee but due care is taken that the notices given will cover those changes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A notice which would be sufficient for the Bill as originally introduced would not by any means be sufficient for the Bill as it now appears, because the Bill as first introduced dealt with a road which had been incorporated and could be incorporated by the legislature of the province of Quebec, dealt with a road altogether in the province of Quebec; and upon a notice quite sufficient for the introduction of a Bill of that kind you have founded a Bill which deals with a railway covering territory in both provinces, partly in one province and partly in the other.

Was this advertised in that district? If so, it must have been a matter of extraordinary precaution because it would not be necessary in the first instance that this Bill should be advertised in New Brunswick at all; it related only to a road altogether within the province of Quebec and would the chairman of the Railway Committee or the minister——

Mr. EMMERSON. It was advertised in Campbellton, in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was any inquiry made in regard to that in the Railway Committee?

Mr. EMMERSON. The chairman of the Railway Committee has already stated that in every instance inquiry is made. Mr. Hartney, the secretary, is very particular in respect of that and in every case where there is any proposed amendment to a Bill he brings the question of notices to the attention of the committee.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the Minister of Railways or the chairman of the Railway Committee say that there was an advertisement of a line of railway such as is described in the reprinted clause 4?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, that was done.

Mr. EMMERSON. And as will be seen by reference to the Bill as originally introduced it proposed to have power to acquire certain other railways, not definitely naming them. In the amendment the same powers are given but with more definiteness. The main point of the notice was that a railway was to be built from the line of the Intercolonial Railway at or near Rivière du Loup down to the Intercolonial Railway at or near Matapedia just on the borders between New Brunswick and Quebec and it has been clearly defined that in following that route it would go through the province of New Brunswick. I quite concur in the statement that the first clause is really not necessary, that is the declaratory clause, but it has been inserted in such Bill very frequently, notwithstanding objections to such a course.

Mr. LENNOX. Much better to leave it out.

Mr. EMMERSON. I frequently object to its being put in but those promoting the the Bill ask that it should be there, and the committee very frequently concur.

Mr. SPROULE. Several times we have had the question of the insufficiency of the notices up in that committee. It sometimes happens that the notice does not comply with the enactment in the Bill and our attention is not drawn to it by Mr. Hartney, as the minister says. More than once we have had quite a discussion over the insufficiency of the notice, but the committee consented to accept it as sufficient, although the members did not believe it was. It is evident that these notices are not looked into very closely.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will bear me out when I say that the question seldom arises because there are very few amendments proposed. Within the last fortnight, questions did arise with respect to that, and Mr. Hartney had the papers right here and satisfied the committee at once on the question of the sufficiency of the notice.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister must remember that Mr. Hartney did not satisfy the committee. I think the question arose with regard to the Canadian Northern Railway or amendments proposed to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in which cases the notices did not in any sense cover the ground. Yet we were obliged to change the Bill to comply with or partly comply with the notice because the notice was not properly complied with.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The rule of the committee is that if a notice does not cover the proposed amendment and is objected to by any member of the committee, it cannot go on. But if the members of the committee think that the proposed amendment is not of very great consequence, although it may be covered by the notice, and no member of the committee objects, frequently it is allowed to pass. In the case of the Canadian Northern, my hon. friend did object at first, but afterwards withdrew his objection and the amendment went through.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend must know that when I raised the objection, he himself ruled that it was quite within the notice. I said I am not so personally interested as to continue the fight. The notice may be right or wrong, but I drew attention to it. That however did not control the action of the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I remember well your saying I am not going to object.

Mr. SPROULE. I said I am not going to continue the fight.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I take it that the proper course to pursue when a promoter offers an important amendment, would be to refer the amendment to the committee on standing orders.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil). I may be allowed to say that this railway was incorporated in the province of Quebec in 1903 for the purpose of building a line from Rivière du Loup to Matapedia. It was originally thought that it could be constructed entirely in that province. But it runs through a very mountainous country,

and it has since been ascertained that it may be necessary to run a small part of the line in the northern part of New Brunswick. Therefore a federal charter became essential. The second reason is that that this company is asking for power to acquire the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, which is a federal railway, and to merge both and give a railway service from Rivière du Loup to the Baie des Chaleurs and as far as Paspebiac.

On section 6,

6. Should the company acquire the lines of the Atlantic and Lake Superior and the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, by purchase, lease, transfer, judicial sale or otherwise, it shall be held liable for claims on those roads for labour, board, material, right of way, and damages, including undercharged and prescribed claims to an amount not exceeding in the aggregate fifty thousand dollars for labour, board, materials, right of way and damages—the said amount, if insufficient to pay all such claims, to be distributed rateably in accordance with a report of a commissioner to be appointed by the Governor in Council for the purpose of determining the validity and amount of such claims.

Mr. MONK. This clause goes very far. It revives claims that have been outlawed. It decrees that this company, if it should purchase the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway or the Baie des Chaleurs Railway shall have to pay claims—even if it acquires by judicial sale, which in our province purges all other claims—all claims for labour, &c., even prescribed claims, to the extent of $50,000. Should any dispute arise, this sum will have to be deposited with a receiver who will judge the validity of those claims and pay them in their entirety or pro rata. We do not know whether the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway or the Baie des Chaleurs Railway have been heard on this legislation, which will revive against them claims to the extent of $50,000, that may be outlawed under the civil code of the province of Quebec. If we enact this section, we may find ourselves in this position: That legitimate legal claims already due would have absorbed this $50,000; but, in view of this legislation by which we revise extinct and outlawed claims, the strictly legal claims might remain unpaid or be paid only in part. I point this out because it seems to me that this $50,000 ought to be devoted to paying legal claims only.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Marcil). I may be allowed to explain, that this parliament has, on two different occasions within the last four years, enacted this clause. First in connection with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Bill and afterwards in connection with the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Bill. This clause has been accepted by the Quebec Oriental, and it was concurred in before the Railway Committee by the Atlantic, Quebec and Western and also by the Atlantic and Lake Superior and Baie des Chaleurs companies, represented before the committee by Mr. T. Chase Casgrain, of Montreal. So, it is a matter of agreement. The Atlantic and Lake Superior, and the Baie des Chaleurs companies are insolvent corporations and have been for years. They have been operated by trustees for the bondholders and are now on the point of being sold. There are many unpaid accounts of workmen and others for labour, board, material, right of way and so on. It has been deemed just by the companies interested that before title is given for possession of the roads, a reasonable amount should be offered to the farmers for the right of way, the labourers who built the road and others who have unpaid accounts. It was thought that $50,000 would be a reasonable amount, and it has been agreed to by all the parties interested.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE MANITOBA RADIAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

On motion for concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Bole.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Before these amendments are read a second time and concurred in, I would ask what is the effect of the elimination of section 9?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways). The effect is to obviate the necessity of getting the consent of the municipality for the running of this railway along any highway. The Railway Committee inserted that clause 9 making it necessary for the company to secure the consent of the municipality, but the Senate in their wisdom, struck it out.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Section 9 in the Bill I have before me, refers to the use of gasoline.

Mr. EMMERSON. As it appears in the Bill as sent from this House to the Senate, it reads as follows:

Notwithstanding anything in the Railway Act, the company shall not construct or operate its line of railway along any highway, street or other public place without first obtaining the consent, expressed by by-law, of the municipality having jurisdiction over such highway, street or other public place and upon terms to be agreed upon with such municipality.

This is the railway that extends from the city of Winnipeg around Winnipeg, northward, I think, to Keewatin.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). It is an electric railway is it not?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the minister (Mr. Emmerson) think that we ought to insist on that section remaining in the Bill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My own view is that that section ought to remain. Of course, this is a railway extending from a province into a territory. But the most important feature of the railway is its radial character in and around the city of Winnipeg and to serve municipalities. The interests of these municipalities should be guarded. But if we concur in this amendment we are not conserving these interests.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think we ought to concur in this amendment from the Senate. This is a clause that has been carefully thought out and that has become, as it were, a standard clause in electric railway Bills. And I do not think the Senate has ever undertaken to advise the striking of it out before. There are ample reasons why a clause of that kind should be applied to electric railway companies which use the highways for lines and so avoid buying their right of way. It was decided some years ago that it was not just that these companies should be allowed to use the highway without the consent of the municipality which is responsible for damages to the highway, and which, under the British North America Act, through the provinces, is obliged to keep the highway in repair and to control it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would suggest that the matter stand until we make further inquiry. I do not think that we should concur in the amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly, in the absence of explanation, this amendment should not be concurred in. This is a clause which has been adopted in respect of all railways for a number of years and no exceptional circumstances have been disclosed leading us to believe that it should not be adopted in this case.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 119) to revive certain patents of the Nichols Copper Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate the Travellers' Indemnity Company of Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 121) to incorporate the Ottawa Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 122) respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company. —Mr. Turgeon.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Wilbert McIntyre.

Bill (No.125) respecting the Lake Superior Power Company.—Mr. Pardee.

PREVENTION AND SETTLEMENT OF STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 36) to aid in the prevention and settlement of strikes and lockouts in mines and industries connected with public utilities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the Bill is read the third time, I would like to say that in so far as it makes for industrial peace, and I think it is along that line, we on this side of the House have been disposed to assist the minister in putting it in as good shape as possible. It affects certain interests of employers and certain interests of employees in this country, who have already been provided with a means of settling disputes by the Railway Labour Disputes Act passed in 1903. When this Bill was introduced at the present session, and also upon its second reading, the Minister of Labour informed us that the Railway Labour Disputes Act had been eminently satisfactory ; he declared that it was owing to the provisions of that Bill that there had been no strike of railway employees in Canada from 1903 up to the present time. He attributed that result in distinct terms to the passage of that measure ; and he called our attention to its operation, in one instance at least, when he said the Act had resulted in the settlement of a strike between the telegraphers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and their employees. Now, there has been a good deal of communication of a certain sort between the minister and the representative of some of these employees ; there have been letters, some of which have been read to this House ; there have been oral communications, and there have been conferences between the minister and the representative of some portion of the railway men of Canada. So far as these men are concerned, and indeed so far as all the labouring and employing interests of Canada are concerned, there has not been up to the present time any opportunity for their representatives to appear before a committee of the House to give any reason in support of or against the enactment of this measure. At an earlier stage in the session I urged that a course such as I have indicated should be followed, and I then pointed out what I desire to repeat now, that the very worst service you can render to the cause of harmony between employers and employed is to impose upon either one class or the other, any legislation as to which they think they have not had a fair hearing and which they regard as unjust. The course taken in other countries under

similar conditions has been, so far as I have been able to ascertain, to give to both these classes an opportunity of being heard before any important departure is made. Now, this Bill, so far as railway men, and indeed all labouring and employing classes, are concerned, does make an important departure. I need not allude to those provisions of the Bill which restrict strikes and provide for an investigation, and which are along lines that have for the most part obtained support in this House. I understand the position of the railway men to be this: they say they are thoroughly organized; they declare they do not strike rashly; they declare they do not strike without investigation, without the most careful investigation; and they point out that not only is that investigation conducted through every local union, and through every other tribunal within their organization which has any jurisdiction over their actions, but that they follow up the matter in dispute from the railway official who has jurisdiction in the first instance to his superior officer, and so on through every grade of the service, until their final negotiations are usually conducted with the very head of the railway company.

Now, they point out also that the measure and the result of their care and caution and deliberation are to be found in the fact that no great strikes, no dangerous strikes have taken place within recent years, that the only strike which was likely to assume great proportions was that in respect of which the Labour Railway Disputes Act of 1903 was invoked, and taking these matters into consideration and pointing to the declaration of the minister himself that the Act of 1903 has been effective, that the Act is a good one and that it has brought about the very purpose for which it was enacted, they asked, in the first place, that this Act should not include them, and in the second place, that it should not be passed until they had an opportunity of coming before a committee of this House and putting forward their views, in order that they might be reported to the members of this House upon whom the responsibility of this legislation must eventually rest. So far as their demand for a hearing is concerned, it may be said that they have been heard through their representatives. But that hearing has been of a very casual character. It has not been such a hearing as should be given to the men upon whom legislation of this kind is to be imposed in the face of a declaration such as that to which we have listened from the hon. Minister of Labour. I do not believe in affecting any man's rights either in the courts of the country or in the highest court of all, in the parliament of the country, without giving that man the most ample right to be heard, and I do not think that these men, up to the present, have had that opportunity which they desire and which should be afforded to them to be heard before this parliament through one of its regularly organized and appointed committees. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without taking up the time of the House further, because the subject has already been debated a good deal, I move:

That the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 36) be discharged and that the said Bill be referred to a special committee of this House for the purpose of hearing any persons affected by the provisions of the said Bill who may desire to present any reasons or considerations for or against its enactment in its present form, or who may desire to suggest any amendments, and that the committee do report to this House the result of such hearing.

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). Mr. Speaker, I regret that at this last stage of the consideration given to this Bill my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) should move this amendment inasmuch as the House has already pronounced upon the principle embodied in it. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend early in the present session, foved a resolution on similar lines to those of this amendment. It is true also that at that time the House thought, in view of the Bill which was being introduced, that a special committee should not be formed. Now, what would be, at the present stage, the necessity of renewing before a committee the debate which has already taken place before this House during several sittings? We have debated this question of compulsory investigation, because, after all, that is the only principle at stake for several days and evenings. I think that both sides of the House, generally speaking, have agreed to the soundness of the principle and to the desirability of adopting it and embalming it in the statute-book. After this long discussion, after considering the Bill clause by clause and section by section, after having seen that this Bill was generally approved by the country, my hon. friend, speaking on behalf of the railway brotherhoods, who are opposing this Bill and, as he says, speaking on behalf of the workingmen in general, wishes to delay the adoption of the Bill and have it referred to a special committee of the House. I take exception to the amendment for many reasons. It is quite obvious to the House that we have discussed the Bill thoroughly; we know its principal features and we know it bearings. Could we, by referring the

Bill to a special committee, learn more than we know at the present time? I believe not. It is true that we might learn before a special committee of the House that there have been strikes and lockouts in the past, but, as I have stated before, we are not legislating for the past. We are legislating for the future. It is true that I stated when I introduced this Bill that the Railway Labour Disputes Act passed in the year 1903 had been satisfactory; that that Act had given satisfaction to the parties interested; that is to say, to the railway companies and their employees, and it is no mean compliment to pay to the father of it, the Hon. Sir William Mulock. But, notwithstanding that that Act has worked well in one instance when it was invoked by the Railway Telegraphers Union, we must also provide for any possible contingency that may arise in the future. We all admit as the hon. leader of the opposition has stated during the course of this debate, that no strike or lockout should be declared in this country before an investigation takes place. Is my hon. friend ready to say to-day that if to-morrow the railway employees, say, of the Grand Trunk or of the Canadian Pacific Railway, were to declare a strike that it would not be the duty of the government or of the state to step in and say: No, there will be no strike; the traffic of the company shall not be crippled, the passengers shall not be stopped until a thorough and complete investigation has taken place. We all agree as to that. Why then should we have a special committee and a reference of this Bill before it to know whether or not the railway employees or some of them are opposed to the principle? For my part I respect the railway employees. I have the highest regard for the organization of the railway brotherhoods. But I say that although they may be right in their assumption that this legislation may perhaps cause them a little trouble, still the public must be protected and before they declare any strike, or before the railway companies declare any lockout, the public must be protected and know the cause of that strike or quarrel or dispute existing between the contending parties. This is the only principle at stake; whether or not the parliament of Canada shall commit itself to it is the question before you, Mr. Speaker, this evening.

Are we to declare, or are we not to declare: that in future there shall be no strike and no lockout on a great public utility, unless a thorough public investigation has taken place? That is the principle incorporated in this Bill, and as to that, a special committee of the House cannot teach us anything more than we know at present. This is pioneer legislation, but novel as it is, it has been commended by the highest authorities on economics in America and in Europe. Need I mention the opinion of President Roosevelt, who in his recent message to the Congress expressed his desire that industrial interests in the United States should be furnished with a safeguard similar to that which we propose in this legislation. The commission which inquired into the Pennsylvania coal strike recommended the adoption of legislation similar to this, as did also the commission which investigated the labour, agricultural and industrial questions in the United States. I repeat my former statement, that this legislation is in accordance with public sentiment in Canada and in America as well. Not long ago Mr. Eliot, the eminent president of Harvard University, spoke before the Canadian Club in Ottawa, and he referred in high terms of this very Bill which was then being considered in this House. In view of all this, and especially in view of the fact that since this Bill has been under discussion, the principle which underlies it was invoked with great success in the case of the Toronto telephone strike, I submit that this parliament would be wise to pass the Bill and to have it come into force as soon as possible. I may say that at the present time, as Minister of Labour, several of the large concerns in western Canada have written to me asking that this Bill should be passed immediately and assented to by His Excellency, because there are fears that strikes may occur in the mining districts of the west, and it is hoped that the application of this Bill may avert them. It is, I think, generally recognized that this legislation will be beneficial to the employers and the employees, and to the general public as well.

I do not know what more we can learn from the railway brotherhoods. I have had conferences with their representatives, I have had correspondence with them. I have heard their delegates and their legislative agent in Ottawa. It is stated that they object to the legislation because they have in their own constitution all the machinery that is necessary to prevent strikes. Well, if that be a fact, then the railway employees will not be affected by this legislation. As I understand it, the railway employees argue that this Bill will be too expensive and too cumbersome, and that they are better satisfied with the Act of 1903. Well, we have provided that they shall have the option of availing either of the Act of 1903 or of this Bill of 1907. If they are satisfied with the mode of procedure under the legislation of 1903, they can adopt it, and if they are satisfied with the present legislation—as I know many of the railway employees are—then they can invoke it. But, will hon. gentlemen opposite say, that whether it be under the Act of 1903 or under the Act of 1907, the railway employees should not be subject to a public investigation before a strike, as are the employees on other public utilities? I am

sure that is not what is in the mind of the leader of the opposition. It certainly is not what was in the mind of the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) when, in probably one of the most eloquent speeches he ever delivered in this House, speaking on the second reading of the Bill, he used this language:

And the internal transport interests of a great city are inextricably bound up with the steady, even, successful development and working of this franchise. Do you mean to tell me that, because the chairman of the street railway corporation and the president of the employees' union fall out as to what car shall be cleaned and by whom, or what man shall be detailed for this route and what man for the other, and cannot come to a reasonable agreement, that they should be free to leave matters in such a condition that the whole transport system of that city shall cease operation? Are we to be told that this is to be permitted—that women and children, the healthy and the invalid, the business man and workingman should all alike be deprived of what has come to be almost an absolute necessity and certainly a daily convenience? More: If these two men, the representative of the company and the representative of the employee, quarrel and continue to quarrel, and if an attempt is made to use the street cars, trouble arises and the police are called upon. And then the militia are called out and the state, in the highest exemplification of its power, must act. There is loss—that is one thing. There is inconvenience—that is another thing. There is the bad spirit that is aroused—a thing to be avoided if reasonably possible. Do you mean to say that the time does not come, and should not come, when the state represented primarily by that great municipality and secondarily by that greater authority which has the militia for its arm in the preservation of order, should have something to say in these matters. Do you mean to say that we should simply regard this as a quarrel between capitalists and labouring men, a quarrel to be settled by these people themselves? Sir, there is no need for me to make this part of my argument any stronger.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was there speaking of the possibility of a street car strike, but later on in his speech, he used the very same argument with reference to strikes on the great railway systems. Nobody in this House and nobody in the country at present, except probably my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who has opposed the Bill from the beginning on its very principle, will oppose the principle of the Bill, and as I have stated on many occasions I do not believe that if we referred it to a special committee of this House we would learn more than we know at present. We know that the railway employees have all the protection, all the safeguards they desired to have at the beginning when they declared themselves perfectly satisfied to come under the Labour Disputes Act, 1903.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in that eloquent speech, expressed a strong opinion that the men should have a hearing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He may have declared that but the principle is there. Of course he was chivalrous enough to sustain my hon. friend who had moved on those lines a few days before. My hon. friend was moving to have a special committee to consider this legislation and it was through pure chivalry on the part of the hon. member for North Toronto that he supported those views on that occasion. No, my hon. friend has done his duty towards the railway men represented by Mr. Hall. I believe that Mr. Hall, if my hon. friend will read his correspondence, has expressed himself quite clearly on a previous occasion, when he said, speaking of the legislati n of 1903:

If after the committee have failed to settle the difference then the privilege of course of referring the matter to arbitration, or what is more a fact: investigation of the difference between the company and their men. They make in their report to the Minister of Labour, who will according to the provisions of the Act make a report of the findings of that committee through the public press of the country. This being for the purpose of influence by public opinion. Something I believe, that will have that force behind it, that no matter which side of the controversy refuses to be fair, will compel them to accept reasonable conditions and to make a fair settlement.

And further:

And as I believe the Bill is intended to operate and Sir, my only wish is that it will be the dove of peace to bring about happy conditions, where sometimes we have war and enmity to each other.

Well, this legislation will have the same effect as that of 1903 since railway employees will be perfectly free to invoke that Act of 1903. Under all those circumstances I shall vote against the amendment of my hon. friend.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). There are of course in the brief remarks made by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) some points on which I would be ready to agree with him. If I understood this legislation to be of a permanent character, and that it would not be easy to amend it, if it was legislation that would be the permanent basis for the settlement of labour disputes, I would be willing to agree with my hon. friend and to support him in his motion. But I take this whole legislation as an experiment. It is my deep conviction that it will have to be amended very soon. When it was first introduced by the minister, I took it as a step in the right direction; and to my mind, if we intend making it operative—and we will have to make it operative—it will certainly require some modification before long.

As far as the railway organizations are concerned I may say that I am not ready

to agree that the railway organizations should adopt such a dictatorial tone as they have taken in this instance. I have, for instance, received a letter which I think it is to the advantage of the public to make known. It is as follows :

The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, System Division No. 7. J. Wagner, general secretary-treasurer, Copper Cliff, Ontario.

Aylmer, Quebec, February 2, 1907.

Dear Sir,—At a joint meeting of the following organizations : Order of Railway Conductors, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Order of Railway Trainmen, the following resolution was unanimously carried :

That in the opinion of this assembly the present Bill before the House known as the Minister of Labour's Bill (No. 36) is against the interests of the railway organizations, therefore we earnestly solicit your co-operation and support in aiding our legislative representative in his efforts to have the reference to steam railways eliminated from said Bill.

You, a member, supported, no doubt, by many a member of the various trade unions of Canada, are requested to use your influence in accomplishing the defeat of Hon. Mr. Lemieux's Bill, known as Minister of Labour's Bill (No. 36).

Anything you do to assist organized labour will be deeply appreciated. Your efforts on behalf of the labouring men of Canada are being closely watched, and no doubt at coming re-elections members of the various organizations will vote accordingly. Thanking you in advance for any assistance you give us,

I remain,

Yours respectfully,

J. B. GARTON.

Local secretary, Order Railroad Telegraphers.

Mr. Speaker, I must protest against this kind of intimidation being tried against members of parliament in the accomplishment of their duty. I am ready to render justice to the railroad organizations as to any organization in Canada, but at the same time I do not want that organizations of this kind should be allowed to write letters to members of parliament in which it is stated that if they vote this way or that they will hear of it at the next election. I think this kind of intimidation should be exposed immediately so that it may be treated according to what it is worth. On that ground, I would be disposed to regret the amendment of the minister with regard to railway organizations. However, as there was a special Act passed to cover railway disputes and as this amendment simply makes it easier to settle railway disputes, I will not make any strong objection on that ground, and I hope that this amendment has not been made because of any intimidation being exercised by those organizations.

There are some other amendments which have been made in committee which I regret. For example the disappearance of sections 62 and 63 of the Bill has to my mind been brought about in order to please what I might call unreasonable men on both sides ; and I am afraid that the disappearance of those two clauses will contribute to a certain extent to deprive this Bill of some of its usefulness. There is no doubt that most of the disputes between employers and employees either have risen from the struggle between organized labour and unorganized labour, or at least are certainly embittered because on the one hand of the unreasonable opposition on the part of the employer against labour organizations and on the other hand of the tyrannical spirit which exists in some of the unions. For my part—I have never concealed it—I am strongly in favour of the principle of labour organizations ; but as long as labour organizations have not a legal standing under our statutes, I am not disposed to do anything which might favour the tyranny that can be exercised by labour unions which are not acknowledged by our statutes, which organize themselves, have their own constitutions, frame their own regulations without having the responsibilities which any corporate bodies have under the law of Canada, and which might use their influence in an improper way. So long as the labour unions carry on their propaganda by trying to induce unorganized labour men to come in I entirely agree with them. But when they carry it to the point of trying to intimidate on the one hand the employer and on the other hand the free employee, they should not be protected but should be made to understand that their basis of organization must be the same as that of any other organization in this country. Likewise, I do not think it is legitimate to allow an employer to discriminate between union and non-union men. I am quite of the opinion that employers would find it better on the whole to favour the organization of labour on a proper basis than to combat the principle of unionism.

As regards the composition of the board, my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) was kind enough, at my request, to let those sections stand. Unfortunately I was called away a few days, and I notice from the reports of debates that my hon. friend informed the House that, after considering the matter with the deputy minister of labour, I had come to the conclusion not to advocate this year the principle of a permanent board. This is accurate to a large extent ; however there is a shade of inaccuracy in the statement, and I will take this opportunity of stating it. To my mind one of the greatest weaknesses of this Bill is the composition of the board of arbitration. It is provided that the board shall be composed of one member designated by the party complaining—whether employer or employee—another by the party resisting, and a third by the minister. But how would this work in the case of a difficulty arising because

of the different treatment that an employer gives the union and non-union men? Or suppose an employer would cause a lock-out because of difficulty existing between the union and the non-union men. The employer would name his representative on the board; but where would the labour men stand? Would their representative be designated by the union or by the non-union men? The employees themselves are at loggerheads with each other but they are only entitled to one representative. If their arbitrator is designated by the minister at the suggestion of the non-union men, then the minister is appointing a man antagonistic to the other section of the employees. And if he appoints an arbitrator at the suggestion of the union men, then he is antagonizing the non-union section. If the object of this legislation is to have an impartial board which can confidently appeal to public opinion in order to enforce its decision upon both labour and capital, such board should be composed of impartial men and not of arbitrators designated by the parties themselves to the dispute with one referee between the two. Let it be composed of men appointed with all the guarantees of independence and permanence which our judicial courts enjoy at present. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) anticipated my objection by stating in committee that this would be very difficult on account of the great extent of our country. But of course if we are to take measures to prevent disputes between labour and capital, we ought not to be restricted by any such consideration as the number of tribunals required. There ought to be a tribunal to adjust these disputes in every province—a court composed of impartial men appointed with all the guarantees of permanence and independence given to the judges in our judicial courts; and in this respect these boards of arbitration or labour tribunals would acquire the same standing in public opinion as is enjoyed by our judicial tribunals.

However, taking this measure as merely experimental and tentative, I am ready to let the Bill go through this year without insisting on the permanency and independence of the boards of arbitration; but I predict that these boards, as devised under this Bill, will not give satisfaction. We shall never have satisfactory legislation in this matter until we reach that point of judicial organization with regard to labour disputes which we have reached with regard to civil disputes between citizens. The idea that the decisions of a permanent tribunal would not command public confidence because the party condemned would lose faith in that tribunal is preposterous. That same argument would apply to any ordinary tribunal which adjudicates between two ordinary citizens. Every time two citizens go before a court of justice, one is bound to gain and the other to lose; but no one would dream of arguing that our courts of justice should not be permanent and our judges be appointed for life because when one of the suitors was condemned he would lose respect for the court that condemned him; and that consequently the same court should not be called upon to adjudicate between the same parties on any other occasion. Such an argument would destroy our whole judicial organization. In this matter as in some others, no doubt I am a little in advance of my time in this country. I lay down the principle that disputes between capital and labour should be considered in the light of the same principles of justice and authority as the disputes between any ordinary classes of citizens in this country. I am not ready to agree that because capital and labour are not prepared to accept the adjudication of such a tribunal, the principle is bad. Capital and labour disputes should be submitted to the principles of justice just as any other classes of our citizens.

I come now again to the argument I made a moment ago. Suppose the union men strike because the employer discriminates between them and the non-union men. One arbitrator is appointed at the suggestion of the union men, another at the suggestion of the employer, and a third is appointed by those two. Can such a board give satisfaction to the non-union men who are perhaps interested to a greater extent than the other two parties to the dispute and yet have no representative on that board? Or suppose the non-union men go on strike because they claim the employer is intimidated by the union men and does not treat them justly. The non-union men appoint their arbitrator, the employer appoints his; but where are the union men? Where is the union, in that case? The union might be in a position to prove that, in the case in point, it had acted for the benefit of the whole body of workingmen; and yet, on account of the shortcomings of the law, the union would not be represented at the board. And do you think the board will give to the union the satisfaction which is said to be absolutely necessary for the proper carrying out of this Bill? Will public opinion be satisfied and will that feeling of confidence be inspired in the parties which you consider necessary for the proper settlement of these disputes? I repeat that the principle of the Bill is a good one; I voted for the second reading, and I shall vote for the third reading to-night. At the same time, I claim that the amendments which I have referred to have not tended to improve the operation of the measure. I am ready to submit to the judgment of the House—I have to—still, I think that we proceed in the wrong way when we, as it were, plead mercy for the principle of this legislation, saying that we do not want to use any kind of compulsion, that we do not

want to do anything to displease capital on the one hand or labour on the other. I say that we should be courageous enough to give both capital and labour to understand that they have the same rights as other people in this country and no more, and that this parliament is prepared to force both capital and labour to observe the principles of justice and equity as other citizens are compelled to do, and that we are not prepared to sacrifice these sacred principles of justice because of the interest of either capital and labour at election time. However, I agree with the minister that we must move a step at a time, and this consideration is all that prevents me from moving an amendment to the third reading.

Now, there is one other point upon which I wish to say a word, and that is the striking out of the clause which gave power to the Governer in Council to declare that other industries than those directly referred to in this Bill might be brought under the operation of the measure. That section, number 67, read :

> The Governor in Council may, from time to time, by notice in the 'Gazette,' declare any specified industry to be an agency of transportation or communication or a public service utility, and such industry shall thereafter be deemed to be included in the provisions of this Act.

Now, there is one principle contained in this clause, which, certainly, I do not favour. So far as this point is concerned, I am glad to have this section disappear. The principle I refer to is that of giving the Governor in Council power to practically amend the legislation of this parliament. In this matter I agree with the leader of the opposition. I think this is an abuse which grows greater every day. It has been denounced in England by an author, who, certainly, cannot be considered as too democratic or liberal. I remember reading some very sensible remarks by Mr. Lecky with regard to the heightening abuse of cabinet legislation overruling parliamentary legislation. Looking over the history of the parliamentary system as developed in Great Britain, Mr. Lecky points out how at one time the King controlled, that afterwards the House of Lords was the great power in the state, that then came a balance between the House of Commons and the House of Lords. And he goes on to say that the great danger of the British parliamentary system is that, day by day, the control over legislation is shifting from parliament to the Cabinet; so that, in our day, the Cabinet has grown at the expense of both King and Commons. I am afraid that in this democratic country we are going in the same direction at an even quicker pace than Great Britain is.

But, while I am glad to see this section disappear on that account, yet, I am sorry to see it disappear as removing from control by this legislation of those classes of industries which are referred to. I am sorry that the Bill has not been amended in another way so as to include these industries. For my part, I would favour a change in the Bill which would make it operative in the case of any industry employing a sufficient number of men to make it of vital importance to the locality in which it is situated. This Bill is supposed to apply to industries in which the public at large are interested. It is made applicable to industries or utilities employing as few as ten men. But, surely, it will not be claimed that a tramway company, or a waterworks company, or an electric light company, employing only ten men, is one in which the people of Canada at large are concerned. I suppose the object is to protect the public of a small place against strikes which would involve the public there in inconvenience with respect to electric light, gas or tramways. But I claim that there are many industries that are of much greater importance to the public of the locality in which they are situated than are any of these public services. Take some concrete cases that have recently forced themselves upon public attention. The strike in the coal mines at Lethbridge, and the strike on the tramway at Hamilton have been quoted as cases which make it imperative for parliament to adopt legislation of this kind. But take another case, one quoted by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux)—the strike at Buckingham in the county I have the honour to represent. The industry affected by that strike was of far greater interest and necessity to the whole population of that town than could be all the coal mines of Canada. The strike was of greater inconvenience to the public of that town than the strike on the Hamilton tramway was to the Hamilton public, for no tramway strike in any city affects the very means of living of the majority of the people. Buckingham is a place of about 3,000 inhabitants. The only large industry, the one in which the strike occurred, employs between five and six hundred men, a large proportion of whom are heads of families. It is the one great industry of the place—not the only industry, but the others are comparatively small. Here is an industry giving wages and the means of life to one-third, if not one-half the population. A large part of the rest of the population is made up of the merchants and dealers of various kinds who depend for their living upon the earning capacity of the employees of this great industry. The moment there is a strike like the one which took place in Buckingham last year, not only have you one-third of the population deprived of its means of livelihood, but you have all those who are dependent upon these people reduced to the same position. I claim that this is one case of many which

might arise, and that there is as great a necessity for legal interference in such a case as there was in the case of the coal mines.

The principle of the legislation is good, but it does not go far enough. I think it should be enlarged; but instead of being enlarged, it has been narrowed; and I am afraid it has been narrowed, not so much in the interest of the public, as on account of some process of intimidation brought to bear upon the government and its majority in this House. However, I cannot vote for the motion of the leader of the opposition, because I agree with the Minister of Labour that I do not see how a special committee of this House could give us any further information regarding the principle of the Bill. Legislation of this kind will be proved effective by experiment rather than by witnesses or opinions. If a committee were appointed, you would have men coming from all parts of the country, some to give evidence for and others against. With the means of communication we have to-day, I think the well organized labour unions have had ample opportunity to state their reasons for or against this measure. I think that public opinion on the whole is favourable to this Bill, and my remarks to-day are made, not so much for the purpose of criticising the Bill, as to impress upon the Minister of Labour that, instead of trying to get absolution for this Bill, he should look upon it merely as a step in the right direction, he should prepare himself to carry it further just as soon as public opinion will warrant him in doing so, and he should educate public opinion in that direction.

Mr. C. DEVLIN (Nicolet). I wish to say only one or two words on this motion for the third reading. The leader of the opposition seeks further information. I think he made a motion in this House a short time ago to a similar effect, but the House, in view of the Bill which was about to be submitted, decided that it was in possession of all the necessary information to justify it in proceeding with the consideration of the Bill. I am forced to the conclusion that we have before us a good Bill, and one that is calculated to meet one of the greatest evils that confronts this country. There is no doubt that a dispute between capital and labour is at all times a calamity. That has been the experience, not only in this country, but in every country where strikes have occurred. Knowing the intentions of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour and of the government with respect to this Bill, I am sure that they wish to show the labouring classes that they are not hostile to their interests, neither are they hostile to the best interests of the employing classes. We know that since this government has come into power they have created a Department of Labour, something which was unknown during the long term of years when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and that the creation of the Department of Labour has been welcomed by the labouring classes throughout this country. We know that the 'Labour Gazette' established by this government has been the means of spreading information regarding labour matters of great use to both interests. I believe that the object of this Bill is to render strikes unnecessary. We know that circumstances have in the past been such as to render strikes almost inevitable, but with good will on the part of the employer and with good will on the part of the employee, if this Bill is fairly applied, there will be less likelihood of strikes in the future than there has been in the past. I was interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). He is anxious for the creation of a permanent tribunal. No doubt a permanent tribunal would be a very good thing in its place, but what can be the objection of my hon. friend to the two judges who would be appointed under this Bill? True, they might not be qualified, they might make a mistake; but, on the other hand, they might succeed, and if they proved themselves efficient, I am certain the Minister of Labour and contending parties would continue those judges in the exercise of the functions allotted to them.

Mr. BOURASSA. In this Bill it is left to the parties interested to designate the judge.

Mr. C. DEVLIN. But with the approval of the government I understand the hon. gentleman would have a permanent tribunal. Perhaps this permanent tribunal might be objectionable to the parties themselves, and then there is no remedy.

Mr. BOURASSA. You might say that of any court.

Mr. C. DEVLIN. But in these cases there is much more sensitiveness than with respect to ordinary courts. I think this arrangement will not be strongly objected to by the labouring classes. At all events, I rose to support this Bill because I think it is a good one. I know perfectly well, and the hon. member for Labelle knows perfectly well, what the consequences of a strike are. There has been a strike in his constituency.

Mr. BOURASSA. As the Bill stands now, it will not apply to any exceptional case.

Mr. C. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman can make such a statement, but let the Bill be put into operation, and then it will be time enough to see whether it will cure strikes or not. The Bill enables con-

tending parties to meet and confer before they strike, and perhaps the causes which lead them to strike would be obviated by a conference, and then there would not be any strike. The hon. gentleman was eloquent in his remarks with respect to the strike which occurred in his constituency. I know what that strike was, because I represented the county of Labelle in this House during a number of years. I know perfectly well the town in which this strike occurred, and it was the saddest thing we have had in this country. I know of nothing so terrible as the strike which took place in the town of Buckingham. The poor men were out of their wages for ever so long, their homes were desolate, business was suspended, they were deprived of comfort, they were loaded with an accumulation of debt which will not be paid for years to come, and finally death, in its most terrible form, was another attending circumstance. I believe this Bill is an honest attempt to try to prevent such occurrences taking place, and that is one great reason why I congratulate the Minister of Labour upon bringing this Bill before the House. He has certainly brought one of the great measures of this session before parliament. He has debated it with skill, with patience and with every effort to meet the wishes of those favourable and opposed to the Bill. My object in rising was simply to state my view that this is a Bill which will not only receive the support of this House, but a Bill that will commend itself to the good judgment and approbation of the people of Canada generally.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of my hon. friend from Labelle Mr. Bourassa), especially in his description of the reception of a communication in which some member of a union came between the wind and his nobility and also his remarks with regard to his representation of the county. I suppose the hon. gentleman has been reading Burke's address to the electors of Bristol and endeavouring to emulate that celebrated author when he took the position that his duties were judicial altogether and that he should ignore the representations of his constituency. My idea is an entirely different one. I believe that the duties of the representative of a constituency are not judicial so much as they are representative, and that any elector in his constituency has the right to tell him how to vote and what the penalties are if he does not vote in that way. I do not see anything wrong in the representations of the gentleman who sent that letter saying that he was watching his course very closely and that if he did not vote in a certain direction he would be obliged to vote against him in the next election.

Mr. BOURASSA. If the hon. gentleman allows me; that gentleman is not at all a constituent of mine.

Mr. HAGGART. He lives some where in the country at large. The hon. gentleman is the representative of a constituency, and as such, no matter where the party lives, he represents that individual. That is the doctrine, and he must not mind if he receives representations of that kind; in fact, they are solicited by most of the representatives in this House in order to get the opinion of the electors. I was, however, with the hon. gentleman when he spoke about legislating in reference to unions and mentioning them in the legislation that we are introducing into this House. I think with the hon. gentleman it is bad form and that we should not be giving a position to unions by mentioning those that we know nothing about. As to the position of the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Charles Devlin) he blames my hon. friend from Labelle for not supporting the Bill thoroughly because, if the Bill were in force, it might have application to a strike like the one in Buckingham. The hon. gentleman has been listening to the debates in this House. I do not believe he ever read the Bill because if he had he would know at once that it would not have the least effect on a strike if it occurred in Buckingham to-morrow. The Bill is for the purpose of dealing with strikes or attempted strikes on public utilities. As my hon. friend from Labelle says it was originally intended, by order in council, to take in such strikes as that which occurred at Buckingham, but that was early eliminated from the Bill, and now it deals entirely with public utilities. The object of the Bill is to prevent strikes and lockouts on public utilities pending an investigation or inquiry into them. The minister has removed from the Bill its application to nine-tenths of the parties who were originally subject to it. Nine-tenths of the parties who were intended to be covered by the Bill, that is the railway employees, have been given an option. They are not under the Bill and they are under it. Why does the minister retain the application of the Bill to railway men when he does not intend to apply it to them? You have your option, he says. You have the Bill of 1903 and you can strike as often as you like and there will be no preliminary investigation under it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Whether the railway men choose to come under the Act of 1903 or whether they choose to come under the operation of the present Bill a public investigation will take place before the strike. They can adopt whichever procedure they choose.

Mr. HAGGART. Under the Act of 1903 there is no provision for a public investigation preceeding the strike.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. That is my information. I may be wrong.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Section 13 of the Railway Labour Disputes Act in the revised statutes provides that:

Whenever a difference exists between any railway employers and railway employees, and it appears to the minister that the parties thereto are unable satisfactorily to adjust the same, and that by reason of such difference remaining unadjusted the railway lockout or strike has been or is likely to be caused or the regular and safe transportation of mails, passengers or freight has been or may be interrupted, or the safety of any person employed on a railway train or car has been or is likely to be endangered, the minister may, either on the application of any party to the difference, or on the application of the corporation of any municipality directly affected by the difference or of his own motion, cause inquiry to be made into the same and the cause thereof.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt about that. I have never denied that the minister had the right to make inquiry as to why the strike should take place, but is there any penalty for the parties striking?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, according to this Act. If they shall proceed under this Act there are penalties provided.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that. The railways say they are perfectly satisfied with the Act of 1903. If it were not for your Act of this year there would be no penalties attached to striking at all. There is no means of enforcing the Act. They have the right to strike pending your investigation, or preliminary to it, but now, under the Act which you introduced, pending an investigation they are liable to penalties. The difference is an immense one. An employee, or a set of employees, or a union, can strike under the Act of 1903 which the minister gives them the option to come under altogether instead of coming under the Act of 1907. I want to know how the Act of 1907 will apply if the parties ask for the option of coming under the Act of 1903?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let my hon. friend read section 56 of the present Bill and he will find that out.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand the position they would be in under the present Bill. Pending an investigation and a settlement by the parties to whom the dispute is left, if a man strikes then he is liable to penalties. How does the Bill apply to a railway hand or to a set of railway men who choose to come under the Act of 1903? What application has this Bill at all, if the minister's statement is correct, or do I understand him rightly that they have an option, that they may take one Act or the other and that if they choose the Act of 1903, the Act of the present year does not apply at all?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The object of this measure is to provide for compulsory investigation before a strike, and it provides, as does the Act of 1903, machinery by which that investigation can be held. The parties can select either the Act of 1903 or this Act of 1907, to have the board appointed and the trouble investigated.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister led us to believe that the option was with the railway men to come under this Act or under the Act of 1903, but the penal clauses are all incorporated in the Act of 1903. I fell into error because I had listened to the hon. gentleman. The fact is that this Act depends upon public opinion for its enforcement, and that is a principle which was long since adopted by the state of Massachusetts. The Railway Commission of that state had no power to enforce any order, but they published their decision in the newspapers and as a result the railway corporations conformed to the decision of the commission. That is the principle the Minister of Labour incorporates in this legislation, and I must say I approve of it. I may be a little old fashioned but I agree with the hon. gentleman from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that you do not go far enough in this direction.

Mr. E. PAQUET (l'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if the House will allow, I would like to say just one word. I have looked with the greatest care into this capital and labour problem which we are endeavouring to solve; and I regret very much not to be in a position to support the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition. Of course he has been inspired all along by the most sincere love for his country; however, as I am in favour of the principle embodied in this Act, that of compulsory investigation, I consider it my duty to give my support to the Bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Labour.

Mr. A. VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). I rise to express my support of the third reading of the Bill, and to dissent from the amendment presented by the leader of the opposition. I have already stated in this House that I do not agree with this amendment, and I cannot for the life of me see that it is any better to-day then when it was proposed in the committee stage. I repeat that it is futile to bring the workingmen and the employers from all over the country to confer at Ottawa, because when we are all through with such an inquiry we have to fall back on the situation that we are not able to declare what is the real cause of the strike, which, in a word, may be summed up to be

a misunderstanding between capital and labour. There is no reason why there should be a committee appointed to hear both parties to the question unless it was intended to shelve this legislation for the present session. I do not want this Bill shelved. I would rather have imperfect legislation than no legislation at all. For my part, I would rather like to see this legislation go further than is proposed, but even as it is, I believe it will do some good, and to that extent I am satisfied with it. Something has been said to-night about the few men that may be involved in a strike on a public utility, but I can point to an important public utility, namely, the Shawinigan Falls Power Company, which produces hundreds of thousands of horse-power and in which only half a dozen men are engaged. Now, in reply to some remarks that have been made here, I may say that I am probably the only member of this House who is also a member of a trade union, and I may say further that I am not afraid of the non-union men because they are not dangerous. To gain anything, the workingmen must organize just as capital organizes. A man, to better his position, and to know enough to effectively ask this government to pass legislation, must first be a union man. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) spoke about legalizing the labour unions, but that is something for the future. If the responsibility of organized labour was defined properly, I for one would not have the slightest objection to incorporate or register under such a law. But until that is done, we cannot go under a Trades Union Act. This question comes down in the end to whether we want in Canada to bring capital and labour closer together. If we do not desire that let us vote down this Bill and let hon. gentlemen take the responsibility before their constituents. If we desire it we must vote for the Bill. For my part I see no middle course. If the Bill is not satisfactory in its operation we can amend it at a succeeding session of parliament, but in the meantime I give it my cordial support.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). During the discussion on the second reading of this Bill I gave my opinion, but when the Bill had been considered clause by clause in Committee of the Whole with very reasonable objections and very reasonable amendments, I did not anticipate that there would be any objection to the principle of the Bill at this stage. It seems to me that in order to understand the situation of this Bill it is necessary to remind the House of the fact that gave rise to this legislation. Some months ago, owing to the shortage of the coal supply in the Northwest, a resolution was brought before this House and in the discussion of that resolution serious charges were made against the government for not having enacted legislation that would regulate those supplies in the interests of the public. As a matter of fact, so very close did the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) come to proposing the fundamental principle of this measure, namely compulsory investigation, that the Conservative press represented my hon. friend the Minister of Labour had brought in his Bill, as the direct cause of that legislation. The 'Mail and Empire' of Toronto on February 18, 1907 says:

> The Bill of Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, based on the suggestion of Mr. R. L. Borden, calling for the compulsory arbitration of labour disputes on public utilities was approved by the labour council last night.

They discussed this measure, considered it satisfactory and forwarded resolutions to the Minister of Labour endorsing it. There was no doubt in my mind at that particular time that that was what the hon. the leader of the opposition stood for. There could be no mistake in the attitude of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) if anyone will read his words. He says:

> My hon. friend for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) says that you cannot intervene by force of law—that this country is not ready for it. I do not know. I do not pretend that it is or that it is not, but I am perfectly clear upon this—that now, and not a minute later, is the time for us to set ourselves to work.

To initiate legislation for the accomplishment of this purpose.

Now these are questions originating, coming out of the speeches made by the leaders of the Conservative party in this House on a question that was being discussed at that time and in my opinion these speeches, partially at any rate, induced the minister to bring this legislation forward.

In connection with the railway men let me say that they had two complaints against this legislation as I understand. They complained that the machinery for negotiation in its operation made it more expensive to their unions than their own voluntary machinery or the machinery of the Act of 1903. It has been stated in discussing this matter and it has been assumed and is assumed by the leader of the opposition that no consideration has been paid to the opinions of the railway men, that they have had no opportunity to consider this question. As a matter of fact the heads of the several railway unions of Canada met in a body in one of the committee rooms of this House. I was present and listened to the argument. The officials of these unions presented their claims and their objections to this legislation of the Minister of Labour. Weeks and weeks of negotiation with regard to this matter have taken place so that it is not right to say that opportunity has not been given to that body to make their protest against this legislation or to make propositions amending it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At what date was it that the members met in this House to discuss the question ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I could not give my hon. friend the date without looking at papers which I have in my possesion, but it is about five or six weeks ago.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Since the Bill was printed ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Since the Bill was printed. My friend Mr. Harvey Hall, the legislative representative of the railway men of this country and all the principal leaders of the railway employes not only of Canada but of the United States met in the old Railway Committee room of this House and discussed this matter with the minister, placing their grievances before him. I think it right and proper to present this fact because the basis of this resolution, the assumptions that have been made and the assumption of the resolution itself, is that opportunity has not been given the men to present their views. I would be the last man in this House to shut off any possible opportunity for men to present their views on matters to which they object. I think the position of the leader of the opposition, so far as that is concerned, is absolutely correct but the assumption is incorrect, that is the assumption that these men have had no opportunity, as they have had weeks and months of opportunity and more than once their representatives met the minister since the Bill was brought before the House and certainly since the legislation was printed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand that at that meeting they approved of the legislation now before the House ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That is another question, I did not say that, I did not insinuate that. I am discussing the resolution before the House which proposes to put off this legislation and have a select committee look into the facts. I am saying against that representations have been made for months, have been made officially and made unitedly by the officials of the railway men of this continent to the Minister of Labour. His deputy was present, I was present myself because I was anxious to help the question along, and ever since then repeated opportunities have been given to the men to meet the minister and the officers of the department and discuss this question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say that the railway men came in a deputation to meet me in the old Railway Committee room, I suppose it must have been on the 9th of February, because I see here in the notes of the proceedings that took place at the Prime Minister's private office that the deputation met the Prime Minister on the 11th of February and that was two days subsequent to the interview I had with the same deputation.

Mr. RALPH SMITH.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. A deputation of the railway men met in the office of the right hon. the First Minister and presented their objections to this legislation. One of their objections was that the machinery for arbitration under this Bill would be costly for their union. But they approved of the machinery provided in the Act of 1903. I have here the letter from Mr. Hall, the leader of the union, approving the law of 1903, which the minister read to-night. Well, said the minister, if you prefer the machinery provided in the Act of 1903, we shall give you that machinery instead of the machinery provided in the Act of 1907. The next objection of the railway men was to the principle of compulsory investigation. That, Sir, is the principle of this Bill, and I submit that if the railway men are entitled to be exempted from the operation of that principle, we should not apply it to any other public utility. If it would be wise not to enforce compulsory investigation upon the railway men, it would be most unreasonable to enforce it upon coal miners and operators. There is no industry in the country which is half so much a public utility as a railway. There is no business that affects directly public interest, life and limb and business and commercial interests of every description, to anything like the same extent as does the operating of a railway; and if the argument of the hon. gentleman in favour of exempting railway employers and employees from the operation of this legislation is reasonable, there can be no reason why this legislation should be made compulsory on any other industry. I understood that the House had, if not unanimously, pretty generally decided that there should be some principle of compulsory investigation enacted with regard to public utilities. I thought we had decided that it ought not to be possible for any body of men to go on strike and deprive the people of such a prime necessity as fuel, without giving the government authority to interfere. I thought that had been agreed to. And since the minister has agreed to give the railway men the machinery provided in the Act of 1903, their objection to this legislation is reduced to an objection to the principle of compulsory investigation being applied to them. Well, I say now in the presence of railway representatives, and will be glad to have the opportunity of saying it at any time before the men employed on railways, that if the argument presented by the railway representatives against this legislation on the question of compulsory arbitration is to hold good, then we must do away with the principle of compulsory investigation altogether. But if the principle of compulsory investigation be a good one, they are the last men in the country who ought to have any complaint against this legislation. The claim is made, and truly made, on their behalf that they rarely

strike. They have brought the system of collective bargaining to a higher and more efficient condition than any other body of men doing business in the country, and that is very much to their credit. The railway men and the railway companies settle their mutual differences by coming together and thrashing out their points of dispute, and the result is that the men rarely have recourse to a strike. But this measure does not interfere with them in that respect. This Bill does not prevent their settling their mutual differences by negotiation. And if they can settle their disputes without a strike, then this Bill will not apply to them at all and they need have no fear of its application. According to the statements of the railway men—and they are the only men who are opposed to the Bill—this legislation will not affect them in one case out of a thousand. But suppose there should be one case out of a thousand in which compulsory investigation was desirable to prevent the business of the general public from being tied up, why should not the railway men be subjected to that remedy? Would it be wise, even if a railway strike should not take place in more than one case out of a thousand, in which disputes arise between the men and the company—would it be wise not to have compulsory investigation in that one case and have the grievances considered and the facts made known to the public? If necessary I could discuss this matter further, but we have discussed it repeatedly, and I think we are all pretty well agreed that the principle of investigation is a sound one. There is no legislation in the civilized world exactly like this. In the colony of New Zealand they go a good deal further. They go to the extent my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) would go. His complaint is that this Bill does not compel all classes of organizations of capital and labour to come under its influence. Logically he is correct, because after all there is a fraction of the public affected by every kind of industrial struggle. The industry may be a private one and any stoppage of it may not materially affect the public as would the non-operation of a railway, but after all every industrial strike in this country affects some portion of the public. The government, however, has thought it more prudent to confine this legislation for the present to the operation of public franchises. This legislation is after all merely tentative. Suppose that one year's experience proves its success. And suppose in the meantime we should have very serious industrial struggles and strife in private operations, then the successful operation of this measure with regard to public utilities would be the strongest reason for extending its application to private enterprises. Personally I would have no objection to this. In my experience I never knew an intelligent body of men who were not anxious to have public investigation and let the public know exactly what their grievances were. And I have come to the conclusion, since the beginning of this dispute with the railway men, that, with all due respect to their officers, I do not think they have a right conception of this legislation. I am not in the habit of speaking like that; and if I do so at present it is because of private correspondence which I have in my possession. I make that statement because men have personally interviewed me, men who work on railways in this country, and who, when the facts of the legislation were put to them, were absolutely satisfied that they had been mistaken in this matter. I do not say that any man personally and directly sought to deceive the railway men—that would be a pretty serious thing to say. But what I do say is that the great mass of the railway men of this country have never had a complete and truthful understanding of this legislation, and I am convinced that when the nature of the legislation is known the great majority of the railway men will support it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it not have been wise, then, to bring them before a committee of the House and explain it?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend's (Mr. R. L. Borden) question is a very fair one. But the railway men are represented not in parliament, but about parliament by their official representative. And I want to say that the whole constitution under which the railway men carry on their business is based on the fundamental principle upon which this Bill is based—the principle of employees meeting employers, of using conciliation to overcome difficulties, of giving notice in case of industrial strikes and troubles—all these things are embodied in the purely voluntary machinery of the railway men's union. I submit—and I do not want to say a single word that would suggest that I had reflected upon any officials of the railway men—that, after repeated conversations with some of the men themselves, I am satisfied that they have not understood this legislation. And I am convinced according to their own constitution and my experience of the Bill that we shall find ninety per cent of the railway men in this country and on this continent supporting this measure. I think the government do right in maintaining their position in this matter. I support it absolutely. I hope the government will stand by the legislation. I am convinced that within three months they will have any amount of evidence that mistakes have been made and erroneous notions held with regard to the provisions of the Bill. There is a possibility at present of tremendous labour strug-

gles in this country. I am not speaking officially or because of any direct information that I have, but I have good reason for knowing that there are great probabilities of very serious industrial strikes within a few weeks. I would recommend the government to get the legislation through as soon as possible, and apply it, and we shall get practical evidence of its benefit. There is a possibility of a struggle in the coal fields of the west on a much more extensive scale than when the question was originally considered in this House. Personally, I am convinced that both the companies that own the mines and the great mass of the men who work in them will appreciate this legislation and will gladly bring it into force. I believe in the intelligence of the people of this country. I believe that the time has come when capital and labour are not prepared to enter into a struggle to the public disadvantage unless they believe that the conditions of a struggle are fair, and, to that end, they will be ready to support the fundamental principle of this legislation. I hope that the government will not only put the measure through this House as quickly as possible, but will use their influence in the Senate to make it law. And if they apply it, I fancy we shall have an opportunity of showing the practical good of it in a very short time.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) did not answer the question of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), though that question was a simple one that seemed to call for a very simple and direct answer. The hon. gentleman says that this Bill is very much in favour of the railway men. I would ask him if he has any communication from the railway men's organizations affected by the Bill in the line of what he has stated? It seems to me that all the hon. gentleman has said makes for the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition in favour of allowing further time for investigation of this measure. The effect of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) says is that railway men do not know what they want. The railway men, apparently, are not asking that this Bill be made law so far as they are concerned. And yet he tells us that this Bill is greatly in favour of their interests. Apparently the hon. gentleman is convinced that they do not know their own interest.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) if, in any resolution he has received from the railway unions, they give good reasons against the legislation?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. They gave excellent reasons.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. In the resolutions from them that I have received there is absolutely no reason given against this measure.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) any resolutions in favour of this legislation?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I have the expressions of individual men in my own district working on railways who endorse it.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The railway men had the opportunity of one or two hearings before the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) and, I think, the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). But it must be remembered that, though the Minister of Labour is a most industrious minister, he is not either this House or a committee of this House, and so is not able to bring to bear upon this legislation the wisdom that could be brought to bear upon it by a special committee of this House charged with the consideration of its provisions before whom the various interests affected could have been represented. The hon. member for Nanaimo gives another reason why there should be a select committee to consider legislation of this kind when he speaks of fresh strikes which may possibly arise. Had the parties been given the opportunity to make their views and their differences known to a select committee which would bring out the points between them, there would have been a better opportunity to propose means to harmonize these conflicting interests. I merely rose to point out to the hon. member for Nanaimo that the various railway interests are not at all satisfied with the hearing they have had and with the disposition that has been made of their case. They do not believe that they have had a fair hearing. I have here an extract from a memorial to the Prime Minister from the Order of Railway Conductors, presented as recently as the 16th inst.:

> If it is possible to exempt railway organizations from this Bill, could you not lay it over until another session, so that we could all have sufficient time to study its merits. This is an important measure, and you will agree with me if I say that all concerned should have ample time to weigh it. If you cannot consistently grant either of the above requests, I will appeal to you to have the Bill referred to a special committee before being fully passed in the House, in order that the same might have proper consideration and discussion.

This is the concluding paragraph:

> While it is true that we have had an interview with yourself——

That is the First Minister.

> —and the Hon. Mr. Lemieux, at the same time, sufficient opportunity was not given to fully present our objections to the Bill, and in

granting this concession of allowing the Bill to be referred to a committee, we feel that many reasons not before given can be advanced, and greater justice can be done our organization.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is certainly a very reasonable request, and it is a request that I think should not go unheeded. This memorial is signed by the Supreme Grand Chief Conductor for Canada for the Order of Railway Conductors. These men surely ought to know their wants and their requirements. Their memorial is similar in tone and tenor to many others that have been received by members of this House from various other departments of railway labour. It is in complete harmony with all that has been presented to the House along the same lines. There has not been one discordant voice, so far as I have heard, from the railway men. They appear to be unanimous, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith).

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Has my hon. friend anything in his possession as a reason from the railway men against this Bill?

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. If they are given the opportunity now asked for they will present their reasons, and I am appealing to the government to give them a chance to present their reasons according to their own light, to give them a chance of presenting their grievances. It cannot be supposed that men, in a short memorial, can state their reasons as fully and as convincingly as they could orally before a committee. They have already sent lengthy memorials to this House, and believing that their request for a committee would be granted, they have not pressed their reasons in any other way except by memorial. I certainly think that this Bill ought to be referred to a special committee, and in that view I shall support the amendment.

Mr. H. LOGAN (Cumberland). With a view of making this Bill as satisfactory as possible, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour, first, if he has considered the effect of this legislation upon the coal miners of Nova Scotia? We have upon the statute-books of that province an Act which, I think it will be admitted, is a compulsory arbitration Act. Has the minister considered the possibility of this legislation clashing with the provincial legislation? Another question I would ask is this: The Bill as introduced applies to all public utilities in Canada, particularly to coal mines and railways. It is being amended so that railway employees may come under the operation of this Bill or, if they choose, under the operations of the Bill of 1903. Now, I have in mind a company which operates both a coal mine and a railway. All the employees of the company are on one pay-roll, some of them are on the pay-roll of the company as coal miners and many of them are on the pay-roll of the company as railway operators. Has the minister considered whether difficulties might not arise in a case like that? Would the men employed on the railway be allowed the privilege of coming under the operation of this Bill or under that of 1903, in other words, would they stand in a different position from their fellow-workmen in the coal mines of the same company?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are you referring to the Springhill Railway?

Mr. LOGAN. To the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company of Springhill, N.S. They operate a coal mine at Springhill, employing about 1,700 men, and they operate a railroad running a distance of 30 or 35 miles.

Now, I would like to say a few words with reference to the general principle of this amendment. For one, I desire to protest against the proposed change in this legislation. I cannot see why we should give any more liberty to the railway employees than we do to the men who go down into the earth to bring up coal. I cannot see why the railway men should not come under the operation of this Bill as well as the coal miners.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does he imagine I am moving an amendment to that effect?

Mr. LOGAN. Not at all. I am going to vote against the hon. gentleman's amendment, because I believe, with the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), that delay in this matter means killing the legislation. It is better to have this legislation than none at all. I propose to vote against the amendment of the leader of the opposition and to vote for the Bill of the Minister of Labour, although I believe the Bill could be improved, yet half a loaf is better than no bread at all. Now, it seems to me that if there is any class of people in this country who should come under the operation of a compulsory investigation Act it is the men who operate the railways of this country. We know that when there is a strike upon a railroad the company will raise heaven and earth to operate it, and they will bring in men who know little or nothing about the business. That has been done in Canada. We have seen the company bring in men to work upon a railroad who are not skilled, and as a consequence every man in Canada runs the risk of his life in travelling upon a road which is operated by men who do not know how to operate it. Yet it is proposed to take this class of men out from the operation of this Act and put them under an Act passed in 1903. I believe, Mr. Speaker, in the principle of this Bill; I believe it

is wise to have public investigation, in order to influence the great court of public opinion, which is, after all, the only court in a labour dispute to which a man can appeal who has to earn his living by the sweat of his brow. I have heard statements made by men who say that this Bill should not be applied to railway men; I have read a circular sent out by Mr. Hall, representing a great number of men. I hold in my hand a letter from a gentleman who says that the men he represents outnumber those represented by Mr. Hall at least two or three times. I propose to read a letter from A. B. Lowe, representative in Canada of the Maintenance of Way Men of the continent of America, a gentleman well known to most of the members of this House, a gentleman who, I believe, knows as much about the wants of the railway trackmen, at least, as any man who lives within the bounds of this confederation. Mr. Lowe says:

I have spoken to several of our people in the maintenance of way department, where the majority of organized railway men are; at least, they outnumber any other two or three of the brotherhoods, and they very cordially agreed with me that an investigation and an award by three chosen, two by the parties to the dispute and one by the other two so chosen, would most likely stop a strike, or if the men had to go out through the company refusing to abide by such an award public sympathy would be very strongly on our side.

And the delay caused by such investigation would be amply repaid in my opinion by having the public so thoroughly posted as to the merits of the controversy. Mr. Verville's suggestion that there should be no reduction of pay during the investigation seems good, and there should be a prompt investigation. In the telegraphers' dispute with the Grand Trunk Railway there were wearisome delays during the investigation. But even then the telegraphers came out well. But what some railway men and others perhaps need to learn is the public interest in these railway disputes, the danger to the travelling public and the inconvenience generally. The time has come when the railway service enters so much into almost every one's every day life that their safety and convenience takes preference of the interest of either employee or employer, and they are getting to have but scant patience with either strikers' or lockers out. Hence, the good of this Bill, in my opinion, that it informs public opinion on the merits of the dispute.

He alludes then to the proposal to refer this matter to a committee and says that he thinks this is an unnecessary delay. Then he ends up the letter by saying:

I hope with proper safeguards as to delays in holding the investigation and making the award, the Bill of the hon. Minister of Labour will carry.

(Sgd.) A. B. LOWE.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that only goes to show that all the railway men of this country are not opposed to this Bill. Here is a man who represents the trackmen who are a very large number of the employees of the railways from one end of this country to the other, and this is the deliberate statement of this man who has been their representative before the committees of parliament for the last fifteen or twenty years. I am prepared to give the statement of Mr. Low a great deal of consideration knowing him as I do and believing that he is thoroughly honest and fair in these matters. The principle of the Bill, I believe, is good. There may be some parts of it that are not as we would like them, but after all, and I refer again to my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, even if this is not perfect legislation it is better than no legislation at all. We are coming back here to another session of parliament. If there are deficiencies in this legislation let us then try to remove these deficiencies. It has been stated this is the only legislation of the kind in the whole world. We may have great faith in the Minister of Labour and in his deputy but we cannot expect to secure perfection in the first Bill of this character which has been introduced anywhere in the whole wide world, but I believe that the Bill as it stands has gone a long way to meet the difficulties of the situation that we have in this country, that the principle of investigation is a good one and that it should be our bounden duty as representatives of the people to do our very best to bring this legislation as near perfection as possible in this and following years. I agree with the statement of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that the best way of testing this legislation is to pass it now and to experiment with it and if we can, by this legislation, prevent, as I believe we can by informing the great court of public opinion of the difficulties between employer and employee, privations, the loss of property, the ruin of men, the destitution of women and the hunger of children we will have done that which will be greatly to the benefit of mankind and will redound to the credit of this House of parliament, of the Minister of Labour and of his deputy.

House divided on amendment of (Mr. R. L. Borden).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Ames,	Lefurgey,
Armstrong,	Lennox,
Avery,	Leonard,
Barr,	Macdonell,
Bennett,	MacLaren,
Bergeron,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Blain,	McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Borden (Carleton),	Marshall,
Brabazon,	Monk,
Bristol,	Morin,
Broder,	Perley,
Chisholm (Huron),	Reid (Grenville),
Christie,	Roche (Marquette),
Clements,	

Cockshutt,
Elson,
Gunn,
Haggart,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Worthington.—48.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Bickerdike,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin (Nicolet),
Devlin (Wright),
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Hall,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCool,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Paquet,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—106.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
McColl,	Ward,
Fisher,	Foster,
Dyment,	Northrup,
Grant,	Seagram,
Sifton	Henderson,
Laurence,	Fowler,
Black,	Ganong,
Watson,	Wright (Muskoka),
Ross (Cape Breton),	Martin (P.E.I.),
Ratz,	Pringle,
Guthrie,	Clare,
Bole,	Porter,
Galliher,	Daniel,
Ethier,	Forget,
Cyr,	Crocket,
Dugas,	Bovce,
Lovell,	Barker,
Talbot,	Osler,
Mayrand.	Lewis.

Amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden) negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. I voted inadvertently and I wish to have my name struck off the list. I am paired with the chief whip of the government, or otherwise I would have voted for the amendment. The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Ward) has not voted.

Mr. WARD. I am paired with the hon. member for West Northumberland, or otherwise I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Since the House in its wisdom has seen fit to vote down the amendment of the leader of the opposition, I beg to move :

That the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 36) be discharged, and that the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by excluding from its operation the railway employers and employees, in respect of whom provision is made for conciliation and inquiry by the Railway Labour Disputes Act, 1903, now embodied in chapter 96, Revised Statutes, 1906.

Just a word in support of this amendment. The railway men throughout the Dominion are perfectly satisfied with the Act of 1903, and since it has come into force there has not been one strike on any Canadian railroad. Several amendments have been made to the present Bill in its passage through the House with regard to which amendments the railway men have not been consulted. When you realize that there are between 80,000 and 90,000 railway employees affected by this Bill, you can readily understand how important it is that the wishes of these men should receive due consideration. This Bill was only printed on the 12th of January this year and available for distribution on the 19th, so that the Bill could not be distributed among the unions in different parts of the country, its provisions considered, and the opinion of the men reported back to this House. The railway men have therefore not had an opportunity of expressing themselves on this Bill, or on the changes made in it. I urge on the House the necessity of adopting my amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the same division as before ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, on division.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Armstrong).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Elson,
Gunn,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Leonard,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Monk,
Morin,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Worthington.—45.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Bickerdike,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin (Nicolet),
Devlin (Wright),
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Hall,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCool,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Paquet,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—105.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
McColl,	Ward,
Belcourt,	Foster,
Black,	Haggart,
Bole,	Northrup,
Burrows,	Seagram,
Caldwell,	Osler,
Cyr,	Henderson,
Dyment,	Barker,
Galliher,	Fowler,
Gervais,	Ganong,
Gladu,	Wright (Muskoka),
Grant,	Martin (P.E.I.),
Laurence,	Pringle,
Lovell,	Clare,
Ratz,	Porter,
Fisher,	Daniel,
Boyer,	Forget,
Ross (Cape Breton),	Perley,
Sifton,	Crocket,
Watson,	Boyce,
Mayrand.	Lewis.

Amendment (Mr. Armstrong) negatived.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). I desire to move :

That the order for third reading of Bill (No. 36) be discharged and that the said Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same as follows .

(a) By inserting in section 2, clause (f), immediately after the word 'work' the following words : or a lowering of wages, or change in conditions of employment.

(b) By inserting in the 27th section immediately after the word 'writing' the following words : 'within three days after the conclusion of the inquiry.

(c) By striking out of section 28 the word 'forthwith' and substituting therefor the words 'within three days.'

(d) By striking out of section 56 the amendments thereto inserted on 15th March and thus restoring the section to the following form :

56. It shall be unlawful for any employer to declare or cause a lockout, or for any employee to go on strike, on account of any dispute prior to a reference of such dispute to a board of conciliation and investigation, or during the pendency of any proceedings in relation to such dispute before a board under the provisions of this Act : Provided that nothing in this Act shall prohibit the suspension

or discontinuance of any industry or of the working of any persons therein for any cause not constituting a lockout or strike: Provided also that, except where the parties have entered into an agreement under section 62 of this Act, nothing in this Act shall be held to restrain any employer from declaring a lockout, or any employee from going on strike in respect of any dispute which has been duly referred to a board and which has been dealt with under section 24 or 25 of this Act.

After the full discussion that has taken place on this Bill I need only make one or two remarks. In reference to the first amendment I propose to have made in the committee by incorporating in subsection (f) of section 2 'or a lowering of wages or changed conditions of employment' there was a rather full discussion of that matter in the committee and there seemed to be a general impression in favour of it, but owing to certain other amendments which were made and which I now propose to strike out these words were omitted.

As to the amendment which I propose to section 27, it is in order to make the matter definite. The language at present in the section is that the commission shall report 'forthwith'; I make it definite by substituting a specific number of days, namely, three days after the conclusion of the inquiry.

The amendment in section 28 is to make it harmonize with the amendment which I propose to section 27. As to the amendment to section 56, this is a very substantial amendment, and it is founded on this line. The Minister of Labour declared over and over again, after full consideration of the Bill, that he had come to the conclusion that he would leave the railway employees and the steam railways under the jurisdiction of the Act of 1903, if they so desired; that is he would leave it optional with them to be under the jurisdiction of that Act if they desired. Now at the last moment he introduces an amendment which puts them in a very peculiar position, neither under the one Act definitely nor under the other, an entirely different position from what I understood to have been the promise of the minister during the discussion of the measure, a promise frequently repeated which amounted to this, that it would leave the employees in the position that unless they made default, unless they went back on the provisions of the Act of 1903, this Act would not be invoked. As it is he does not leave them in that position, and, as I have heard it expressed by several employees, the change the minister introducer on March 15, left them in a more unfortunate position than they were in before. As I feel the minister is not carrying out the promise he made I ask to have the section as it now stands struck out and the section which originally was printed in the Bill restored.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend will understand that if, after the long discussion that has tken place, I do not reply to him it is not through any lack of courtesy.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite understand.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lennox).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barr,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Brabazon,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Elson,
Gunn,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Leonard,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Monk,
Morin,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington.)—44.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Bickerdike,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin (Nicolet),
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCool,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcile (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),

Hall,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth),
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—104.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Greenway.	Tisdale,
McColl,	Ward,
Caldwell,	Haggart,
Belcourt,	Foster,
Black,	Northrup,
Bole,	Seagram,
Burrows,	Osler,
Cyr,	Henderson,
Devlin (Wright),	Barker,
Dyment,	Fowler,
Ethier,	Ganong,
Fisher,	Wright (Muskoka),
Galliher,	Martin (P.E.I.),
Grant,	Pringle,
Guthrie,	Clare,
Mayrand,	Porter,
Ratz,	Verville,
Ross (Cape Breton),	Daniel,
Rousseau,	Forget,
Sifton,	Perley,
Talbot,	Bristol,
Watson,	Crocket.
Dugas.	Boyce,
Laurence.	Lewis.

Amendment (Mr. Lennox) negatived.

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

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The tariff resolutions and the accompanying schedules were reported by the Committee of the Whole. I did not move that the report be received at once because I thought it desirable that the resolutions should be printed in amended form. They have since been printed, and I would ask the House to receive and concur in the report of the Committee of the Whole. Then I shall introduce the Tariff Bill for the first reading and it will be printed and distributed before further action is taken. There are also one or two trifling errors, merely verbal, in a couple of items in the schedule, which I desire to have corrected.

Resolutions read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 134) intituled an Act respecting duties of customs.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. LENNOX.

THE INTERPRETATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 116) to amend the Interpretation Act—Mr. Aylesworth—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). In the present Act the provision is that in every Act, unles the context otherwise requires, the words 'Superior Court,' mean, in the province of Manitoba, His Majesty's Court of King's Bench for the said province. It was overlooked, when the court of appeal for Manitoba was established, to include that court within the definition of these words.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE YUKON ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of the Bill (No. 109) to amend the Yukon Act. He said : This is to make provision for the appointment of an acting commissioner. Apparently the law, as it stands, provides only for a commissioner. Circumstances last year made it necessary to appoint an acting commissioner during the absence of the commissioner. Our advice is that there is not sufficient authority for the action taken and there is a possibility of its being questioned. The Bill legalizes the action of last year and provides that an acting commissioner may be appointed hereafter by the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any commissioner for the Yukon or acting commissioner ?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no commissioner at present, only an acting commissioner.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long has the office been vacant ?

Mr. OLIVER. Since some time in January.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you not make the appointment ?

Mr. OLIVER. One reason is that government house was burned down, and it is not thought desirable to appoint a commissioner during the winter when it would be inconvenient for him to go into that country and when there was no residence for him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the structure being rebuilt-?

Mr. OLIVER. Not at present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the minister wait until it is rebuilt before appointing a commissioner ?

Mr. OLIVER. That was not the intention. Of course, building operations cannot be carried on very well during the winter, and it is thought desirable that the appointment should not be made until navigation opens and people are going in, and suitable provision can be made for the residence of the governor.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How is it that the acting commissioner can endure these hardships and the commissioner cannot ?

Mr. OLIVER. If it were merely a question of enduring hardships the commissioner, whoever he might be, could face them as well as others. But the acting commissioner is a resident of the Yukon and has the same accommodation as he always had not having been affected by the destruction of government house. The commissioner who would be sent in would have to find quarters, and would have to be specially provided for, as the acting commissioner need not be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And now, having trifled a little with the reason the minister has given, would he be kind enough to give us the real reason ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry if my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) does not consider that the reason I have given is a sufficient one. I think, that in all fairness it should be considered adequate.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any provision made for the salary he is to get ?

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman who is acting as commissioner is the territorial auditor and receives a salary for the duties of that office. He is not receiving any additional salary for his duties as acting commissioner.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the one who is to do the work receive any additional salary ?

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of the legislation is to legalize the acts of the acting commissioner the legality of which is at present, somewhat in doubt, there being no provision in the Yukon Act for the appointment of an acting commissioner—an omission, I think, hon. gentlemen opposite will agree, which should be cured.

Mr. SPROULE. By legalizing these acts in this way, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) admits that this official has been doing the work without legal authority. It seems to me that it would be most useful for the government to have a blanket Act to cover all its illegal acts in that country. If the information we get is correct, it would require to be a big blanket. I have no doubt that the acting commissioner, when appointed, will receive a consideration from some source. Is it or is it not intended to pay him a consideration for his work as acting commissioner, and, if it is, under what authority does the minister propose to pay him ?

Mr. OLIVER. The only authority by which he could be paid would be a vote in the estimates. At present there is no intention to put a sum in the estimates to make provision for the acting commissioner. But should it be thought desirable to give him extra consideration, it will be applied for in that way.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does not the minister consider it a mistake now to have sent the commissioner away from the Yukon to run an election in British Columbia, particularly in view of the fact that while he was away his house was burnt down at a great loss to the country ?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor is a little astray in his dates. Government house in Yukon was burnt while the commissioner was in Ottawa attending to the duties of his office which required his presence here. The fire did not occur after his resignation from office, when, of course, as a citizen of British Columbia he had a right to take part in any election he thought fit.

Mr. TAYLOR. But was not he brought down here preparatory to running the election in British Columbia—to get the stuff to go out with?

Mr. OLIVER. I hope I shall not be held to account for all the suggestions that may occur to my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) ; but I say that, as far as I am concerned, there is no foundation for the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Taylor's) observation.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It seems unfortunate that the gentleman appointed as acting commissioner is auditor. Apparently, the gentleman who makes the accounts will have to audit them. Or, if this is not the case who will audit them ?

Mr. OLIVER. The accounts incurred on the responsibility of this government, of course, will be audited by the auditor, who is the acting commissioner. As to what provision will be made for auditing the accounts incurred in respect of the business of the territorial government, I do not know. That is a matter for the Yukon council itself to consider.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is one matter we might understand a little better. For what length of time was the commissioner absent during the last year of his office—about?

Mr. OLIVER. The late commissioner was absent from the Yukon twice, once during the last session of parliament and once during the present session. During the present session he came out some time in December and resigned some time in January. On a previous occasion, I think he came out in February, and returned in April. I have not the date clear in my

mind, but I think he was out for a couple of months during the last session.

Mr. SPROULE. Who was acting commissioner during the Governor's first absence?

Mr. OLIVER. The same gentleman who is acting now, the Yukon auditor.

Mr. SPROULE. Was he appointed by order in council as acting commissioner? This Bill would seem to imply that he may have been appointed by order in council.

Mr. OLIVER. He was appointed by order in council, but it is now believed that that authority was not adequate and that his appointment should be confirmed by statute. I presume it will be conceded that this omission from the statute was unfortunate, and that it would have been better if provision had been made for the appointment of a deputy or acting commissioner in the absence or illness of the commissioner. That provision it is proposed to make in this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Has not the Minister of the Interior power to appoint? The wording seems to be appointed by order in council or by the Minister of the Interior, implying apparently, that the other power has the right to appoint.

Mr. OLIVER. The appointment of the acting commissioner on a former occasion was by order in council. Now it is proposed to give the Governor in Council legal authority to appoint an acting commissioner. And it is proposed to make the statute retroactive so as to cover any difficulty that might arise from the possible illegality of previous action. It is merely to cure a possible difficulty.

Mr. SPROULE. It would appear by this Act that there were two authorities who had power to appoint the acting commissioner; he could be appointed either by order in council or by the Minister of the Interior. Otherwise why the necessity for this language.

2. The validity of any appointment of an acting commissioner heretofore assumed to be made by the Governor in Council or the Minister of the Interior, or of any instructions heretofore assumed to be given by the Governor in Council or the Minister of the Interior to any person to act as or for the commissioner during his absence, illness or other disability, shall not be called in question on the ground that there is no authority in law to make such appointment or give such instructions.

It would appear that either one or the other has acted upon authority and made the appointment.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The minister has told us that this same acting commissioner acted once before. I would like to know who audited the accounts there? I do not think it is fair that the man who makes the accounts should also audit them.

Mr. OLIVER. I have already said that I understood the gentleman held the position of auditor audited the accounts for the Dominion; but I could not say whether he audited the accounts for the Yukon council. That would be a matter for the decision of the Yukon council.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is it not his duty to audit all these accounts?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Then who audited the whole of these accounts at the time he was acting commissioner before?

Mr. OLIVER. I believe that so far as the Dominion accounts were concerned they were audited by Mr. Lithgow, the acting commissioner then, and the acting commissioner now; but whether he acted as auditor for accounts incurred by the local government of the Yukon, I do not know. He is the auditor ordinarily for both the local government and the Dominion government, but when acting as commissioner for the Yukon he may not be acting as auditor for the local government.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there a commissioner to be appointed yet?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who is he to be?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say.

Mr. LENNOX. There was an appointment to be made either by the Governor in Council or by the Minister of the Interior, of some one to act as assistant commissioner and as acting commissioner. Will the minister inform us whether the appointment was made by the Governor in Council or by the minister?

Mr. OLIVER. It was made by the Governor in Council.

Mr. LENNOX. Was it made before the commissioner left the Yukon?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say at the moment.

Mr. LENNOX. Are we to understand that possibly somebody took the place without any appointment being made?

Mr. OLIVER. I assume that his place could not be taken except by some person after he had been appointed. The purpose of this Bill is to provide that there shall be no question as to the rightfulness of the authority which appointed him, upon which point there is at the present time some question, inasmuch as I understand provision has not been made in the Yukon Act for the appointment of an acting commissioner.

Mr. LENNOX. I have some doubt as to whether this second clause will cover what

the hon. gentleman wants it to do, and I would like to know what the facts are. I understand that the appointment is made at the same time by the Governor in Council. Am I right in assuming that that was in reference to the contemplated absence of the commissioner ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, it was in reference to the absence of the commissioner, whether in contemplation or in fact.

Mr. LENNOX. It was to fill the vacancy which had occurred by reason of his absence ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not to fill the vacancy, but merely to carry on the duties of the office during his absence.

Mr. LENNOX. Now he never returned to the position, he resigned without returning. Has there been any subsequent appointment of an acting commissioner?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. LENNOX. Although there has been no subsequent appointment of an acting commissioner, he has continued to act?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Then how will this clause validate that? I do not think it will. I mean that if a person was appointed by the Governor in Council to discharge the duties during the absence of the commissioner, and that commissioner resigns his position, it is the same as if he were dead, so far as the position is concerned, and without a subsequent appointment to meet the new conditions, the person who continued to occupy the position was exercising the duties without authority.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not in a position to discuss the somewhat delicate point of law which my hon. friend raises. But the Bill as it stands has been prepared for the purpose of meeting this case, or like cases which may occur in the future. I think the House will be safe in assuming that it fairly meets the case, which is well understood by those who prepared the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. I take the ordinary reading of the clause. I presume that the acting commissioner has duties to discharge, the validity of his acts will depend upon his having been properly appointed. You are met by the proposition that you have to validate the act of a person who acted when there was no commissioner in existence, he is no substitute of anybody.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that it would be very desirable for the committee to know just in what shape this Act stands and what the acting commissioner has been doing. How long he has been acting in that capacity illegally, what accounts has he been paying, whether he did the auditing for the government and for the Yukon Council, and whether he is auditor for the government still. I think we ought to get that information and to enable the minister to get it I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In case you get through the special order to-morrow, what do you propose to take up ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) will desire to make a statement in connection with the Railway Department and then he will probably follow with his estimates in supply.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 12.30 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 20, 1907

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Ruben Charles Etienne Laurier, Esq., for the electoral district of L'Assomption, in the province of Quebec.

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 135) to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act. He said : The Bill proposes to make two slight amendments. One is to correct an inadvertence which occurred in connection with the Act passed last session. That Act was intended to go into effect on the 1st of July, but did not go into effect until the 1st of August, and in the interval miners' certificates which had expired were not renewed, the miners being under the impression that the Act had gone into force on the 1st of July. Under the law as it has been, if a mining certificate was not renewed within the proper time, the right of the miner lapsed. The Placer Mining Act did away with the requirement of miners' certificates, and the miners, knowing that, and believing that the Act went into force on the 1st of July, did not renew their certificates. The consequence is that those who did not renew their certificates after that date have no legal standing for their claims, and we wish to cure that disability. With regard to the other provision, the Placer Mining Act does not apply to mining

by dredges in river beds. This is dealt with by regulations, but in the Act no provision is made for amending the existing regulations. We believe the time has come when these regulations should be changed, and we wish to make the formal amendment to the Act necessary to permit of their being changed. These are the only two amendments proposed by the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 136) to amend the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting the preservation of the peace in the vicinity of public works.—Mr. Aylesworth.

QUESTIONS.

THE LATE DUNCAN McCALLUM.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government paid or in any way settled with the relatives or the estate of the late Duncan McCallum, who was drowned in the Trent canal, in Victoria county ?
2. Is it the intention of the government to recompense the family ?

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

1. The government has not paid anything nor in any way settled, with the relatives of the estate of the late Duncan McCallum.
2. The department holds that the government in the present instance is not liable.

POINT PRIM, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, WHARF.

Mr. McLEAN (Queen's)—by Mr. Martin—asked :

1. How many tenders were received for the construction of the wharf at Point Prim, Prince Edward Island ?
2. What are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender ?
3. What tender has been accepted ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. Six tenders were received.
2. Kimble, Coffin & John Quinn, $4,160 ; Alexander Compton & Wellington Compton, $4,750 ; D. W. B. Reid & Lewis Archibald, $5,480 ; Hugh McDonald, $5,875 ; Lyons & White, $5,990 ; Thomas Campbell, $6,200.
3. That of Messrs. Kimble, Coffin & John Quinn.

Finlay Panton's tender for $3,900 was withdrawn on January 7, the day on which tenders were due.

THE LORD'S DAY ACT.

Mr. MARSHALL asked :

1. Does the Lord's Day Alliance prohibit the distribution of American Sunday school papers in Canada ?
2. Would any one distributing such papers render himself liable to the penalty ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I presume it is intended to ask whether the Lord's Day Act prohibits such distribution. If so, I have only to say that the interpretation of the Lord's Day Act, as of any other statute, is for the courts, and is a question upon which the government has no right to express any opinion beforehand.

DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. DESJARDINS asked :

1. Has the survey, into farm lots, of a part of the Doncaster Indian reserve, in the county of Terrebonne, been completed ?
2. If not, does the government purpose having it completed this spring ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The surveyor reports that he has practically completed the field work of surveying into farm lots part of the Doncaster Indian Reserve, but that there are about 15 days' work to be done in the summer, planting boundary stones which could not readily be done in the winter.
2. It is intended to complete the survey, as soon as possible.

FLOOR OIL.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. What make or brand of floor oil, if more than one, is used by the department for the public buildings of Canada, for the preservation of floors and keeping down dust ?
2. What is the price per gallon of each ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. No special brand of floor oil is used.
2. Prices range from 60 cents to $1 per gallon.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CARS.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

What number of box cars, passenger cars, and engines, respectively, belonging to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, are in operation, and what railway companies are operating them ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This would seem to be a question that should be directed to the company rather than to the Department of Railways and Canals. The only Grand Trunk Pacific Railway equipment, in operation are twenty-six hundred and fifty box cars at present being used on the Grand Trunk Railway to relieve general shortage of such equipment until such time as required by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for the operation of its own line.

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What sums have been paid to Sir Charles Ross, or the Ross Rifle Company, in addition to the contract price of $25 per rifle for, (a) sights; (b) gauges; (c) rent; (d) heating; (e) water tax; (f) lighting; (g) inspection; (h) salaries or wages; (i) for any other reason?

2. What sums have been paid to any person, company or corporation, other than the above, for the above items, respectively?

3. What is the total expenditure to date in consequence of the contracts re Ross rifle?

4. How many Ross rifles have been accepted by the government to date, (a) mark 1; (b) mark 2?

5. How many have been rejected, (a) before; (b) after acceptance?

6. What was done with those rejected in each case?

7. Has the government paid for any that were rejected? If so, how many?

8. Was the progress estimate paid on any of the rejected rifles? If so, how much, has it been refunded, and when?

9. How many rifles, mark 1 and mark 2, respectively, are being used by the militia, including the permanent force, and the Northwest Mounted Police?

10. Who discovered the nine defects in the Ross rifle, pointed out to the House by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, on the 26th of February last?

11. Are the Ross rifles, mark 1, corresponding and equal in every respect to a standard sample rifle, approved by the minister under clauses two and seven of the contract with Sir Charles Ross, dated 27th March, A.D. 1902?

12. If so, has the committee which approved the Ross rifle been asked to explain the above defects? If not, has the inspector of small arms been asked to explain why the rifles were accepted?

13. Were above defects in the rifle approved by the committee appointed by the minister to examine and report upon the Ross rifle originally?

14. How many contracts has the government made with Sir Charles Ross or the Ross Rifle Company?

15. What does the government consider to be the duration of the original contract of March 17, 1902?

16. What amount of insurance payable to the government is there on the rifles on which progress estimates have been paid, and what is the amount of advances?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. (a) $26,250.

(b) $26,237.63.

(c) $3,455.46 including heating and lighting January 1, 1904 to December 31, 1906.

(d) Included in c.

(e) None.

(f) Included in c.

(g) None.

(h) None.

(i) $810 for 405 rifle-boxes; $50 for time recording clock for Small Arms Inspection Department; $133.20 for bayonet joint gauge; $33.20 for component parts of rifle for inspection use; $130 for 50 (each) clearing spoons and plugs.—$1,156.40.

2. (a) None.

(b) None.

(c) None.

(d) None.

(e) None.

(f) None.

(g) 1903-04, $4,586.26, Auditor General's Report, Q-116-117; 1904-05, $6,359.86, Auditor General's Report, Q-100-101; 1905-06, $16,741.73, Auditor General's Report, Q-118-119; 1906-07, $15,102.01, to March 18, 1907.

(h) Salaries and wages of inspectors included in (g) as part of cost of inspection.

(i) None.

3. 1902-03, $62,971.92, Auditor General's Report, p. Q-109; 1903-04, $163,848.74, Auditor General's Report, p. Q-116-117; 1904-05, $240,301.27, Auditor General's Report, p. Q-100-101; 1905-06, $367,306.01, Auditor General's Report, p. Q-118-119; 1906-07, $293,954.96, to March 18, 1907.—$1,128,382.90.

4. Up to 2nd instant the government had accepted:

(a) 9,000 for Militia and Defence, 1,000 for Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 500 for Marine and Fisheries.

(b) 16,500 for Militia and Defence, 12 for Justice Department.

5, 6 and 7. Rifles found defective in manufacture at first inspection are rejected, but it is understood that the company remedies the defects and presents them again for inspection. No rifles were rejected after inspection.

8. Progress estimates were paid upon the certificates of the chartered accountant and the inspector of Small Arms, without reference to any particular rifles. There has been no refund on this account. As a matter of fact, the part of the rifle to which exception is taken in the inspection is made good, and the rifles re-inspected, and this is repeated until they meet the requirements of inspection.

9. The Militia, Mark I, 1,710; Mark II, 3,509; Northwest Mounted Police, Mark 1, 1,000.

10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. The return laid on the table of the House contains all the information in possession of the department with reference to the matters referred to herein.

16. The amount of insurance, $700,000; the amount of advances, $390,993.55.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the question which the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) has just answered, I find in sections 10, 12 and 13 reference to defects in the Ross rifle said to have been pointed out to the House by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). Those who will read the speech of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton that is

here referred to will see that no defects were pointed out in the rifle. It is true that it is shown that certain improvements were made, but they are not the defects in the original rifle.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—ACCOUNTS TO BE FURNISHED.

Mr. BRISTOL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Has the Grand Trunk Railway Company regularly furnished to the Inspector General of Canada, or other proper officer, the accounts required by section 27 of 16 Victoria, chapter 37 ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The Act referred to is an Act of the old parliament of Canada before confederation, and the officer therein referred to was an officer of the province of Canada. The records of the Finance Department contain nothing to indicate that these accounts were furnished.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—SIXTH REPORT.

On the order:

Consideration of the sixth report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). For a proper understanding of the question involved in the report now under consideration, I think it would be convenient that I should make a statement of all the matters which have led up to the subjects that are involved in the report, and I shall endeavour to do so as fully as possible, and, at the same time, as briefly as I can. In 1903 the present government determined upon the construction of a national transcontinental railway from ocean to ocean through Canada, and for that purpose entered into an agreement with certain gentlemen representing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company incorporated by this parliament in that year. A railway was agreed to be constructed from Moncton in New Brunswick, wholly through Canada, to the Paific coast. It was divided into two main divisions, the eastern and the western. The eastern division, from Moncton to Winnipeg, was to be constructed by the government and leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the western division, from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean, was to be constructed and owned by the company. Each division was again divided into sections. The western division was divided into the prairie section and the mountain section, which are those with which we are particularly concerned to-day. To aid the company in constructing the western division the government agreed to guarantee the payment of principal and interest on an issue of the company's bonds equal to seventy-five per cent of the cost of construction, such cost to be subject to certain limitations as to the prairie section. It may be convenient here to mention that in a mortgage subsequently made there is a provision that the amount of principal money to be guaranteed by the government for the cost of construction west of Winnipeg to the Pacific is not to exceed £14,000,000 sterling, or something over $68,000,000 of principal money, and, in addition to guaranteeing that principal, and interest upon it, there is a condition that for seven years after completion the government must pay, without recourse, the interest as to the mountain section. The terms and stipulations are set forth in the Act of 1903, chapter 71, and in the agreement annexed to that Act. Some changes were made by a subsequent agreement which is appended to the Act of 1904, chapter 24, but I think that none of these provisions affect the question before the House. By section 51 of the Act of 1903, chapter 71, it was provided that the guarantee may be signed by the Minister of Finance and that the government shall be liable according to its terms, and that the payment thereof shall form a charge on the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

By section 34 of the agreement the Grand Trunk Railway is to guarantee the principal and interest of the remaining one-quarter of such cost of construction, but the bonds for that quarter are to be second mortgage bonds ranking after the bonds for the three-quarters guaranteed by the government.

Then there is a definition of what is meant by cost of construction, and I shall refer to the agreement as set forth, at page 467 of the statutes of 1903, for that definition. In a few words the definition is this. The cost of construction means the cost of materials, supplies, labour, services, &c., required for the construction of that division, right of way, compensation, engineering and legal expenses, and generally all costs and expenses occasioned by construction.

By section 18 of the agreement, the definition of 'cost of construction' as applied to the western division is given in these words:

The cost of construction of the western division shall include the like classes of expenditure as in the cost of construction of the eastern division, but the amount thereof shall be established by the company to the satisfaction of the government periodically from time to time, and upon the completion thereof in such a manner as the government may direct or determine.

Thus the government, with regard to the expenditure on construction in the western division, are entitled from time to time to be satisfied as to the work done, and at any future time they may go over all that again and satisfy themselves until the whole work is completed. I mention that particularly because it emphasizes the point that came up in the Committee on Public Accounts, when some criticism was made

by us as to the action of the government in not obtaining from the Grand Trunk Pacfiic either duplicates or copies of the vouchers which are being scrutinized and passed from time to time but which are left wholly in the possession of the Grand Trunk Railway. So that neither the Grand Trunk Pacific nor this government are possessed of a single voucher covering eight or more millions spent and for which the government are responsible to the bondholders with whose bonds they are entrusted. That is, it seems to me at the very outset, a most important question. The government has a contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific, but neither the government nor the Grand Trunk Pacific has possession of the vouchers showing the expenditure. They are entirely in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway. It strikes me as a most extraordinary circumstance that this expenditure should have been going on for two or three years and no system adopted by which possession should be had by the government of at least the duplicates or copies of the vouchers.

I also call attention to section 19 of the agreement which is as follows:

For the purpose of enabling the government to determine the cost of construction of the said railway, or of any portion thereof, or the cost of equipment supplied, or the net earnings of the railway, or of any part or parts thereof, pursuant to this agreement, the government shall have the right from time to time, and at all times, to inspect all the books of account, pay sheets, contracts, correspondence and all other books, papers and documents, the inspection of which may be considered necessary for the purpose of determining such cost or net earnings.

It seems to me rather odd that so much care should be taken to give the government the right to inspect these documents and papers, and yet, in the actual working out of the contract, that no care be taken that the company which enters into the contract shall be in possession of these papers. They are left absolutely in the control of another company, over which we have no jurisdiction as contracting party.

By another Act of 1905, chapter 122, the Grand Trunk Pacific was incorporated. Its capital stock was put at $45,000,000. So soon as $2,000,000 were subscribed and ten per cent thereof paid into a chartered bank of Canada, that company might organize. And by a subsequent Act, chapter 80 of the statutes of 1904, the $2,000,000 was reduced to $1,000,000, but the company was still required to pay in $200,000 cash, and I draw attention to that fact because if that Act has been complied with, the company is in possession of $200,000 of paid up stock, which fund is the proper fund for the payment of the large amounts of promotion money which it has been attempted to place on the bondholders as cost of construction, but which are no more cost of construction than would be the clothes of the manager of the road.

By section 48 of the agreement the government has the right to appoint one director of the Grand Trunk Pacific who shall be paid a salary by the government not to exceed $2,000 per year. I presume there is such an official; but in the light of what has come to our notice in the Public Accounts Committee as regards the charges for cost of construction, I cannot imagine what that valuable director is doing. We pay him a handsome salary, and he at least ought to see that the Grand Trunk Pacific does not attempt to impose on the government a large sum for work, as construction work, but which was really promotion expenses with all that that implies.

Next we have the Act of 1905, chapter 98 which relates to the mortgages. Article 3, section 3 and 4, at page 170 of the statutes, deals with the government's position with regard to the proceeds of the first mortgage bonds:

All of the said bonds shall be so issued that the purchase price of any of such bonds (hereinafter referred to as the 'proceeds' of the said bonds), shall be paid by the purchasers thereof from time to time in the bank of Montreal, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, the Merchants Bank of Canada, or such other bank or banks as the government may approve of (which are hereinafter collectively and distributively referred to as the 'bank'). The bank shall receive and hold the said proceeds and any interest accruing thereon at the credit of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General of Canada, in a special account in one of the offices of the said bank, in accordance with and subject to the provisions of section 4 of this article.

So that, quite apart from the obligation which the government has undertaken as guarantor of the bonds, it becomes a trustee for the purchasers of all these millions of bonds, and is bound to everybody who deals in them to take care and see that the funds are properly paid. Section 4 provides:

The bank shall keep all such proceeds received by it as aforesaid at the credit of the said special account, and interest upon the balances at the credit of the said account shall be credited at such times and at such rates as may be agreed upon between the Pacific Company and the bank. In proportion as the construction of the western division is proceeded with to the satisfaction of the government, according to the specifications agreed upon or to be agreed upon between the government and the Pacific Company, the government shall out of the said proceeds and interest, pay to the Pacific Company or its nominees, in monthly payments as far as practicable, such sums as the chief engineer appointed by the government or such other officer as the government may appoint for that purpose, may certify are earned, having regard to the cost, at the date of such certificate, of construction work as hereinbefore defined, and having regard to the proportion of the costs of construction which, under the scheduled agreements, is to be met

by the prices of bonds guaranteed by the government.

Now, it is to be noticed that the government is entrusted with the custody of the whole of the first mortgage fund, that is, the mortgage fund which is to cover 75 per cent of the cost of construction, and that it is the duty of the government, as the work proceeds to its satisfaction, to pay to the Pacific Company such sums as the officer appointed by the government for the purpose may certify are earned, having regard to the government's guarantee, and which guarantee for the portion from Winnipeg to the coast, as stated at page 160 of that statute, is not to exceed £14,000,000, or say $68,000,000. It may be as well to say here that if we add to that $68,000,000 one-third for the portion that the Grand Trunk undertakes to guarantee, we find that the cost of construction of the road west of Winnipeg to the Pacific is assumed to be somewhere in the vicinity of $90,000,000. I think that is a somewhat larger sum than the Finance Minister contemplated in the palmy days when he was putting the Bill through the House.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BARKER. I think the people of the country will be somewhat surprised to learn that the probable cost of the construction of that division of the road is likely to be somewhere about $90,000,000. One other condition of the statute which bears on the question before the House is section 13, page 178 :

The Pacific Company shall, during the continuance of this security——

Mark you, this is a provision in the mortgage under which the government are trustee of the funds.

The Pacific Company shall, during the continuance of this security, carry on and conduct its business in a proper and efficient manner, keep proper books of accounts, and, from time to time, give to the government or to the trustee——

trustee there means trustee of the property held by the trust company.

——any information which may reasonably be required relating to the affairs of the Pacific Company.

Now, there is a very important provision in the mortgage, and in the statutes relating thereto, for the protection of the government, namely, that the government are entitled to call for any statements or information from the Pacific Company. Yet we know from the witnesses that have been so far examined that there has not been the slightest care to see that that is done and although over $6,000,000 has already been paid out. The gentleman who goes down from the Railway Department to inspect the accounts of the G. T. Pacific is handed over to the Grand Trunk official, and the Grand Trunk official produces—what ? Grand Trunk Pacific vouchers ? Not one. He produces simply vouchers of the Grand Trunk Company against the Grand Trunk Pacific, vouchers that are mixed up with the ordinary Grand Trunk vouchers. Until a month ago—why the change was made a month ago, unless it was the proceedings of the committee that brought it about, I do not know—until a month ago the papers affecting the Grand Trunk Pacific were not even consecutive, they were dispersed through thousands and thousands of the vouchers of the Grand Trunk Company in all its dealings as a public carrier. This is the way the government, as trustee of these millions, has been seeing that that provision of the mortgage has been carried out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the position is shortly this : The government has undertaken to guarantee the cost of construction of the western division of the Transcontinental Railway that may reach, so far as the government guarantee of principal is concerned, fully $68,000,000, and it has also agreed to guarantee interest thereon as well as pay interest on a large portion of that sum for seven years without recourse. The government has also undertaken the responsibility of controlling the proceeds of all the bonds for that vast sum of money, so that not one dollar shall at any time be paid to the Pacific Company for any other purpose than the cost of construction. And to enable the government to check this cost, provision is made for the keeping of proper accounts which the government has a right to inspect from time to time. The government therefore is not only nominally the guarantor of the sum, but it is the trustee of the bondholders' money necessary to pay for the construction. Now, I need not urge upon this House the extreme importance of dealing with this trust fund with the strictest care and vigilance. Canada's faith is pledged to the financial market, to the financial world, and all dealers in such securities ; and should doubt be cast upon the handling of this fund, if there be any suspicion of misapplication, any concealment, any hesitation to allow the closest scrutiny, for example, if the Public Accounts Committee are not allowed to look into all the papers, the reputation of the government, of parliament, and of the country and the price and value of our own government securities would suffer in consequence. I think that is a consideration that should not be overlooked, especially when we find in the committee, day after day, obstruction being thrown in the way of obtaining certain accounts. As the majority of the committee have put it, if items are improperly charged we have nothing to do with them ; we have only a right to look at what is properly charged ; we are not to scrutinize any wrong accounts but only those which are right. That is the position taken by gentlemen composing the majority of the Public Accounts Committee, under the lead of

the Minister of Finance. He says: We have nothing to do with items that have been cast out, that have been improperly charged; we must confine ourselves only to what has been said. Presumably if they are right, those concerned in this transaction may make attempt after attempt to get through items that are utterly wrong, we have nothing to do with them, and we must sit down and be content with looking at what we know or believe to be right. Now, the public accounts were formally referred to that committee, and upon that reference this trust account came under review, and not only all the receipts by the company, but the expenditure authorized by the government in its quality of trustee. In that line we have been endeavouring to get at the facts. According to the evidence, it appears that in September, or early in October, 1905, the Grand Trunk Pacific sent in their first statement claiming to have expended in construction on the western division, from the beginning up to the 30th June, 1905, $926,-293.

That statement was apparently sent to the Railway Department, it was submitted by the Minister of Railways to the Accountant of his department, Mr. Shannon, for audit. Mr. Shannon proceeded to Montreal to the Grand Trunk Pacific offices, and found that the vouchers, as I have said, were all in the possession of the Grand Trunk Company. They were not kept separately, he says, nor were they numbered consecutively, they were interspersed among the ordinary Grand Trunk vouchers and were in possession of the Grand Trunk. They were submitted to Mr. Shannon for inspection and as soon as they had been looked at by him they went back into the possession of the Grand Trunk. Mr. Shannon reported his audit to the department on October 11, and it appears that of that $926,-293 Mr. Shannon rejected and disallowed $162,000. And it must be remembered, in looking at that very considerable item, $162,-000, recommended to be disallowed, it does not mean that the vouchers represented only that amount, because any items that were of a general character were distributed pro rata over the several divisions and sections. So when Mr. Shannon was allowing or disallowing general items he might in many cases be dealing in this $162,000 with only about 61 per cent of the actual sum vouched for, an additional 39 per cent being charged to other sections. The pro rata of the western division among the properties of the company is, I think, 61·35 per cent, and in a large number of items, legal expenses for example and matters of that kind of a general character, the amount represented in the $162,000 would not be the whole of the legal expenses, and various matters that come under the head of promotion, but only 61⅓ per cent; so you will see that the $162,-000 was a very striking item to be refused and disallowed by the government accountant out of the first statement presented by the G. T. Pacific.

Although Mr. Shannon, on the 11th of October, 1905, disallowed that $162,000, we find that on that day or the following day the government engineer overruled Mr. Shannon and allowed the whole claim of $926,293, and he forwarded that recommendation to the Minister of Railways. It appears further that a day or two after that first statement had been submitted for audit, the G. T. Pacific officials sent to the Minister of Railways four certificates covering the whole of the $926,293, dividing it into four portions according to the different districts being dealt with. Those certificates were signed by the President, Vice-President and Engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific who certified that that sum had been expended in construction, and of it 75 per cent was to be paid by the government out of the trust fund. The certificates were upon a printed form addressed to the Minister of Finance and Receiver-General, but they were sent through the Railway Department so that they might be certified there by the government engineer, and the government engineer, as I have said, did certify them. In the face of Mr. Shannon's rejection of that large sum the government engineer on the following day passed the whole sum; he could not possibly have investigated the accounts but he allowed the whole sum. We have not yet completed the evidence, and we do not know, but we shall probably hear, that he had an interview with some of the officials of the road, but of that at present we are not informed. Certainly the fact is beyond question that Mr. Shannon reported in writing rejecting those accounts; he was overruled, and Mr. Schreiber, the government engineer, certified at the foot of the certificate given by the railway officers that the sum was correct and should be paid. I shall give presently the exact form of that certificate. The certificate given by the three railway officials was in these words:

> I certify the above statement of expenditure to be correct, that the prices paid for the work are not in excess of the fair value thereof, and that all the proceeds of these bonds heretofore received have been used for the purposes for which the payment thereof was made.

That certificate was signed by C. M. Hays, President; F. W. Morse, Vice-President and by B. B. Kelliher, Chief Engineer. Then at the foot of that, immediately beneath these signatures, Mr. Schreiber signed:

> I hereby certify that I have examined the accounts, books, vouchers, &c., of the company at this office——

He did that, of course, through his subordinate, Mr. Shannon,

> —and I find the above statement of expenditure to be in accord with the same; and further my information is that the expenditure as set down fairly represents the reasonable value of the work done.

Mr. Schreiber signs that with Mr. Shannon's report in his hand, he himself not having examined the vouchers at all; Mr. Shannon having done the work and having certified, giving the details to a great extent, that $162,000 of it was not, as far as he could ascertain, work of construction at all. Mr. Shannon says at page 21 of the evidence that that first statement which he audited was subsequently withdrawn by the company and that a new statement was submitted and that he was ordered by the Minister of Railways or his deputy to audit it which he did, and he made that second audit at the end of October, in the same month but later on.

Mr. Power, acting auditor of the two companies, the Grand Trunk and the G. T. Pacific—and I may say here to show what little value there is in an audit as between the two companies, that all the gentlemen who audit accounts on the one side for the Grand Trunk and on the other side for the G. T. Pacific are Grand Trunk officers, every one of them. A Grand Trunk official presents a voucher for a certain amount to the G. T. Pacific. Some other officers, I am not quite sure but sometimes they are the same officers, audit and sign on behalf of the G. T. Pacific, and so it is all right. Mr. Power, the acting auditor, tells us in his evidence, that if the general manager signed a voucher he would not presume to go beyond the General Manager's signature. He did not say he had no right to do it, but he would not do it; it is not the practice to do it. When the General Manager puts his name to a document that is not to be criticised by any official. Mr. Power at page 73 says.

When Mr. Walker the general auditor brought back that first statement from Ottawa, Mr. Walker ordered that it should be destroyed and it was destroyed and a new statement was prepared.

At page 79 Mr. Power says:

Not only the original statement sent to the government was destroyed, but all the copies of it in the company's office.

Is there any significance in that? Why should a company that made up a statement honestly—even though some over-zealous official put in things they were not entitled to put in—why should the company be afraid to keep in their own books the carbon copies of the statement they had issued? Why should Mr. Walker, the auditor, on getting back this statement which had been audited, and fairly and properly audited I should fancy by Mr. Shannon, and which had been certified beyond that audit by the railway department; why should he want to destroy that statement and all copies of it, if everything was honest and above board? What harm could there be for that statement to remain in existence? And what must there be underneath it all to have called for the withdrawal from the government of the accounts sent in, and to have them destroyed, and to have even the copies destroyed. But it is this destroyed statement and the vouchers upon which it is based, that the Minister of Finance says are matters we should not look into. And his followers say, yea. The $160,000 ultimately was not paid, but it was passed through all the forms into the Finance Department and it was checked here—not checked in the ordinary sense—it was stopped there. And forsooth, we are not to look into it, although it is stamped with suspicion by the conduct of the company itself. Mr. Power confirms Mr. Shannon's statement as to the objections, because Mr. Power says:

The rejected items of that first statement were about $160,000.

At page 76, Mr. Power says:

The first statement included as far as he is aware everything that the company had paid whether for promotion or getting a charter or anything else, as well as the cost of construction.

There is confirmation of Mr. Shannon, the accountant; Mr. Power says the first statement included everything, from the work upstairs in this building to the work across the ocean, visits to the Pacific coast, everything was included, all the legal expenses—and apparently there was an array of legal gentlemen because the legal expenses came to $26,000 for the preliminary work. All this was included; and yet the Railway Department knowing that; knowing that not a dollar should go into that account but cost of construction, passed it on to the Finance Department for payment. On page 42 of the evidence, it will be seen that the secretary of the Railway Department, on the 19th of October, 1905, (about a week after the certificates) wrote this letter to the Minister of Finance:

I have the honour by direction to inclose herewith for the necessary action by your department, four certificates dated the 11th inst., of Mr. Collingwood Schrieber, as chief engineer of the government in connection with the construction of the western division National Transcontinental Railway to which position he was appointed by an order in council of that date. Such certificates endorsed on certified statement of expenditure furnished by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, they being as follows:

Then is recited, so much for the mountain section, so much for the prairie section, the total of the sums, and the amount of the 75 per cent. Apparently, although Mr. Power tells us the company was hard pressed for money and were very urgent to get it; apparently the certificates were held up in the Finance Department—not by the minister, I would not charge him with delaying it a day, but by Mr. Courtney, ex-deputy minister who seems to have been very cautious. And although everything in connection with the certificate was in per-

fect form, so that there was nothing to be done but to issue the cheques, he tells us he took time to consider the course to be pursued, because it was the first case and he wanted to have things regular. During that time, when the certificates were in his hands, he tells us at page 42 of the evidence, that he constantly saw Mr. Shannon about the business of the railway accountant's department, and Mr. Shannon whom he saw so constantly was the gentleman who had rejected the $162,000. The inference from that is, that Mr. Courtney was not so much concerned about the method he was to adopt as he was about the fact that $162,000 was being got out of the government irregularly and improperly. I do not know that there can be any doubt about that. Here were Mr. Shannon and the deputy minister constantly in communication. It is impossible to believe that Mr. Shannon on seeing the deputy minister would have abstained from pointing out that he had rejected $162,000, and that his opinion had been overridden by Mr. Schreiber or by the Railway Department, I do not know which. It is a fair inference that knowledge induced Mr. Courtney to delay putting the matter through as quickly as he otherwise would have done. It appears in the evidence that there was then a conference between Mr. Shannon, Mr. Courtney and the Minister of Finance, and the result of that will appear in some further correspondence which I shall read. On the 9th of November, 1905—this, you will observe, was very shortly after the certificates were sent in—we find Mr. Walker, the general auditor of the Grand Trunk Pacific, writing to the deputy Minister of Railways, Mr. Butler:

Dear Sir,—Will you kindly return statements of expenditure which Mr. Shannon took with him to complete his audit, as I wish to amend them? Also the certificates, which will have to be redrawn to correspond.

Then Mr. Jones, the secretary of the department, writes to the Deputy Minister of Finance:

The department is in receipt of a request from the general auditor of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for the return of certain statements of expenditure which require to be withdrawn.

Then follows a letter from Mr. Courtney to Mr. Jones:

In compliance with your letter of this day's date, I beg to return herewith four certificates dated October 11, of Mr. Schreiber, as chief engineer of the government, in connection with the construction of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway, of expenditures as follows.

Then he recites the expenditures. Then Mr. Courtney is asked:

Q. In compliance with that letter did you return the certificates?—A. Evidently.

Q. How did you come to return those certificates?—A. At the request of the Railway Department.

Now, I think a remark may very well be made here as to this extraordinary action of the Finance Department and the Railway Department. Here a railway company puts in accounts for an enormous sum of money that it was not entitled to, and they were certified by three of its officers in words that would show that the company was entitled to it. Those accounts were passed by the Railway Department, the Railway Minister or his deputy sending them on to the Finance Department. They are certified by the proper officer of the government to make them valid in favour of the railway company, and the Department of Finance and the Department of Railways see no difficulty whatever in returning those accounts and certificates to the railway company. Surely common prudence would have told the government that it was improper to place in the hands of the railway company the certificate of the government engineer that they were entitled to the whole of that sum. Would a railway company, who had found a contractor charging improperly large sums of money, and that its engineer had either erroneously or negligently certified the account as correct, return it with the certificate of the engineer to the contractor? I think not. I do not think there is a business man in this country who would have thought for a moment of doing it. On the contrary, if I know anything about railway managers, they would hold on to that paper as against the man who sent it in for future reference, and as a caution to all those in its employ who had to deal with such matters, that it might not occur again. Mr. Boville, the successor to Mr. Courtney, says this:

Q. Was there any question in the department as to the irregularity of the certificates, or the form of the certificates, the lack of proper endorsement on the certificates?—A. The only recollection I have is, as Mr. Courtney said, this was the first transaction and a good deal of care had to be taken with it, as it would serve as a precedent for future dealings with similar transactions. I think you will find this letter is addressed to Mr. Fielding, the Hon. W. S. Fielding. I think those certificates probably came under his view. I think there was a consultation probably between Mr. Courtney, probably Mr. Shannon was there at the same time, and Mr. Fielding may have had something to do with it.

That is the nearest we could get to the facts, because Mr. Courtney's recollection was uncertain. Mr. Boville was in the next room, but he is under the impression that Mr. Shannon was present when it was arranged that these certificates should be sent back from the Finance Department to the Railway Department, in order that they might be returned to the G. T. Pacific

Company. So I think we may fairly assume that the Minister of Finance knew what was intended to be done, and acquiesced in it. I do not think there can be any doubt about that. One of the witnesses said that it was quite the common course to pass vouchers from one department to another.

Mr. FIELDING. No, he did not say that. What he said was that it was a common practice for one department to pass documents to another. He did not say a voucher. On the contrary, he said that a voucher would not be withdrawn.

Mr. BARKER. I said voucher, because that is the word used here. He said it was a common practice for one department to send papers to another. What I am arguing is that the Minister of Finance acquiesced in these certificates being returned.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has no evidence for any such statement. The record says they were withdrawn at the request of the Railway Department, and what became of them was a matter for that department.

Mr. BARKER. I was drawing a perfectly fair inference from what appears here.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Boville said that the minister and Mr. Courtney discussed the subject with Mr. Shannon, and he must have known that there was this complaint about the $162,000. No one can believe that Mr. Courtney did not tell him that; and what happened? After that discussion the paper was sent to the Railway Department, the Finance Minister knowing that it was to be sent to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company.

Mr. FIELDING. I again state that there is nothing in the evidence to show that. I do not think it is material, but I do not know why my hon. friend continues to make that statement.

Mr. BARKER. I am stating just what occurred.

Mr. FIELDING. But it did not occur.

Mr. BARKER. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. What I say is that it is impossible to believe that Mr. Courtney did not tell the minister that there was this question of the $162,000 connected with that voucher.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Courtney and I discussed the whole subject, and the certificate was held up. My hon. friend took particular pains to say that it was not done by the minister, but by Mr. Courtney. The evidence shows that the minister and Mr. Courtney discussed the matter, and the minister decided, for the time being, the amount should not be paid.

Mr. BARKER. Then, from what the minister now says, it is quite clear that he did know all about this disputed account, that he did know apparently that the vouchers were applied for to be returned to the G. T. Pacific Company.

Mr. FIELDING. I say myself that I was not consulted about the return. I was aware that the papers had been asked for and returned. I do not think the point material, but the hon. gentleman might as well state it fairly.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman did know then that the certificates had been applied for and had been returned?

Mr. FIELDING. I knew afterwards. Yes, I knew they were returned.

Mr. BARKER. Did he ever ask to get those back into his possession?

Mr. FIELDING. Never.

Mr. BARKER. That is what I was coming to.

Mr. FIELDING. Rather a roundabout way.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman tells us now what we could not get out of the witnesses—that is all. I have read a letter from Mr. Walker applying for a return of those certificates, page 41. Then I read a letter from Mr. Jones to Mr. Walker. Now, I will read a letter of the 13th November from Mr. Walker to Mr. Jones:

Dear Sir,—I have pleasure in acknowledging return of four certificates per yours of 10th instant.

They were given up, you see, very promptly. Then at page 62, on the 14th December, 1905, I find the following letter from Mr. William Wainwright, second vice-president of the G. T. Pacific, to the serretary of the Railway Department:

Dear Mr. Jones,—I send you herewith the certificates originally signed and which have been withdrawn for cancellation, and which perhaps you will kindly hand to Mr. Schreiber in order that he may destroy them or take his name off, whichever he desires to do.

Then Mr. Schreiber is asked:

Q. Did you receive those certificates back? A. I did.

Q. What did you do with them?—A. I tore my name off.

Q. Have you got them with your name torn off? A. I think not. I handed them back to the Department of Railways and Canals.

And this transaction between the Finance Department and the Department of Railways and Canals we dare not inquire into! All we are allowed to inquire into are the items concerning which there was no dispute. Surely if the bondholders in England hear of this, hear that documents of this kind are thus handed round, they will think

they have an extraordinary trustee in Canada. The original statement is taken to Montreal and destroyed, and every copy destroyed, and the certificates are given away by the Finance Department to the Railway Department and then sent to Mr. Wainwright of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and Mr. Wainwright returns them so that the government engineer, Mr. Schreiber, shall tear his name off, and we do not know what has since become of them. Mr. Schreiber is asked :

Q. Who will have those four certificates with your name torn off ? A. I could not tell you, the correspondence ought to show no doubt.

Q. Why did you tear your name off ? A. So that they could not be made use of for any purpose.

But this gentleman saw no difficulty in their being in the possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific for weeks. They were sent back in November and only returned in December. He seems to have become a little alive to business considerations and was anxious to get them back, but instead of keeping them on record with an endorsement stating the circumstances, he tears his name off. That is an odd way of doing business. I do not think that a country store-keeper would do business in that way, and much less would one expect it from the government of Canada.

Now, there is the substituted statement that was sent in. Mr. Shannon says he audited that at the request of the department and his evidence as to the audit and as to certain items in that statement will be found on pages 25 to 29. In this second statement, the corrected statement, the statement that was sent in after that difficulty about improper charges, Mr. Shannon rejected from $70.000 to $80,000 as not proper cost of construction. You will find instances given by him at pages 27, 28 and 29. He says he refused to allow legal expenses $26,000. I perhaps ought to remind the House that this was at the very beginning of the enterprise. They were auditing the accounts for twelve months up to the 30th June, 1905, and here we have $26,000 legal expenses charged to construction and coolly put into the accounts the second time. Then we have a trip to England, $1,132. I suppose to do the work between here and the Pacific it was necessary to cross the Atlantic. Then there are London salaries, $4,666; London directors, $4,866; London expenses, $890; Sir Adolphe Caron, $2,000. And then among the legal expenses are $5,600 paid to Mr. McGivern, of Ottawa, the gentleman who acts for the Grand Trunk Railway upstairs when Bills are going through. There is an item we are told we must not look into—the rejected accounts. Does the House not think that would be a proper item to look into owing to the attempt made to charge it against this trust fund? I think we ought to look into it. I think for the character of this House we ought to know where this $26,000 of legal expenses went, into whose hands it was paid. Was it for services of legal gentlemen or what are called disbursements by legal gentlemen? It is an outrage that we should be told in the Committee of Public Accounts that we must not look into those things. These items were rejected because they were not works of construction, and therefore we are told that we must not look into them. They are accounts rendered twice against this government by this company, and we are not to inquire into the items or learn anything at all about them.

There is another claim that Mr. Shannon rejected and which certainly throws a little light upon the way business was done. He refers to it at pages 25 and 28, as an amount of $46,000 for terminal land. It is divided into two items—F. W. Morse—I understand he is the second vice-president of the company—for terminal lands $20,000 ; Peter Larson—I do not know what his position is or whether he is connected with the company, for terminals $26,000. Well, Mr. Shannon very properly said : If these are terminal lands, I would like to know what is the area of the land you are buying; I want to know whether you are getting this for right of way and necessary terminal area, or does it include any town sites? And, would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, they refused to give him any answer. Mr. Shannon rejected every dollar of that $46,000. And here was this company, having undoubtedly paid out that $46,000, and being undoubtedly entitled to a portion of it for whatever the proper area of that terminus should be, would rather give up the whole $46,000 than explain. And we must submit to that, for that is one of the items that the government say we shall not inquire into. We know that $162,000 of the first statement had been rejected ; and we see now the nature of some of the items brought into the second statement, of which some $70,000 were rejected. And from the nature of the $70,000 rejected in the second statement, we can guess, to a certain extent, what the others may have been. What must have been the nature of some of these accounts forming the rejected $162,000, when, bringing in $70,000, they omitted the balance. And, as I have said, we must not inquire into this ; it is not our business ; the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee rules that it is not a proper subject for inquiry, and the committee sustain him. Suppose that a committee were appointed to investigate the doings and business of a bank or any large financial institution and, in the course of that investigation, it appeared that some of the officials or other parties connected with

the bank had been making improper charges —perhaps a forgery here and there—and when the committee ask particulars about these, would not they be surprised if the manager said: You must not inquire about this or that, for we found it was a forgery and did not pay the money, and so you have nothing to do with it—you can come here and look over every regular item in our books, but must not inquire into any irregularity which we discovered before the money was paid. That is the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, I wish to refer briefly to the proceedings in the committee. And I may say here that in view of the disappearance of one gentleman who knows all about these matters, it is of some consequence to learn when somebody got the hint of what inquiries were going to be made in this House. On January 9, a return was ordered of all the vouchers for payments to the Grand Trunk Railway since January, 1904. That brought up the question, I take it, of the surveys on the eastern division. Then, there was a motion for the production of all accounts for payments in respect of the surveys. There was notice of intention to question the government in reference to the guarantee of bonds on the eastern division of the G. T. Pacific. That was on February 20. On February 27, there was a motion in the committee that Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Bell and Mr. Shannon be examined on March 5. On March 5, a motion was made in committee and carried that Mr. H. W. Walker be summoned to appear on March 8 to give evidence respecting the western division of the Transcontinental Railway, and to produce first and second statements submitted to the government for audit, together with all vouchers and papers relating to the items therein. That passed the committee;—I think, perhaps, the last part escaped attention; at all events it was carried and Mr. Walker got notice of the summons. On March 6, a motion was made by a member of the committee who was afraid that the previous summons was not sufficiently specific that a summons to Mr. Walker be amplified so as to more fully describe the papers to be produced on March 8. This motion was negatived in committee by eleven to six. They refused to specify vouchers and papers relating to the rejected items. On March 8, a letter was read from Mr. N. J. Power, acting auditor, that Mr. Walker was absent in Washington, but the summons would be handed to him on his return. Then, on March 8, Mr. Walker not being present Mr. Courtney, Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Boville, were examined. On that day there was a motion that Mr. Walker be summoned to appear on Wednesday, March 13, to give evidence and to bring with him the first and second statements, audited by Mr. Leonard Shannon, and vouchers and papers on which they were based. I should explain that attached to Mr. Shannon's report on October 11, were a number of his own statements referring to the discarded items and his reasons for discarding them. These have been removed. The report is there to-day without Mr. Shannon's statements and there is a memorandum on it that these statements had been removed by direction. The motion was that Mr. Walker be summoned to appear on Wednesday, March 13, and to bring with him any statements and details handed back by Leonard Shannon. An amendment was moved by Mr. E. M. Macdonald, of Pictou, that the latter part of Mr. Ames' motion be struck out—that is the part referring to bringing all the papers. This was equivalent to summoning Mr. Walker to appear without directing the production of the papers required. The amendment carried by sixteen to thirteen, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) voting in support of the amendment. On March 12, knowing that Mr. Walker was to appear next day, a motion was made that Mr. H. W. Walker be notified by telegraph to bring with him and produce on the following day the first and second statements. And thereupon Mr. Johnston of Cape Breton moved that all reference to papers that Mr. Walker should produce should be struck out. And this amendment was carried by twenty-three votes to eleven, both the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) voting for it.

Mr. FIELDING. And how did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) vote?

Mr. BARKER. I moved the motion so it is to be taken for granted that I voted for it. On March 12 I moved that the proceedings be reported to the House. I spoke upon that motion, and said that we were determined to bring this question before the House to see whether we should be allowed to go into all the accounts. That motion was negatived by 29 to 13. Again the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance voted against the motion.

On the 13th of March, Mr. Walker was called, there was no answer. Mr. Power, the acting auditor, was called and was examined as to Mr. Walker's absence. His examination appears on page 67 of the evidence:

Q. You sent that letter to Mr. Howe which has just been read ?—A. Yes.

Q. Was Mr. Walker in Washington at that time ?—A. He was.

Q. When did he return ?—A. On Sunday.

Q. Sunday last ?—A. The document was given to him on his return.

Q. That was on Sunday last ?—A. Sunday I believe.

Q. What is the date of that, the 11th ?—A. The 10th.

Q. The 10th of March. What did he say ?—A. Well, I did not see him myself. He came down next day to the office and then he said he had received it.

Q. Then what ?—A. He said that he had received it.

Q. He said he had received the summons ?—A. Yes.

Q. What about the second summons read today?—A. I received one and he also received one.

Q. When did he and you receive those summonses ?—A. I would not be certain, I think it was Monday.

Q. Monday the 11th ?—A. I think so. As I say, I could not be certain now.

Q. Why is Mr. Walker not here ?—A. He is on his way to the old country.

Q. He is on the way to England ?—A. To the Mediterranean.

Q. When did he go ?—A. He went yesterday.

Q. He went yesterday ? Mr. Walker is the general auditor, he is your senior in the department, is he ?—A. Yes.

Now there was a serious block to this inquiry. Mr. Walker is the man of all others in the Grand Trunk service who knows all about the accounts. He sent Mr. Power, who knew little or nothing of them. He is the auditor of disbursements, but he does not go into the broader questions that Mr. Walker deals with, except in the absence of Mr. Walker. Mr. Power, over and over again, says that he does not know about such and such a thing, he could only state what he had heard. Mr. Power knowing practically nothing, was sent here to give evidence, and of course without the papers. Mr. Walker was asked to bring the papers, but he sent Mr. Power without the papers. I think that is a very extraordinary circumstance, following up all the matters I have referred to. Mr. Walker is the man who gets the first statement back and destroys it, orders it to be destroyed. Mr. Power says it was destroyed by Walker's order. Mr. Walker who handles every account in the first statement and in the second statement, knows every detail, and all about it. He remains in Montreal until two days before he is wanted here, and then he starts for the Mediterranean, where I understand he is to be three months. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman will keep the session going long enough for us to get him back, but I am afraid we will not do much with him this session. Now the moment that disclosure was made I moved that the proceedings be reported to this House, and I pointed out that as Mr. Walker had gone away we could only get on by getting the vouchers themselves. That as the chairman had ruled that we could not get these vouchers, that we had no right to them, the only way we could get on was to report the matter to the House and ask the House to direct that the committee should have power to look into these things. The Minister of Finance, I think, was a little shocked at the disappearance of Mr. Walker, I think it was a surprise to him that the bird had flown. While, so far as I could judge, every one of his followers on that committee was ready to vote just as he had voted before, the minister found that it would not do, and admitted that under the circumstance the proceedings should be reported to the House; and instantly that committee which was so pugnacious, so determined that we should not get at anything that was improper, became gentle as sucking doves, and not a man said a word. At every stage of the inquiry the Minister of Finance had only to hold up his finger, and every hon. gentleman supporting the government bowed assent. Now perhaps I have occupied more time than was necessary, and I conclude by moving, seconded by Mr. Bristol :

That the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company about October 1, 1905, presented to the government a statement of expenditure purporting to exhibit the sums expended by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company upon construction work on the Prairie and Mountain sections of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from its inception to June 30, 1905.

That such statement was submitted to the accountant of the Department of Railways and Canals who was instructed to examine and audit the same in accordance with the provisions of the statute and agreements in that behalf.

That said accountant having examined and audited such statement did report thereon in writing to the Department of Railways and Canals (which report is now on file before the Standing Committee on Public Accounts) and did transmit such report with statements attached thereto to the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals on October 11, 1905.

That the said report and attached statements remained in the possession of the government from October 11, 1905, to November 10, 1905, during which time, as public document, they formed the basis of conferences, and communications between the Department of Railways and Canals, the Department of Justice and the Department of Finance.

2. That immediately after the presentation of the aforesaid statement to the government, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company delivered to the Department of Railways and Canals four certificates signed by the president, second vice-president and chief engineer of the said company, whereby it was declared that the amount which the aforesaid statement set forth as expended had been in fact expended in the manner and as set forth in the said certificates—that such certified expenditure was correct and that the several portions and amounts thereof had been expended on construction work on the Prairie and Mountain sections of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

That the said four certificates sent to the Department of Railways and Canals were directed and addressed to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General of Canada. On their receipt by the Department of Railways and Canals the same were further certified on behalf of the government by its general consulting engineer, duly

appointed in that behalf, as correctly stating the moneys earned by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in such work of construction, and were duly delivered to the said Minister of Finance and Receiver General so that such minister by virtue thereof should cause to be paid to the said Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company the sums of money thereby certified from funds in the hands of the government for that purpose pursuant to statutes relating to such company. Such certificates authorized payment of large sums of money which had been disallowed in the said audit and which had not been expended in such works of construction.

3. That the said statement of expenditure and the said certificates were and are the property of the Dominion and are essential to the full and proper understanding and investigation of the claims and accounts dealt with therein, and, as records, were and are essential to the protection and safeguard of the public interest, and of the trusts upon which the said funds are held by the government.

4. That certain statements have been detached from the report of the said accountant and have been returned or handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company; and the said four certificates have been mutilated and have disappeared; and neither the statements nor the certificates are any longer in the possession of the government, or under its control.

5. That the claims, payments and accounts upon which the said statement for audit and substituted statements were based be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts for inquiry, investigation and report.

6. That the report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts presented to this House on the fifteenth day of March instant be referred back to the said committee with instructions (a) to inquire into and investigate every payment or claim upon which the said statement for audit and all substituted statements and the said certificates were based and as to the disposition made of the said statements and certificates and for that purpose to examine all necessary witnesses and all papers, vouchers, statements and documents relating to or affecting the same—and to report thereon to this House.

I omitted to say that after the auditing had begun and proceeded for some time the Department of Railways obtained from the Department of Justice a written opinion as to the meaning of the words 'cost of construction,' and the auditor says that he followed the opinion of the Department of Justice in his audit. I may say in conclusion that Mr. Power informed us that, with the vouchers in possession of the Grand Trunk, he can replace the statements referred to.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). I feel that I will not have to detain the House at any length to answer the speech of considerable length of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) from the very fact that there is, to my mind, very little in the speech which requires answering. A motion was made in the Committee on Public Accounts by my hon. friend for the production of certain papers which were the basis of payments made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company in connection with matters pertaining to the Grand Trunk Pacific construction. That motion was defeated. The hon. gentleman moved that the proceedings of the committee to that time be reported to this House and he has told us that the object of that motion was to secure a direction of this House to the committee for the production of those papers and the investigation of those accounts. I would have thought that the hon. member would have endeavoured, and I suppose he did endeavour, but having endeavoured I would have supposed that he would have better succeeded in convincing this House that the action of the committee was an improper action, that that committee should not have done what it did in refusing to order the production of those vouchers and of the first statement which the hon. gentleman has spoken of. I for one fail to find wherein he has advanced one single argument to show that that committee was wrong in its action. He made a suggestion that if a banking institution was to be inspected, surely the inspectors could go into every item of the accounts, forged accounts and forged documents. I apprehend that hon. members of this House will readily see the distinction between the inspection of a bank and the inspection which is allowed by the Public Accounts Committee. It may be well in the first place to ascertain what the powers of the Public Accounts Committee are and to ascertain what is referred to that committee and what should be inspected by it. It is very certain that the Public Accounts Committee, being a committee of this parliament, can only investigate so far as the powers which are accorded to it by parliament allow it to investigate. It is well established in May's Parliamentary Practice, that a Standing Committee on Public Accounts can only investigate what is referred to that committee. I venture to say that that suggestion will not be controverted, that that committee can only investigate such matters as are referred to it. Now, Sir, what has been referred to the committee in this particular instance? Early in the session, on the 5th of February, on motion of Mr. Geoffrion it was ordered:

That the Public Accounts in volumes 1 and 3 of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1906, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

On a subsequent motion the remaining volumes of the Auditor General's Report were likewise referred to that committee. After that committee met the hon. member for St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames) moved as follows:

That all accounts, vouchers, correspondence and other papers relating to a payment of $352,191.73 to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in connection with the purchase of Grand Trunk Pacific surveys east of Winnipeg, as set out at W—251 and W—323, et seq. of the report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1906, be produced for the use of the Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Public Accounts.

And also that the Auditor General be desired to produce:

The original statements and other documents submitted from month to month by or on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway, upon which the monthly advances, amounting to $310,923.16, set forth at W—326 and W—327 of the Auditor General's Report, were made.

Those accounts were produced and were fully examined and gone into and evidence was taken day after day in relation to the accounts which the hon. member desired to investigate before that committee. During the coure of the taking of that evidence the question of the audit of moneys paid by the Grand Trunk Railway Company towards the construction of the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific was gone into. That was a proper matter for investigation, because I find that those payments though not set out in detail, are in a bulk sum in the public accounts. Nothing pertaining to the construction of the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is mentioned in the Auditor General's Report.

All that the Auditor General's Report shows is a statement of payments on account of the eastern division of the Grand Trunk Pacific. In the Public Accounts, page 15, appears the item: Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, special account, payment, $950,174.39. I am told by the officers of the Finance Department that that is a payment in connection with the construction of the western division, and that that aggregates the whole payments made in connection with the construction of that division. There never has been, there is not now, and I apprehend there never will be the slightest objection on the part of the Public Accounts Committee, or any member of that committee, to the production of every document, every voucher, every statement connected with the payment of that sum of $950,174.39. There is no desire to burk investigation. The hon. member (Mr. Barker) knows and every hon. gentleman on that side knows that every opportunity is given them to investigate as fully, and as long as they like, every expenditure which goes to make up that item which includes every dollar up to the 30th of June, 1906, guaranteed by the government towards the construction of the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific. What right has the Public Accounts Committee to investigate anything further. If a contractor had claimed $100,000 for extras, and if the Minister of Railways should reject $50,000 of that, will any hon. gentleman say that the Public Accounts Committee would have any right to investigate what payments were made by the contractor in connection with that $50,000 so rejected? It seems to me, that case is similar to this. The government of Canada guarantees the payment of the principal and interest of the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific up to a certain amount. Certain of these bonds were placed on the market and netted to the company about $13,000,000. That money was deposited in various banks in Canada to the credit of the Receiver General, in trust for the Grand Trunk Pacific bondholders. The government of Canada being the guarantors of the payment of principal and interest on these bonds up to 75 per cent, have taken upon themselves to act as trustees for these bondholders and to see that this money is properly, legitimately, and economically expended, and goes into the actual cost of construction. That money does not belong to the people of Canada; that money does not belong to this government, it belongs to the bondholders in England, and it must be used in the construction of the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) says that we should go into matters pertaining to expenditures on the Grand Trunk Pacific, which have not been paid by the government. I maintain that the Public Accounts Committee has no more power to go into such matters than they would have to go into the $50,000 extras claimed by a contractor in the case I have already spoken of.

Mr. LALOR. There is quite a difference, because in this case the government engineer had recommended the payment of the full amount.

Mr. GERMAN. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to be considerably exercised about the fact that the government engineer recommended the payment of this account. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) had desired to be absolutely fair he would have stated the reasons given by the chief engineer as to why he certified that account. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) thinks that the bondholders in England will have a suspicion of the trustworthiness of their trustees in Canada. On the contrary, after this transaction, the bondholders will feel that they have most trustworthy and reliable trustees who have been very careful to carry out the trust imposed in them. Notwithstanding, that under a mistake the chief engineer has certified that this amount was correct, the Finance Department saw fit to look into it, and the Minister of Finance held it up to good purpose, and demonstrated to the bondholders in England that he was willing and anxious to safeguard their interests, and so he refused to pay $160,000, although it was certified by Mr. Schreiber. I venture to say

there is not a man in this parliament, or in Canada who will impugn the honour and integrity of Mr. Schreiber. He has been too long a public servant, he has been too long in the light of criticism, to fear any such charge. I believe it will be recognized by all that when Mr. Schreiber certified to the payment of that account he felt in his heart that he was doing what he should do. My hon. friend from Hamilton should have read what Mr. Schreiber says in reference to that matter, and which will be found at page 59 :

My position was this. In the Act of 1903, chapter 71, it described what construction was. Then in the Act of 1905, chapter 8, it also describes it, but adds one other item which I presume was an enlargement of the first Act, that is : Preliminary expenses. In the first Act these words did not appear. Preliminary expenses, I interpreted to mean expenses preceding construction, the commencement of construction. When these accounts came in and I was dealing with them, the question was raised by Mr. Shannon, and I had a talk with the Minister of Justice about it.

Q. Who was he at that time ?—A. The Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Q. You had a talk with Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick ?—A. Yes. I asked him whether I was right in including preliminary expenses and he said, yes, he thought so, but I did not explain the nature of the preliminary expenses. Therefore I certified on that, and my report went to the Finance Department, after an order in council had been passed and it remained there a little while, when Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance, asked me whether I was satisfied in my own knowledge as to whether the legal expenses were fair and reasonable. I answered him that I undestood the Justice Department to say they were proper charges, but that for his own satisfaction perhaps he had better refer it to the Justice Department, which he did.

Having referred it to the Justice Department, he received a letter from Mr. Fitzpatrick, the Minister of Justice, stating that he did not think these payments came under the head of preliminary expenses. The witness read that letter which is dated November 15, 1905, and is as follows :

Dear Mr. Schreiber,—I cannot think it at all doubtful that the expression 'preliminary expenses in article 1, section 5, of the mortgage schedule (A) to the Act 4 and 5 Edward VII., cap. 98, was intended not to enlarge the scope of the clause in which it was found, but merely to amplify in somewhat more particular detail the matter specified in the corresponding clause in the fifteenth section of the agreement forming schedule to the Act 3 Edward VII., cap. 71.

The clause deals with the cost of surveys and engineering, so far as its provisions bear immediately upon the present question, and I think it quite plain that such surveys and engineering must be incident to the work of construction, in order to their cost falling within the definition of 'construction work.'

It follows, in my opinion, that the words 'preliminary expenses' must be so construed as to include only such expenses as are preliminary to and connected with surveys and engineering incident to the work of construction.

It is very clear that Mr. Schreiber was entierly honest when he certified for the payment o fthe whole amount, believing as he said he did, that it came within the meaning of the term preliminary expenses, as suggested by the Minister of Justice. That being so, the statement goes to the Finance Department with the endorsation of Mr. Schreiber. The question was raised there by the Minister of Finance whether such preliminary expenses should be included in the cost of construction. He decides that they should not, and the Justice Department decides that they do not, and the Finance Department refuses to pay the amount. What is to be done ? The government refuses to pay, the company wants the money. If the company had accepted the amount the Finance Department was willing to pay, I suppose a cheque would have been issued on that statement. The statement is there, with certain items disallowed ; but the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, for purposes of their own, wanted the statement back. Why they wanted it back I do not know, and no one in this House knows, but I submit that they were entitled to get it back. It was an account which the government had refused to pay, and they said : give us back the statement, and we will make a statement which the government will accept as correct. Transactions of that kind are going on continually in the government departments. Whether the Minister of Finance should have given up the statement to the Department of Railways and Canals or not, and whether the Minister of Railways should have returned it to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or not, are questions which those ministers are quite able to deal with, and I believe they will be ready to justify their actions to the satisfaction of this House and the country. The statement went back to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and they made a new statement, and left out of it the $162,000 which was embodied in the old statement. The new statement comes, and of that some $47,000 is rejected by the government, and the balance paid. The hon. member for Hamilton and some of his friends claim that the Public Accounts Committee was entitled to investigate not only payments made by the government, but payments not made by the government. I contend that that committee is not for that purpose, but for the purpose of investigating payments made by the government and such payments only. The Public Accounts Committee has power to investigate only such payments as are made by the government and are referred to that committee under the procedure of parliament. The hon. gentleman wants this House to believe that we in the Public Accounts Committee were endeavouring to

stifle investigation and to screen the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. I deny it. I have no objection to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company submitting a statement and to the hon. gentleman investigating it if he likes; but I say that committee had no power to compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to produce vouchers for moneys which were not paid by the government. They say: We will not produce them; we do not propose to have this question investigated by a committee of parliament; it is a matter between the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the Grand Trunk Company, which is to be adjusted later on. The Grand Trunk Railway Company claim that they have paid certain sums in aid of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and they claim to be entitled to be reimbursed for those expenditures out of the bonds issued for the construction of that road. The government say they will not consent to it. Then the Grand Trunk Company have a right to turn around on the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and claim the right to be reimbursed, and they say, we do not wish our case to be prejudged by the Public Accounts Committee; and I think they are quite right in taking that position. The hon. gentleman was very particular to read the portion of the evidence regarding the absence of Mr. Walker, who was subpœnaed as a witness. In that connection also he deemed it advisable to suppress a portion of the evidence. Mr. Walker was subpœnaed, it is true, and did not appear. Mr. Power came and stated the reason why Mr. Walker was not present.

Mr. BENNETT. A good one.

Mr. GERMAN. I think he stated a very good reason, that will appeal to reasonable men if it does not appeal to the hon. member for East Simcoe. Mr. Power stated in his evidence that at the time the first subpœna was issued Mr. Walker was in the city of Washington, that he had been there for some time, that he had only returned on the Sunday prior to the meeting of the committee, that on the Monday following, being at the office, he told Mr. Power that he had received the subpœna. If the hon. gentleman had gone on in the evidence he would have found that Mr. Macdonald asked this question:

Q. Did you say Mr. Walker made arrangements to take his trip (to Europe) some time ago?—A. About four or five weeks ago he arranged with the manager for three months leave of absence and also for his passage from Boston this week for himself and family.

Would any reasonable man assert that Mr. Walker having made those arrangements for himself and his family to go to the Mediterranean, on leave of absence from the general manager of the company, should alter his plans in order to come up here and produce vouchers which his assistant, Mr. Power, could produce just as well, and the evidence with regard to which could have been given just as freely by Mr. Power. Surely no one believes that Mr. Walker went on a voyage to evade this subpoena and in order not to give evidence before the Public Accounts Committee. But hon. gentlemen opposite are continually drawing on their imagination. When they are lacking facts to establish what they desire to assert, their invention never fails them. I can see nothing wrong in the decision by the Public Accounts Committee not to investigate those accounts. I do not see how that committee could force the production by Mr. Walker or Mr. Power or the Grand Trunk Railway of those vouchers, even had these people been subpoenaed. We know well that some years ago, when an investigation was being had into certain contracts with Larkin, Connolly & Company, Mr. Michael Connolly, standing in the Committee on Privileges and Elections, refused to allow that committee to look at his book although the book was lying on the table in front of him. When Sir Louis Davies asked the witness to show that book, he replied: You shall not see it unless you take it from me by force. And the committee did not see it.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, they did afterwards. The House compelled him to show it, and the committee looked at the book just as much as they wanted.

Mr. GERMAN. If the House compelled him to show his book, that escaped my memory; but the committee did not compel him to produce it and could not, and because they knew they could not they reported to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Sir John Thompson himself made the motion.

Mr. GERMAN. I have no objection to my hon. friends taking all the advantage they can, but my point is that the committee could not compel the production.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the reason we are coming to the House.

Mr. GERMAN. I am quite satisfied. This is the proper place to come. I am defending the action of that committee and the vote I gave against a motion for the production of certain vouchers which the Grand Trunk Railway refused to produce and which the committee could not compel them to produce.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the Connolly case, it was not the refusal of the committee but the refusal of the witness.

Mr. GERMAN. The Grand Trunk Railway, as I understood from the solicitor—who said it loud enough in the committee so that every one could hear—would not produce those accounts before the committee. That is the position he took. The hon. gentleman has seen fit to bring the matter to the attention of this House, and if this House should order the production of those

accounts, I am satisfied ; but I submit we have no more right to investigate those accounts than we have the right to investigate the business affairs of any one of the hon. gentlemen opposite. We have nothing to do with these accounts. We have never paid them and never will. The accounts are in the Finance Department which have been paid up to date, and nothing further will be paid unless hon. gentlemen opposite should get into power when they may perhaps do something of that kind. That being my position and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) not having given us any authority——

Mr. BARKER. There is no need for it.

Mr. GERMAN. I would suppose that authority would be needed to establish the doctrine that we can go into the investigation of private accounts and the expenditure by a corporation, over which this parliament has no control, so far as its business affairs are concerned. Hon. gentlemen opposite might as well argue that we should go into the accounts of the Canadian Pacific Railway and see how their money has been expended because we have given that company millions of dollars to aid the construction of its railways. We have no more right to go into those accounts than into the payments of the Grand Trunk Railway. For those reasons I shall vote against the motion of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who is endeavouring to compel the Grand Trunk Railway to produce their private accounts.

Mr. E. BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. German) has overlooked an essential fact of this case, which is this, that the statements and documents referred to were documents belonging to the government. They did not belong to the Grand Trunk Pacific. The minute that company filed them with the Railway Department, making a claim to moneys which are in the control of this government, they became the property of the government. If I write a letter to the Grand Trunk Railway and drop it into the post, the moment I have mailed it I part with my property in it and have no more control over it. My hon. friend is too good a lawyer to suggest that I would have any right to property in any such document. If a letter which has left my possession and is received by the person to whom it is addressed becomes his property, how much more is this statement No. 1, with the vouchers attached, filed with this government, acted on by the Department of Railways, certified by an official of that department and also by the gentleman who placed it before the government in the shape of a claim, coming to the Department of Justice for consideration and finally reaching the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding)—how much more is such a document the property of the government which should never have been parted with ? If the government had never parted with that document there would be no trouble or talk about investigating the accounts of the Grand Trunk Railway. We are asking that this company which got some of the property of the government should return it. This matter touches the honour of the government. They first of all parted with the document and then failed to get it back. Why did they not get it back? The reason believed by the people is that the document and the vouchers attached cover up a fraud attempted on the people in the shape of bogus claims, which should never have been made.

Let us just deal with this matter for a moment. I find on referring to 'May's Parliamentary Practice,' 11th edition, chapter 21, page 536 :

> Parliament is invested with the power of ordering all documents to be laid before it which is necessary for its information.

There is a broad statement. I am assuming now that these documents are not the property of the people but of the Grand Trunk Railway. There still rests in parliament the power of ordering all documents to be laid before it which are necessary for its information. I submit that this is a matter which this parliament has a right to consider necessary for its information. At page 538 of the same work it is laid down :

> Returns may be moved for, either by order or addresses, relating to any public matter in which the House or the Crown has jurisdiction. They may be obtained from all public offices, and from corporations, bodies or officers constituted for public purposes by Acts of parliament or otherwise.

So that, if the document were the document of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, a company incorporated for public purposes, we should have the right to examine it, if we thought we could serve the public interest or it would be useful for our information. Now, there was not an opportunity on the part of most of the hon. members present to hear this evidence, and as it has been suggested that the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) read only the parts—material to his contention, I propose to read from the evidence—and I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will see that I give fair treatment to their side of the case—those parts that seem to me material in dealing with the questions before us. At page 6, evidence of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, section 15 of the Act is read setting forth what is to be covered by the expression 'cost of construction.' This has been read, and I will not repeat it ; but what I will point out to this House and to the people of this country is that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, with Mr. Hays, an eminent railway authority and its president, and, at the head of the system Mr. Morse, one of the ablest men in this country, assisted by a legal staff, as the

Department of Justice is, to advise what the company had a right to claim from the people of this country under that clause; mark, not a number of poor farmers unskilled in the law and needing assistance in these matters, but men of high standing occupying great public positions as the heads of a great corporation, having the same opportunity to read the Act as the Department of Justice has and acting under competent advice—this company has the audacity—I repeat it; has the audacity—to file this extraordinary claim with the government and actually to certify over signatures of these gentlemen that these Bills are correct. Suppose that it had been a case in which a claim had been made by a man in the ordinary walks of life against a fellow citizen. If the claimant had the audacity to make such a claim as this, the man against whom it was made would say that it was an effort to obtain money from him by false pretenses and would endeavour to seek redress by other methods than by conciliation and handing back the statement to be torn up. On page 7, I read as follows:

Q. The vouchers——

These are the vouchers we are now discussing.

The vouchers you refer to—where are those vouchers?—A. The vouchers themselves are in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's office at Montreal, but the assistant accountant will have copies of each voucher.

Q. I suppose these vouchers are really still in the control of the government?—A. Oh, yes, the government can examine them at any time under the Act.

Q. They are open to inspection at any time?—A. Certainly.

I do not know whether Mr. Schreiber is correct, but, apparently, the view he wished to give the committee was that the vouchers which these gentlemen are at so much pains to prevent us looking at are open to our inspection at any time—as certainly they should be; if they are not, there should be such legislation as would lay them open to our inspection.

On page 8, I find the following:

Q. I do not mean the engineers—I mean the accountants and clerks?—A. I might say this, I have nothing to do with the accountants, beyond that they are making their report to the deputy minister, who refers it to me.

And at page 9:

Q. As a matter of fact, is it not part of your duty—a very important part of your duty—to see that the contract is lived up to in all particulars?—A. It is, quite so, and, as I say, unless I had the proper authority, I should not pass anything that is contrary to it.

Then at page 11, in Mr. Bell's evidence:

A. That was a matter of engineering. That ran into the North Bay branch so that the cost to the commission was $288,863.67.

Then, he goes on to state the result of the audit, which also is not material at present. And on page 12:

Q. They are all Grand Trunk Railway Company vouchers?—A. All Grand Trunk Railway Company vouchers.

On page 13:

Q. There was no audit previous to that you made, was there?—A. Not to my knowledge.

And lower down on the same page:

Q. Now, we will get some information about that. Under whose instructions are you with reference to that work?—A. I report direct to the deputy minister.

That refers to the deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. At page 14:

Q. Have you got those statements here?—A. I have got my report; the report of my audit. Their statement is just a mere list of vouchers.

Q. Their statement is a mere list of vouchers? Do they leave that in your hands?—A. Yes.

Then on page 15; at the top of the page:

Q. At a subsequent meeting, you can produce them?—A. If I get an order from my chief, I will produce them here. I do not know whether they are considered the property of the department or not. They are of no value. Any information they contain you can get from the reports.

He did produce them. On page 17, about the middle of the page:

Q. You are aware, Mr. Bell, I suppose, that at any time the government can go back on this inspection of accounts?—A. I am, sir.

Q. As an accountant, why do you suppose the Grand Trunk Railway keeps its vouchers?—A. We can have access to them of course.

Q. If you want them at any time hereafter?—A. Yes.

So that Mr. Bell, as well as Mr. Schreiber, says that the officers have the right of access at any time to these vouchers. If so, why should not the members of parliament have the same right of access that the officers of the government have? On page 18:

Q. But you do not go into the details of the account as in the case where you allow the voucher?—A. Oh, yes, I give really fuller details where a voucher is disallowed. I give my reasons for disallowing it.

And on page 19:

Q. To whom do you report your objections? A I make my report direct to the deputy minister.

At page 20, Mr. Shannon states that he is comptroller and treasurer of the Interco-

lonial Railway at present. It is notable that as soon as Mr. Shannon had begun to do most useful work in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific his sphere of usefulness is changed. Part of his evidence is as follows :

Q. And what was your previous position ?—A. I am accountant of the Department of Railways and Canals at Ottawa.

Q. By whom were you assigned to this particular work ?—A. By the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals and the minister.

Q. Were any other officials of the department associated with you in that work ?—A. No, sir. . . . .

I think I started first somewhere about October, 1905, and my first inspection would take in up to a period of, I suppose, a month or two months before the inspection. That would cover, roughly speaking from memory, a period of over a year. . . .

Q. And audited everything prior to that date ?—A. From the very commencement of the work.

Q. From the commencement to what time, would it include September accounts ?—A. No, that would take up to June 30, 1905.

Then at page 21 :

Q. And what would that include, how far would that bring the accounts up to ?—A. That practically went over the same audit again with the addition—no, it was practically the same audit again. The reason for that audit was that they substituted a new one, so I went over the second statement and went over the work again.

Q. What do you mean by substituting a second for the first statement, what was the matter with the first statement ?—A. I took exception to a great many items in the first statement, and I had orders to go and make a second inspection and I made that audit of the new statement.

Q. You had orders from whom ?—A. From the department, the deputy minister.

Q. From the minister ?—A. The deputy minister.

Q. To re-audit what you had rejected ?—A. No, no, not at all, to re-audit the new statement, or rather not to re-audit the new statement, but to audit the statement which was then submitted, the second statement.

Q. They submitted the first statement ?—A. The first statement they submitted was withdrawn.

Q. You had rejected a number of items in it ?—A. It was withdrawn, and then there was a second sent in which I audited.

Q. Have you a copy of the first statement there ?—A. No. . . . . .

Q. Tell us what you can remember about the first statement ?—A. Well, there were certain expenditures that they would not give me any information about, so I would not allow them.

Q. How were these expenses made up ?—A. They were vouchers put in.

Q. How did they read ?—A. Well, they would read 'Legal expenses,' some were under that heading and some were simply 'Amount expended' without any details whatever.

Q. There were no details given ?—A. No, not a particle.

Q. And when you asked for details ?—A. They would not give them to me, so I would not allow them.

On page 23 :

Q. Were you accustomed to classify the cost of construction according to the subheads that are given here ?—A. I took for my guidance as to the cost of construction the interpretation of that particular clause which was given by the Minister of Justice, and I kept that always in view.

On page 24 :

Q. When you were examining from time to time, the books and vouchers of the company at Montreal, who assisted you by way of explanations on behalf of the company ?—A. Well, of course, the general auditor, Mr. Walker, was supposed to be the man I was to deal with, but Mr. McCombe, one of the principal clerks, knew more about it than Mr. Walker did, so that after questioning Mr. Walker several times I was glad to continue my questions with Mr. McCombe, who had greater knowledge than Mr. Walker of the whole business.

Further down on the same page :

Q. Any one else ?—A. Yes, I have had to go to Mr. Wainwright and to Mr. Morse.

Q. For——A. For explanations.

Q. Would the explanations they would give you be verbal ?—A. They would be verbal.

Q. Would you take no memorandum ?—A. No. If the explanations were satisfactory, I would pass the account. If they were not satisfactory, I would throw it out.

At the bottom of the page :

My recollection is that the want of explanation made me throw them out.

Page 25 :

Q. And the want of explanation then would send you to Mr. Wainwright or to Mr. Morse?—A. Send me to Mr. Wainwright or to Mr. Morse.

Q. And the explanations they would give you, none of them are carried on the face of the voucher ?—A. In most cases they were entirely unsatisfactory, and I would not allow them.

Q. In some cases they were unsatisfactory?—A. In most cases.

Q. And were those vouchers passed out for good and all?—A. As far as I was concerned they were.

By Mr. Foster :

Q. That would be a voucher on which you allowed part ?—A. No, Sir.

Q. The voucher would be passed in whole or not at all ?—A. I will give you an illustration of what I mean. There was a voucher placed before me for a considerable sum of money. I asked explanation of it. It represented a purchase of land, and they would not give me the explanation. I wanted to know how much of that land was to be used

for railway purposes, for purposes of the construction of the road, and how much might be used for townsites, because I did not think, in my estimate, that they would be entitled to any more than what was necessary for the right of way, and in that case they refused to give me information, and I threw the whole thing out.

Now that last item refers to $46,000 which was divided into two, one of of $20,000 without giving the name, which was Mr. Morse, I believe, the vice-president of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Here is a gentleman occupying a high position making a claim against the government over his own signature, and other officers of equal standing, with every opportunity of getting legal advice, endeavouring to foist upon this country and upon the bondholders the cost of paying for a town site, where they knew as a matter of fact that the company only had a right to get so much railway land as might be required for the purpose of constructing the line. Any more flagrant effort to get money to which the company was not entitled than that, could not well be imagined. Then on page 26 :

Q. You were mentioning 'legal expenses' a moment ago, did you ever refuse vouchers for 'legal expenses' ?—A. I refused a great number for legal expenses.

Q. Why did you refuse them ?—A. Well, some of them had to do with what they call 'preliminary expenses.'

Q. With what ?—A. With what they call 'preliminary expenses.' I will give you an illustration. They had a lawyer here in Ottawa who was here as their representative, and who made a charge every month for legal services.

Q. In what connection ?—A. I do not know outside of legal services. I took the ground that that had nothing to do with construction, and therefore I would not allow it and threw it out. I contended that it could not have anything to do with construction, because there was no construction going on at that time.

Q. Do you recollect the amount ?—A. I could not say the amount, no.

Q. Have you any idea as to the amount of preliminary expenses that they endeavoured to pass ?—A. Oh, there are lots of preliminary expenses in here, expenses that lead up to construction.

Q. But there was a large number of items that they attempted to pass for preliminary expenses which you would not allow ?—A. They would not give me any details.

Q. Have you any idea of what they aggregate ?—A. No, in my statement I notice what I was not aware of before, that I have specified all the vouchers that I knocked out, and the reasons why. They are all set out there.

That of course relates to the second statement only. Then, skipping a few lines :

Q. Take the next one ?—A. For printing in the 'Canada Gazette,' $24, and then there is a voucher of the 'Railway and Shipping World' for a notice of application, an advertisement ; I would not allow that. The next one you see here is 'Department of Public Printing and Stationery—supplemental notice,' which is not as much, $15.40. Then there is the Bank of Montreal, expenses of the Grand Trunk officials to the Pacific coast, $3,000, and I would not allow that. That was for Messrs. Morse and Hays, they put that in there.

Q. They wanted to charge that against the western division ?—A. I would not allow it.

Q. An account there like that $3,000, would that ever come back to you ?—A. Never to me.

Q. Did you have any discussion with Mr. Wainwright about these vouchers ?—A. Mr. Wainwright said that I should have allowed them, and I said, no.

Q. You persistently refused ?—A. I persistently refused.

Q. And you believe they never came back to you in any other form ?—A. I have no reason to believe that they have ever been paid.

Q. You do not have any reason to believe that they have ?—A. No, I do not think so. These (indicating items on statement) are for notice of application.

Q. Yes, all small items. Now then come down here, what is this for, E. S. Rowe, services ?—A. That is a man who was sent out to Winnipeg, a clergyman who was down on his luck, and they wanted to provide for him, and this voucher was made out there ; they were paying him, and he was not doing very much, and I would not allow it.

Mr. Speaker, the Grand Trunk Railway Company evidently consider that charity covers a multitude of sins.

Q. How did they explain to you that it was there ?—A. They had it charged, and I wanted to know in what capacity he was there, and what he was doing, and they could not give me any satisfactory explanation, so I threw it out.

I am glad the expenditure was not in connection with putting the Bill through here at Ottawa.

Q. Evidently the Rev. E. S. Rowe got $125 per month. What is this, Mr. Wainwright, advertising, $325 ?—A. He would not give me any explanation, and I threw it out.

Q. Then there is Wm. Wainwright again, $325 ?—A. Yes.

Q. He would not give you any explanation of that either ?—A. No, and I therefore threw it out. He would not give any explanation about that.

Q. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, directors' fees, $120 ?—A. I would not allow that item, because it was not construction. It was Grand Trunk Pacific directors' fees, but my view was that it did not come within what is meant as construction and preliminary expenses, and therefore I would not allow it.

Q. C. M. Hays, trip to England, $1,132 ?—A. He went there to see the English board, but I would not allow that.

Q. Then there is London office, salaries, $4,666. That is marked 'board entries' ?—A. They wanted to charge in there a portion of the cost of the London office of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I would not allow that.

Q. Grand Trunk, directors' fees, $2,433.33 ?—A. I cut that out, too.

Q. London office, directors' fees, $2,433 ? again, that is $4,866 for London, and you would not allow that ?—A. No.

Q. Salaries and expenses of directors, $890, London office, why would you not allow that ?—A. That had nothing to do with the construction of the railway.

Q. Now with regard to the 'legal expenses.' Sir Adolphe Caron, $1,000, that would mean for promoting the Bill ?—A. I could get no details.

Q. W. J. White, Montreal, $500 ?—A. I do not remember that, I must have had good and sufficient reason for it, or I would not have cut it out.

Q. H. B. McGivern, $1,000 and $900, and $524 ?—A. That they paid to their lawyer, but I would not allow that.

By Mr. Ames :

Q. You refused all those ?—A. I refused all those.

Q. Then there is F. H. Chrysler, $825 ?—A. That was advice in connection with the drawing up of the trust and mortgage deed. As he was one of the lawyers who attended to that and had nothing to do with the construction of the road, I would not allow it.

Q. Then there is H. B. McGivern's account, $1,000, $500, $600, $150, $400, $150, $150, $150, $150, and many others. Did you ask for explanations with reference to this legal account ?—A. I asked what they were for and I could not get satisfactory answers, so I simply threw them out.

Q. That is they could not give you a satisfactory answer as to what the sums have been expended for ?—A. No.

Q. These are additional legal expenses of about $23,000 which you rejected ?—A. Which I rejected.

Q. 'Statement of amounts deducted from expenses to June 30, 1905,' then all these legal expenses, which amount, I see to about $23,322, you refused to audit ?—A. I refused to allow.

Then at the bottom of page 28:

Q. These are the amounts that you threw out ?—A. Yes, amounts that I threw out.

Q. Then there is an amount, 'F. W. Morse, for terminal lands, $20,000' and another, 'Peter Larsen, for terminal lands, $26,000,' chargeable to mountain section ?—A. About $46,000.

Q. $46,000 you refused ?—A. I refused that because they distinctly declined to give me the explanation that I wanted, and I had—I was going to say a fight—but quite a good deal of words over it.

Q. How much did you refuse in all ?—A. I could not say now.

Q. Is the statement added up ?—A. I refused $26,000 of legal expenses and I refused——

Then he was interrupted. Then we have:

By Mr. Ames :

Q. This statement here ?—A. This one representing the total amount as submitted. Here are the deductions that I have made.

Q. Could you roughly run through and say what the total amount is ?—A. There would be $70,000. According to my report that is the total.

Q. 'After making the various changes referred to, the following is the result of my investigation.' How much then did you throw out ?—A. I would have to work that out. Roughly speaking, that one would be $80,000 odd.

Q. How much ?—A. Roughly speaking, about $80,000.

Mr. BRISTOL.

Q. About $80,000 was rejected in that particular report ? Will you take now your second audit and tell us the pages it covered and how much was rejected in that ?—A. That is the next one.

Q. Is there anything prior to that?—A. As I explained before the first statement I audited, they withdrew, and they presented a second one. That is my report upon the second one.

Q. When did they present the first statement which they withdrew ?—A. That covered the same period.

Q. When did they present it ?—A. That would be some time in either September or October, 1905, I could not say.

Q. They presented their first statements in September or October ?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. By whom was that statement prepared ?—A. By the general auditor of the Grand Trunk Railway Company or under his supervision.

Q. By Mr. Walker ?—A. By Mr. Walker.

Q. And presented to you by him ?—A. Presented to me by him.

Q. What did you do with it ?—A. I started to check it.

Q. Where is it to-day ? A. They asked to have it withdrawn as they had in it charges which they said they ought not to have had, and which belonged to other matters, and so they asked to be allowed to withdraw it. The department allowed them to withdraw it and to substitute a second account.

Q. And when the department allowed them to withdraw it, then they took back the original statement ?—A. Yes.

Q. Who allowed them to withdraw it ?—A. Speaking off-hand I should say the deputy minister or the minister, I could not say now, I know it was withdrawn.

Q. It was withdrawn and handed back to them ?—A. Yes

Q. And it contained all these items which you subsequently refused ?—A. Yes.

It contained all these items which you subsequently refused. This is very important for this reason, that it shows that the only difference between the first statement and the second statement was that in the first they were willing to claim about twice as much for legal expenses as in the second, in other words they cut the legal expenses in the second down to about one-half of what they were in the first.

Q. Do you think it contained any other items than those which you refused in the second audit and those which you passed ?—A. Yes it did.

Q. Were these rejected accounts that you have enumerated contained in the second or amended statement ?—A. Yes, because I draw attention to them here as being thrown out.

Q. Then there must have been a good many more in the first statement ?—A. Yes, there were.

Then on page 31 :

Q. On what grounds did they ask for its return ?—A. I do not know on what ground.

Q. Is there any correspondence on the subject ?—A. No.

Of course the witness is mistaken as to that, he was speaking only of his own knowledge because the correspondence is

produced and must speak for itself. Then we have :

By Mr. Macdonald :

Q. And this time a new statement, in which they did not include a great number of items that you had objected to in the first, was submitted ?—A. That is correct.

Then on page 32 :

Q. I see a voucher here that says : 'William Wainwright, $3,000,' you refused to pass that ?—A. Certainly.

Q. Did you ever allow any voucher that represented promotion expenses ?—A. No, never.

Q. Did you ever have some vouchers for large amounts by Mr. Wainwright presented to you which were so indefinite that you rejected them ?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever ask Mr Wainwright for an explanation ?—A. I did.

Q. Did you get any satisfactory answer ?—A. There was no satisfactory explanation and I cut them out.

Q. There were presented to you vouchers covering expenditures for large amounts on the part of Mr. Wainwright, which you refused to pass ?—A. Yes, I think there were one or two.

By the Chairman :

Q. What do you call large amounts ?—A. I do not recall from memory, $6,000 or $7,000 probably.

Then at page 33 :

Q. Tell us anything you can about the rejection of certain accounts which Mr. William Wainwright presented, which you have not any definite record of, of which you could not get any explanation ?—A. As to the amounts I could not say now, there would certainly be several thousand.

Q. More than several thousand ?—A. I would not like to say the amount now, because it was over a year ago or more, and I would not like to say. I would ask him, 'What was this for ?' He would not tell me, and I would say, 'Very well, if you won't tell me, I will throw it out,' and I did.

Then at page 34 :

Q. Was there anything particular in these items of Mr. Wainwright's included in the first account which you did not allow which marked them out specially from any other items which you did not allow, on account of not coming within the cost of construction ?—A. No, certainly not.

Q. There was nothing about them that gave rise to any particular impressions ?—A. Certainly not.

Q. As a matter of fact the company were endeavouring to charge up in these two preliminary accounts the expenses of every character in connection with the preliminary inauguration of the company ?—A. I judged so.

Now Mr. Speaker, we have heard quite fully as to the statements referred to and first of all I want to present this idea to the government and to the House, that the Grand Trunk Company in the first place had no right whatever to this statement number one, that it was a document which belonged to the government of Canada and one which they should have kept, as a claim was made against them upon it and it should have been retained with the certificate attached to it or in connection with it. If you reflect for a moment you will see that the sole object that the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Grand Trunk Railway could have had in getting back statement number one, and the certificates attached to it was to cover up what I venture to submit was an attempted fraud on the government and people of this country and on the bondholders because the second statement which they presented was precisely the same as the first except that they eliminated from the second statement some $88,000 which they attempted to steal or to get wrongfully in the first statement. There was no reason in the world, as a matter of business, why statement number one should have been returned, at least there was no more reason why number one should be returned, than that the Grand Trunk should have asked for a return of statement number two, because statement number two was not allowed in whole, $74,000 was taken off number two and $162,000 off number one. What earthly necessity was there for the Grand Trunk to get back the first statement except to shield those unmentionable items on which, as I will show, they were not only unwilling to furnish vouchers but to afford the slightest information. It is perfectly ludicrous if an account is presented and you are willing to pay $662,000 of that account to say that there should be a necessity for a substitution of accounts. There is no difference whether it is paid on the one statement or the other, the company gets only the same amount of money and you have disallowed the same items in number two as in number one except that in number one you disallowed a few more. There was no business necessity of any sort, kind or description for the Grand Trunk to get back into its hands statement number one with the certificate of Mr. Morse and the others that it was a valid statement of expenditure for construction, absolutely none, because the only difference was that they filed another statement in which they presented $88,000 less of the fraudulent claims they made at first. Had the government sent them a cheque in respect to statement No. 1, and said we will allow you $662,000 and no more, nothing would be gained by the Grand Trunk Pacific filing the second statement, for they would simply be putting themselves to additional expense for nothing. Let us see the reason suggested by the Grand Trunk Pacific for asking to get back this statement which did not belong to them. Mr. W. H. Walker, their general auditor writes, on November 9, 1905, to Mr. Butler, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. (page 41 of evidence).

Dear Sir,—Will you kindly return statements of expenses which Mr. Shannon took with him to complete his audit, as I wish to amend them.

It was not to destroy them that he wanted them back; it was to amend them. Do you believe that if the Grand Trunk Pacific auditor had written to the Department of Railways that they wanted these statements back to destroy them, the Department of Railways would have allowed him to get them into his possession again? The department would not dare to do so, because it would be the destruction and mutilation of a public document, and every one connected with it would be guilty of a crime. Mr. Walker further says:

Also the certificates which will have to be re-drawn to correspond.

Whose certificates were they? They were the certificates of these railway magnates, men who, above all others, in making a claim of this kind, should have seen that it was an honest, and proper, and correct claim, under the terms of the mortgage trust deed. They naturally wanted to get back these incriminating documents, because, if they did not, these documents would remain for all time on the records of the country, a menace to their reputation, as they are today. I want to lay emphasis on that letter, because, so far as the Grand Trunk is concerned, that letter is the only basis on which this government could have considered the handing over of that document out of their possession. I venture to submit that the Grand Trunk did not give a proper, or a reasonable, or a business reason, for the return of that document. What was it necessary to amend? There was nothing on earth to amend, because they were not going to include, in the second statement, any other valid claims than they had already presented. The fact was they were going to withdraw a certain number of claims that they were so absolutely ashamed of as rotten that they had not the face to keep them on the public records. My quarrel with the government is that they should have allowed an important record dealing with a public transaction to be gotten out of their possession on any such plea. I say, Sir, that if the government do not take action, then they are privy to the destruction of this document. It is the duty of the government to require from the Grand Trunk the return of this document, and the certificates, as their property, and the duty is cast on the Minister of Justice to enforce the law of the land, and to see that neither the Grand Trunk, nor anybody else, no matter how great, how rich, how important, can destroy the public records of Canada with impunity. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) reminds me that on November 10, 1905, Mr. L. K. Jones, secretary of the Department of Railways, writes to Mr. Walker, of the Grand Trunk:

Sir,—In compliance with the request contained in your letter of yesterday's date, I return herewith, by direction, four certificates, of the president, vice-president, general manager, and chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, as to expenditure on the Mountain and Prairie sections of that railway, the same being required, you state, for the purposes of modification.

Where was the necessity for any modification? The only modification they made was to destroy the evidence of their guilt, and to present a new document which was so bad that to the extent of $74,000 it was disallowed by the auditor acting for the government. This is a matter which affects the honour of the government of this country; it affects the honour of the government even more than if they were acting for the people of this country, because they are acting as trustees of these bonds, and it is the first duty of the government to see that these documents are returned forthwith by the Grand Trunk Pacific and placed on the files of the department. If they do not return them, and if they cannot make such explanation as will satisfy the government, then they should be punished. Would anybody in this country have dared to do such a thing, unless they felt their influence with the government, unless they controlled the administration to such an extent, or the friends of the administration to such an extent that they would be afraid to publish them; would any one else in this country have dared to do what the Grand Trunk Pacific did? But something more happened. They have not only destroyed this document, but as soon as this investigation comes up, that very day—if we can take Mr. Walker's statement, and I don't care to take it at the present time—that very day, there was a sudden call for him to get three months' leave of absence. It was just one month, or four weeks, before Mr. Walker disappeared from the scene, that this matter was brought to light in the Public Accounts Committee. No other citizen, unless a railway magnate in the position of Mr. Walker, would dare to flaunt a committee of this House as that gentleman has done. What are we told? We are told that Mr. Walker had gone to Washington. On the 5th of March his department in Montreal knew he was wanted here. Is there any evidence that they sent him a telegram, or made the slightest effort to get him here? There is none. We only know from the witness who attended—and that in an incidental way, because Mr. Walker did not even do him the honour to tell him he had received a notice—we only know in an incidental way that Mr. Walker made arrangements to go to Europe as soon as this scandal came on the scene. I use the word 'scandal' advisedly. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) says that Mr. Walker sent someone in his place. Well, I state without fear of contradiction that wherever it was essential for Mr. Power—who was supposed to have come in Mr. Walker's place—to know

anything about this transaction, he absolutely knew nothing, and never had anything to do with it. Probably there is some one in the Grand Trunk office in Montreal who does know something about it, but he is not sent here. And so we were not able to get from Mr. Power, in evidence, any information about the items in this document, and indeed he will not even say that he ever discussed any of the items with Mr. Walker. But we do get from Mr. Power this information: That there are to-day in the possession of the Grand Trunk Railway Company the vouchers, or the alleged vouchers, from which this statement 'No. 1' was made up, so that if this House does its duty to the people of Canada and requires the statements and certificates to be produced, Mr. Power says the Grand Trunk can make up a precisely similar statement and hand it back, and also that, if necessary, they could supply the vouchers. We, therefore, have it that one witness has disappeared, and that in his place another witness comes here who knows nothing about the matter. Under such circumstances, the least the House can do for the preservation of its own honour is to require every thing to be produced by the Grand Trunk Railway, or the Grand Trunk Pacific, that can throw any light on this extraordinary transaction. I want to read to the House (page 43 of the evidence) a copy of the report, of date October 11, 1905, made by Mr. Leonard Shannon, the accountant, in reference to this matter; I read the last portion of it, which is relevant to the question before us:

> I would draw attention to the item of proportion of preliminary expenses in the statement of the Prairie section, amounting to $106,433, this being a portion of a voucher submitted to me for $162,000, in round figures, but which subvouchers to the extent only of $106,650 were shown me—an amount in excess of the proportion charged—but the details were insufficient to enable me to state whether they were a proper charge against the Prairie section or not.

Instead of $162,000, it should be $106,433. You will see that only in respect of the $106,433 was there any subvouchers produced, and they were so indefinite that the accountant could make nothing out of them, whereas as regards $55,000 of the amount it appears that there was nothing but a statement from the manager that it was spent and an absolute refusal on the part of Mr. Wainwright and Mr. Morse to give any statement as to how the money was spent. Although these gentlemen refused to give the auditor any such statement, they had the audacity over their own signatures to file a claim against the Railway Department for that very money about which they were unwilling to give the slightest information. I venture to say that that is trifling with the committee and with the people o fthe country. Having had the audacity to certify that that was a proper expenditure, they should have had the manliness to give the auditor some statement as to what it was spent for, whether it was for constructing parliaments or constructing railroads. One would think that $162,000 was a fair amount for preliminary expenses. It certainly is a larger amount than most of us would expect to pay to get a railway charter through this House. But we have this extraordinary state of facts—I refer to the evidence of Mr. Power on page 77:

> Q. Would the promotion expenses be chargeable to, say, the western division, the whole of it?—A. No, they should be pro rata.
>
> Q. Did you pro rata them?—A. I believe they were.

So that this extraordinary sum of $162,000 for promotion expenses was only the pro rata portion charged to the western division. Under such circumstances I feel constrained to believe that the First Minister will not permit a matter of this kind to go uninvestigated, and that he will not sanction a public document, the property of this country, being taken from the files of a government department where it was placed for the protection of the interests of the people of this country.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). Mr. Speaker, when this debate began I thought there was a very simple matter to be discussed by this House, but after listening to the fiery talk of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I have almost come to the conclusion that the Grand Trunk Railway Company ought to be arrested and tried for attempting to defraud, padding accounts and presenting bogus claims, and that the Minister of Finance should be dealt with as a fellow-conspirator with Mr. Schreiber, an old and respected official of the government.

Mr. BRISTOL. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? I made no attack on the minister of Finance or on Mr. Schreiber, directly or indirectly.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman take advantage of his position in the House to attack only the Grand Trunk Railway Company and not the government or any member of the government?

Mr. BRISTOL. I thought my attack was fairly plain.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman's attack in such fiery terms is justified, what is to be said of Mr. Schreiber, that old and respected employee of the government, who passed this monstrous charge of $162,000, thinking that it was a proper charge? What are the facts of the case, and what is it that the House has to deal with? With

regard to the sum of $162,000, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company presented a statement to the government. They were not asking the government to pay that sum of money to them out of the moneys of the government. They were asking to have it paid out of their own moneys, moneys which the government of Canada held in trust, not for the bondholders only, not only to see that the guarantee of this country was respected, but primarily for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. It was the money of that company, money which they must pay, and because, forsooth, accounts between that company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which are perfectly proper apparently, are presented to this government hon. gentlemen opposite say it is an outrage for them to ask for an advance to be made out of their own moneys—moneys which they ultimately will have to pay. As I understand, that is the position of this trust fund; it is a debt of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. The only interest the government of Canada have in that sum is to see that they are protected in guaranteeing seventy-five per cent of the cost of the railway to the bondholders in respect to the expenditure of that amount of money. It is only necessary to rehearse what has been done to see how utterly ridiculous is this great agitation over this matter. The government have not paid any of this money that is objected to; the government do not intend to pay any of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. What do they change their auditor for?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know anything about changing the auditor. Is it suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite that there is a fear that the government is going to pay this sum? One would think, from the scornful terms in which they denounce the transaction, that they thought the money should be paid by the government to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. I think they pay a high tribute to the Finance Minister by showing that he has prevented this great fraud which they alleged was attempted to be perpetrated, thus saving to the people of Canada $162,000, because that is the result of their argument. An attempt has been made to censure the Public Accounts Committee. I think that committee would have been liable to grave censure if it had given effect to the desires of hon. gentlemen opposite. What is the position of this matter? In the first place, claims are sent into the government, and they must be paid. The government does not come to the Public Accounts Committee to ask whether an account should be paid or not. They are charged with the responsibility of paying it, and they pay it. They bring down their reports to this House, the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report, in order that these payments may be investigated, and the Public Accounts Committee is appointed by this House to inquire into such matters as are referred to it by this House. Now, what was referred to that committee? On the 5th of February last the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report were brought down and referred to the Public Accounts Committee to examine into. That is the authority they have; they have no power to go further than that, and it would be improper for them to go further. Mr. Bourinot's work on page 546 says:

> It is a clear and indisputable principle of parliamentary law that a committee is bound by and is not at liberty to depart from the order of reference.

The order of reference to the Public Accounts Committee, as I understand it, is to inquire into Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report, which had been sent to that committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to submit a question? I know he does not want to make a false statement, but he has just stated that on the 5th of February the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report were brought down and were referred to the Public Accounts Committee. Was he not present to-day when the last part of the Auditor General's Report was brought down and referred to the committee?

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman is no doubt right. On the 5th of February it was only parts 1 and 3 that were brought down; to-day it is part 2 that is brought down. I am glad to be corrected. This is the way this matter came on in the Public Accounts Committee. Here is their text and headline, and the procedure of the committee reminds me of a preacher who starts out with a text and then forgets all about it and preaches about something else altogether.

> The committee proceeded to the further consideration of the payment of $352,191.73 to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in connection with surveys purchased for the National Transcontinental Railway Company, as set out at pages W—251 and W—323 of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906.

If you refer to the items mentioned there, you will find that the first item is for purchase of Grand Trunk Pacific surveys east of Winnipeg, and the second is a summary of Grand Trunk Pacific surveys east of Winnipeg, taken over by National Transcontinental Railway Commission. The committee were dealing with the items concerning the construction east of Winnipeg but they investigated nothing east of Winnipeg. What they interested themselves in

was the expenditure on the Prairie and Mountain section west of Winnipeg. Of course they had the power to do that, but certain gentlemen on that committee, not content with departing form their text to this extent, want to go still further astray and investigate something which is not in the public accounts or the Auditor General's Report at all. That, I submit, they have no right to do. Some hon. gentlemen on that committee may think it proper to look into things which are not the concern of this government, but in my opinion every man in this country will do well if he does his own work and does not give his time and attention to other peoples' affairs. I was not in the committee when this matter was up; but if I had, I would have voted with the majority, and I have not heard any reason given by hon. gentlemen opposite why the Public Accounts Committee should go into matters which do not properly come under the subjects committed to them. But one hon. gentleman has suggested that if the committee had not the right to go into these matters, this House is competent to give them that right. I agree with that view. Parliament can do any thing, but parliament must act with reason. And when we are asked to authorize the Committee on Public Accounts to investigate certain matters, I think that those who submit that request ought to show what public interest is to be served by our doing so. They ought to show what public benefit is to accrue from ordering any committee to waste time and expense investigating a claim in which this government is not interested—a claim that has not been paid and concerning which there is no demand that it should be paid by this government. True at one time a claim was made for certain payments, but that is not so extraordinary after all. Here are two railway companies closely connected, one of which is financing the other. Their officers are practically the same and the items in question will no doubt be charged by the one against the other, and they evidently took the ground that all the expenses in connection with these accounts should be sent in to the government and 75 per cent of the same paid. Those were in the first account which was sent in and which was the beginning of the active discussion between the railway company and the government. The question in dispute was not then understood and was referred to the then Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) for his opinion. Then it was found, in the opinion of the Minister of Finance, backed up by that of the Minister of Justice, that these were matters which did not come within the scope of the original Act under the head of construction expenses. In September or October, 1905, the Grand Trunk Pacific said: We want some money; we have spent over $900,000; here is a statement showing these expenditures. They did not, it is true, send their vouchers. Much has been said about the vouchers. Who should have them? Whose property are they? Are they not vouchers for money expended by the railway company? They are not vouchers for expenditures made by the government. Who then is entitled to keep them if not the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. AMES. Are they in the possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know whether they are or not. As far as the government is concerned, it does not make a bit of difference whether they are in the possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. AMES. Have we any agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not think that any one who has watched the proceedings for three or four years is going to get up and say that the two companies are not very closely connected. The one is financing the other and the same people are interested in both. Why should we care whether the vouchers are kept in the vaults of the one or the other company? They are vouchers for expenditure by one or the other of these companies and are required in case the same claim might be made a second time upon either of them. It is idle to say that they should be stored away in the vaults of the government and to talk about the people who hold the bonds being alarmed because we do not get these vouchers back from the Grand Trunk Railway and put them into the government vault. What the bondholders and the stockholders are much more concerned in is in seeing our Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) watching these things and safeguarding their interests rather than in knowing whether or not certain vouchers are deposited with the one company or with the other or with the government.

When that first claim was sent in, it contained these items under the head of preliminary expenses. We have the report of Mr. Shannon and I have not heard that he is a man to be attacked or questioned in any way. He was the accountant in the Department of Railways and Canals, and he went to Montreal and examined the vouchers and made his report. His report will be found on page 43 of the evidence. Was there any attempt by him to cover up any thing or defraud or deceive any body? Let us see what he said. On the 11th of October, 1905, he wrote the following letter to Mr. Butler the deputy minister:

Sir,—Pursuant to instruction I made an inspection last week of the books, vouchers, &c., of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in Montreal, to ascertain the amount of expenses made

by the Grand Trunk Pacific upon the Prairie and Mountain sections of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from its inception to June 30, 1905, and have the honour to report as follows:

Prairie section.

Expenditure..	$241,505 76
Less refunds..	317 28
	$241,188 48
Add proportion of preliminary expenses..	106,433 00
Add proportion of general and legal expenses..	88,465 66
Total..	$436,087 14

Mountain section.

Expenditure..	$ 49,232 82
Add proportion of general and legal expenses..	47,702 57
Total..	$ 96,935 39

The point about his report is that he says that out of a sum of $162,000 which was claimed, he allowed only $106,433 for preliminary expenses. He does not close the matter there but makes special reference to it in the last clause of his report:

I would draw attention to the item of proportion of preliminary expenses in the statement of the prairie section, amounting to $106,433, this being a portion of a voucher submitted to me for $162,000, in round figures, but which subvouchers to the extent only of $106,650 were shown me—an amount in excess of the proportion charged—but the details were insufficient to enable me to state whether they were a proper charge against the Prairie section or not. If it is thought to be a proper charge against this section, then the total of that section as given by me in this report will be correct. If not, that total should be reduced accordingly.

There is a very businesslike report. Mr. Shannon says that items aggregating $162,000 were sent in, that vouchers were not produced for all, and that of the vouchers which were produced certain ones were rejected, and he allowed $106,433. What happened next? That went into the hands of Mr. Schreiber, the engineer of the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Mr. Schreiber consulted the then Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Mr. Schreiber told the Minister of Justice that certain preliminary expenses were in this account and asked if they should be paid. He did not say what the nature of these preliminary expenses were, and the minister told him that, under the Act of 1905, the preliminary expenses were a proper charge, and therefore Mr. Schreiber certified and passed them on.

He sends them in to his chief, and then, on the 19th of October, they are sent to the Minister of Finance. In some way which does not appear by the evidence, between the 19th of October and the 9th of November, the matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance with his deputy minister, Mr. Courtney. Mr. Shannon was present when they discussed the matter, and the conclusion was come to by the minister that this was an item which did not pertain to the construction of the railway, and should be rejected. And that was the end of it so far as they were concerned. And the Grand Trunk Pacific, instead of pressing this claim or saying that they must have the money, asked that the statement be sent back saying that they would send a new one. According to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) that was a great crime. This statement contained items which, in the opinion of the Minister of Finance should not be there, on the ground that they were preliminary expenses, and, as stated by the Minister of Justice, subsequently in his report, he thought that 'preliminary expenses' meant only 'preliminary' in the work of construction and not 'preliminary' in the sense in which they were charged. But the company asked to have the report back saying that they would send in a new one. It was sent back and was destroyed;—not destroyed for any particular purpose, not destroyed after this investigation was begun, but destroyed as such things are usually destroyed and for the sufficient reason that it had answered its purpose. This was made up of figures from their books, and the books were not destroyed. It was a mere clerical statement, sent in and being rejected it was sent back, and, being of no further importance, it was destroyed. And for this they have been branded as having been guilty of fraud and almost of every crime in the calendar. It is loudly contended that it was a crime for the government to part with the statement. If so, Mr. Speaker, it it is a crime that is committed every day by business people; it is a crime that I have committed very often myself. Surely there is nothing uncommon, when a statement is sent in on a wrong basis, to have it returned that it may be sent in on a right basis. And that was what was done in this case, and, the usefulness of the old statement being gone, the paper was destroyed. For my part, I cannot see that there was any great crime about that. If it were done for an improper purpose, or if any fraud were attempted by its destruction, it would be a different thing. But there was nothing of that sort. The company simply said: We concede your ruling; send us back the account and we will put in a new account from which these items are omitted. They put in the new account, and the account was allowed. And now hon. gentlemen say: We are not satisfied with the action of the Minister of Finance in disallowing it, or with the act of the railway company in doing what we think they ought to have done; we want to go further and investigate a claim for which no account is made, which does not interest the public and relates entirely to the domestic business of

these railways. Much has been said about Mr. Walker having disappeared. Well, is it not a common thing in this country for a head official, who is summoned, to send his subordinate to take his place? If you look at the evidence of Mr. Shannon, you see that Mr. Walker, personally, knew very little about the matter. On page 24 of the evidence, Mr. Shannon testified referring to the audit in Montreal:

Q. When you were examining from time to time, the books and vouchers of the company of Montreal, who assisted you by way of explanations on behalf of the company?—A. Well, of course, the general auditor, Mr. Walker, was supposed to be the man I was to deal with, but Mr. McCombe, one of the principal clerks, knew more about it than Mr. Walker did, so that after questioning Mr. Walker several times, I was glad to continue my questions with Mr. McCombe, who had greater knowledge than Mr. Walker of the whole business.

In view of this, is it not idle to make so much ado about Mr. Walker not coming here? These were clerical matters. Mr. Walker does not expend these moneys, or control the finances of the company. He is a man with clerks under him, and we have the evidence of the government auditor, that Mr. Walker personally knew very little about the details of the matter. Of course, it is wrong for a man to disobey a subpœna from the Public Accounts Committee or any other committee of this House; but there does not appear to be any suggestion that it is done from any improper motive. True, to obey the summons was contrary to his convenience; he had taken his passage for the old country. He said: I do not know about this matter of detail as much as the clerks in my office do. Even if he had come, it is a matter that the committee could not go into, because it was not before the committee, and they would be usurping the powers of the House if they went into a matter that was not before them. It appears to me that the motion has no merit; that the Public Accounts Committee acted properly and in accordance with constitutional authority, and that if we pass this motion it will encourage intermedling with the business of other people with which the Canadian public is not concerned.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). My hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke) seldom addresses this House. With the ability which he possesses and which hon. members know him to possess, we must all regret that when the hon. gentleman does speak he should not have a better case to support. From the outset one could plainly see that his heart was not in his work. And how could it be when we consider this matter in the light of the history of this Grand Trunk Pacific concern? Why, from its very inception, this concern has been regarded by the people of Canada with distrust. What is its history? A great railway company came to this House asking for authority to construct a railway from North Bay to Winnipeg and westward. At the very outset, they were taken by the throat and compelled to desist from the work they had undertaken. A party of Quebec politicians forced them to agree to build their road from the city of Quebec. But, no sooner was it announced that they had made this concession than they were taken by the throat by a party of maritime province politicians, and compelled to agree to another extension. They were subject to punderblundering—which is a new word coined in the United States; and there has been a good deal of this punderblundering. My hon. friend from South Essex has said little, so little devolves upon me to answer. He started out by saying that my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) had attacked Mr. Schreiber. Well, I heard no word of attack upon Mr. Schreiber. I did hear from my hon. friend from Centre Toronto a plain statement of the facts showing the attitude of the Department of Railways and Canals, and I am ready to reiterate every word that was said by the hon. gentleman. No man will attempt to contradict my statement when I say that it was not the fault of the Department of Railways and Canals that this account did not pass, whatever credit may be given to the Department of Finance. The account was passed on, and passed on under circumstances of the most suspicious nature. Mr. Schreiber, although the deputy head, felt so fearful of the position he occupied in the passage of this account after the intervention and opposition of Mr. Shannon, the accountant of the department, that he sought the assistance of the Department of Justice. And what did the Department of Justice tell him? They told him, practically, that in view of the facts, it was better not to pay the account. Yet, for some unknown reason the accounts were pushed onward by the Department of Railways and Canals. Whether any credit is due to the Minister of Finance or not, I notice that he is quite anxious to condemn the Department of Railways and Canals so that he may get a little praise for himself. I am not sure that the honour and credit of stopping this account is not in reality due to the then deputy minister, Mr. Courtney, rather than to the Minister of Finance.

Be that as it may, I say it is to the credit of the Finance Minister that after this account had run the guantlet—I do not think it had much of a gauntlet to run in the Department of Railways and Canals—it was stopped in the Department of Finance. So much for any attack that has been made on Mr. Schreiber. Now my hon. friend says: What is there in this whole thing? it is only an account dealing with trust money. Why, is not the dignity, the honour and the credit of this country

something that we need to guard in the old country? Yet my hon. friend says these are only trust moneys. True, the people of Canada have imposed upon their government the duty of seeing that these moneys are properly administered, but the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) says that is nothing. Well, the honour and credit of this country, according to the English press, does not stand so pre-eminently high that we need not be jealous of it. Let me read the following that appeared lately in the Yorkshire 'Post' under the date of January 4. The writer who signs himself 'Victim' writes:

It is impossible for him to use language strong enough in warning young architects, engineers and land surveyors to avoid Canada until honest, fair and more straightforward principles are adopted by the Dominion government. He warns the British capitalists and wealthy insurance companies to beware of Canadian agents, whether representing government railways or loan companies.

That is a pretty serious accusation to appear in the public press. Yet the hon. gentleman says, with a wave of his hand, that we should have no regard for the honour and dignity of the government of Canada when it comes to dealing with trust moneys. Now, coming down to the argument that we should not go into these accounts at all by reason of the fact that no details of expenditure are in the Auditor General's Report, that is not the rule, as I understand it at all. The rule is that a committee has every right to deal with public accounts as well as with the Auditor General's Reports. By referring to the public accounts of this year, on pages 14 and 15, you will find these very items on both pages. But even if they were not referred to there, will not the object of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) be served if this reference is permitted, and if it is allowed to go to the committee?

Then my hon. friend finished up by saying: What about these vouchers anyway? Why, they are all safe in the vaults and in the offices of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Montreal. Nobody disputes the right of the Grand Trunk to keep those vouchers in their custody; all we are asking is the privilege of inspecting those vouchers, to find reasons why the accounts contained therein were paid. Nobody is asking that the vouchers should be taken from the company, we are simply asking to inspect them. Now what has been the attitude of the Public Accounts Committee on this question? Has it been a judicial attitude? Have hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House met this matter in a judicial manner? Why, when a motion was made on one occasion that a certain witness, Mr. Walker, should produce certain documents, what happened? Hon. gentlemen opposite would not allow Mr. Walker even to come into the room with the documents. They insisted that we should not allow Mr. Walker to be brought there under a duce tecum subpœna at all, they would not even give him an opportunity to come into the Public Accounts Committee to answer for himself; but they were to stand at the very threshold, the guardians of the public expenditure, and practically intimidate this witness, and tell him that he must not answer any questions that were asked him. And further, to fortify themselves these hon. gentlemen, by voting down a resolution to call him, advised him in the first place not to come to the committee; they practically said to him: At all events, if you do come, by all means do not bring the documents with you. Now my hon. friend tries to excuse the absence of this auditor, Walker, and he endeavours to gloss over the fact by saying that Walker was not an important witness. I want to direct attention to page 74 of the evidence where this question was asked of Mr. Power:

Q. What became of the first statement?—A. It was destroyed.

Q. By whom?—A. I do not know.

Q. How do you know it was destroyed?—A. Because I know Mr. Walker gave instructions to have it destroyed, and told me himself it was destroyed.

Q. Coming from your superior officer, he told you himself that he had ordered it to be destroyed?—A. And he asked in my presence——

Q. How do you know he gave orders to have it destroyed?—A. Because he sent for the clerk and asked him in my presence if he had destroyed them.

Now surely my hon. friend will say that a man occupying that position in the Grand Trunk service, who sent to a subordinate clerk to come to his presence and asked him if he had destroyed statements, was not a superior officer of that department. Does the hon. gentleman say that the witness who was produced in lieu of the auditor had power to have done what the auditor did? It is idle for the hon. gentlemen to argue that Mr. Walker has not committed a breach of decency, if parliament has any rights, when he tells a committee of this House that he cares not what parliament wishes him to do, he is going to bid defiance to it. Surely parliament is coming to a pretty pass when every man in the country who may be concerned in an inquiry can simply tell parliament that he is going about his own business, and bid defiance to parliament. It will surely be worse than that for the dignity of parliament and for the government, backed up by a majority, to say that Walker did right, and that any inquiry further along the lines suggested need not be pursued.

Now I do not propose to go into this lengthy evidence, as it is fresh in the minds of the members of the committee. But I do say that the dignity of parliament is at stake in this whole question. From its

very inception there has been a well grounded theory that there was something radically wrong in the expenditures of this Grand Trunk Pacific. Viewed from every point, men have banded themselves together in order to attack the honour of the government, or such as they thought it, in the matter of contracting for this railway. What do I read in the 'Canadian Gazette' as to one company that was formed in this country in respect of this very railway? It shows on the part of these gentlemen an idea that there was something radically wrong in this government with respect to the contracts of the Grand Trunk Pacific and that favoured contractors would be able to get advantages from the government itself. Now what happens in the year 1906? A large number of wealthy capitalists came over to this country from Belgium. These gentlemen came, knowing that this transcontinental road was about to be undertaken, and as soon as these men landed in this country, how were they approached? They were told by some person who was behind the scenes that if they hoped to get any advantages in the way of contracting, there was only one way to attain them.

How was that? To go into the open and the honest market and tender? No, Sir, to ally themselves and buttress themselves with friends of the government. That is true, the facts prove themselves. What happened? They were told that there were two gentlemen in the city of Montreal, Messrs. Galibert & Gauthier, one a leather merchant and the other an accountant, and that they had better ally themselves with these two gentlemen because it would likely prove an entry and a passport to securing a contract on the Transcontinental Railway. What more happened in the province of Ontario? I am sorry the Minister of Justice is not in his place. These gentlemen were told that it was necessary for their success in contracting to go up to the village of Aurora, north of Toronto and secure the cooperation of a gentleman there who is president of the Liberal association in that riding, a gentleman who owns a very small business in the way of a foundry and if they wanted to secure another power behind the throne, to enlist the services of J. B. Tudhope, a carriage manufacturer in Orillia. Why? Because Mr. Tudhope was desired by the Liberal party to be a candidate in that riding at the next general election and in all probability if they secured the services of Mr. Tudhope they would be able to secure a contract, Who are these gentlemen? They are high sounding names to associate with these gentlemen in Canada. Here is the notice:

Public notice is hereby given that under the Companies' Act, 1902, letters patent have been issued under the seal of the Secretary of State of Canada, bearing date the 19th day of January, 1906, incorporating Vicomte Louis Charliers de Buisseret, gentleman; Eugene Fichefet, contractor; Baron Constant Giffinet, minister plenipotentiary; Louis Goffin, engineer; Louis Grenier, engineer; Gerard Macquet, engineer; Comte John d'Oultremont (Grand Marechal de la Cour); Armand Rouffart, engineer; Edmont Rouffart, doctor of medicine, all of Brussels, Belgium, except Louis Grenier, who resides at Ghent, Belgium, and Louis Charliers de Buisseret, who resides at Seneffe, Belgium; James B. Tudhope, of the town of Orillia, in the province of Ontario, merchant; Henry W. Fleury, of the town of Aurora, in the said province of Quebec, merchant; Paul Galibert, merchant, and Thomas Gauthier, accountant, both of the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec, for the following purposes.

Then it goes on to cite the powers to be given to the company.

Mr. PARDEE. What is the company's name?

Mr. BENNETT. The Empire Construction Company of Canada. It startled the villagers in Aurora when they found that these humble individuals from there had embarked with these gentlemen in this imperial company. This is part of the suspicion that has been engendered all through the country.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Has the Empire Company got a contract?

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad the hon. gentleman has suggested that to me because otherwise I would have forgotten the point. Yes the Empire Company sent a gentleman out here and he got a little afraid of the company and he asked on behalf of the Empire Company that the giving of contracts should be delayed for a week, and I want to say here that some of the commissioners, as I have been well informed, were favourable to delaying the granting of contracts for a week, but the majority prevailed against it and the Empire Company did not tender.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. It was no fault of the Empire Company that they did not get in on a contract and it was no fault of the gentleman who suggested to the Empire Contract Company the taking in of those four gentlemen that the Empire Company did not get a contract.

So I say from the outset all through the dealings with this Grand Trunk Pacific Company there has been suspicion and grave suspicion, and when we to-day point to accounts which the Grand Trunk Railway Company refused to prevent, when we see men like Mr. Rowe from British Columbia—and it may be in the recollection of some gentleman that this Mr. Rowe was associated with a commission appointed for this government in connection with labour disputes in the west; perhaps for that reason he had been useful to this government, perhaps he had some little string on this gov-

ernment and for that reason the government were very anxious to have Mr. Rowe satisfied, as he was satisfied, with his $125 payment per month.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) aware that Mr. Rowe was one of the campaign orators for the Conservative party in the province of British Columbia in the last election?

Mr. BENNETT. I was not aware that he was one of the orators. Perhaps the $125 a month from the Grand Trunk Pacific stopped and that may have changed the gentleman's politics.

Mr. EMMERSON. Did he go back to his first love ?

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot say as to that, he seems to be fickle from all accounts. Seriously, my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke) wil not contend that the honour and dignity of this country is not at stake in this connection. This government is entrusted with millions of dollars belonging to the people of Great Britain who have invested in this country and how is that money to be disbursed ? Is it to be spent in the manner indicated in these accounts or in a proper maner ? That it was improper goes without saying. The Minister of Finance says it was improper and he prevented and disallowed it.

There is so much mist, so much overloading of these accounts that no man in this country will believe that this Bill has been honest, straightforward and above board, and there can only be one possible way to disabuse the public mind of the idea that there has been wrong-doing in connection with this, and that will be by fully investigating these statements and these accounts.

I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned and that it be the first Order of the Day at the next sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 21, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election and return of Adelard Lanctot, Esq., for the electoral district of Richelieu.

Mr. BENNETT.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Ruben Charles Etienne Laurier, Esq., member for the electoral district of L'Assomption; introduced by the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Beland.

Adelard Lanctôt, Esq., member for the electoral district of Richelieu, by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the year ending December 31, 1906.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment, by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the St. Mary River Bridge Company.—Mr. Dyment, by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 132) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment, by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 133) respecting the Ontario Hudson Bay and Western Railways Company.—Mr. Dyment, by Mr. Calvert.

QUESTIONS.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. A. Martin—asked :

Under the proposed arrangements at the recent conference between the representatives of the provincial governments and the Dominion government, relating to increased subsidies and other matters, does Prince Edward Island receive eighty cents per head of her maximum population since she entered confederation, and does she so receive eighty cents per head on this population until her population increases? If not, how or on what basis is the eighty cents per head to be paid ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The question of my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) is engaging the attention of the Minister of Justice, and my hon. friend will have an answer when the address to His Majesty, of which notice has been given, is brought up for discussion in this House.

MR. ALPHONSE GERVAIS, OF ST. HYACINTHE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is Alphonse Gervais, of the city of St. Hyacinthe, employed by the government in the Civil Service ?

2. If so, in what department, what are his duties, and where has he performed them during the last three years ?

3. What salary has the said Alphonse Gervais received since his employment by the government and what is his present remuneration ?

4. By whom was the appointment in question recommended ?

5. Has the employee in question passed the qualifying examination prescribed by law ?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Mr. Alphonse Gervais is temporarily employed by the government.

2. He is an employee of the Department of Inland Revenue at St. Hyacinthe and during the period named has been so employed at that place. He is in charge of a bonded vinegar manufactory.

3. His salary when first engaged was at the rate of $300 per annum, subsequently increased to $500 and is now $600.

4. There is nothing on record showing on whose recommendation Mr. Gervais was appointed.

5. No.

MARIEVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Did the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, submit at a session of the council of the administration on the sixteenth instant, a proposal for the erection of a post office building in Marieville, in the county of Rouville, represented by the said minister ?

2. Is the population of Marieville, 1,306, according to the last census return ?

3. What was the estimate cost of the said building, if proposed as aforesaid by the said Hon. Mr. Brodeur ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. Resolutions passed by the Marieville Board of Trade and the town council of that place have been transmitted through Mr. Brodeur to the Department of Public Works, asking for the erection of a public building at Marieville. Those resolutions are now receiving the attention of the government.

2. Yes, but the post office asked for would be for the benefit of a much larger population.

3. Plans have not yet been prepared.

IMPORTS VIA CANADIAN PORTS.

Mr. KEMP asked :

What was the value of sea-borne imports landed at Canadian seaports on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, including the St. Lawrence, during the year 1906, for transport to points in the United States ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The total value of merchandise received at Canadian seaports, including Montreal, for immediate transport across Canadian territory to United States points, during the fiscal year 1906 amounted to $23,953,281.

I.C.R.—DRUMMOND BRANCH.

Mr. MORIN asked :

What outlay was made on the Drummond branch of the Intercolonial Railway at Mitchell and St. Léonard, on new bridges, approaches thereto, and changes in the line at those places ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Expenditure on St. Leonard bridge and approach thereto is.. .. ..$146,984 22
On Mitchell bridge and approach thereto.. .. .. .. 90,811 16
Changes in line at St. Leonard.. .. .. 18,419 59
In line at Mitchell.. .. .. 17,220 11

RESIGNATION OF HON. C. S. HYMAN, M.P.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would my right hon. friend inform the House whether or not anything has been heard from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) as to his resignation, or whether anything is known as to his intention ? I think the House should be informed at the earliest possible moment whether he proposes to make valid the resignation which has been found invalid ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Since the last announcement I made to the House on the subject, I have had no communication directly or indirectly from Mr. Hyman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is anything known as to his present condition of health ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no information at all.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queen's, P.E.I.). When may we expect the return asked for on February 6, of the correspondence between the federal and provincial governments with reference to increased provincial subsidies ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the correspondence will be here in a day or two.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—REPORT RE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Barker for the consideration of the sixth report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe) I had almost concluded the remarks I intended making when you left the chair, Sir,

yesterday afternoon, and I promise the House that I shall not take up much of its time to-day. The right hon. the First Minister had the pleasure to-day of introducing two of his supporters from the province of Quebec, but I have no doubt that, however pleasurable that duty may have been to him, it would have given him much greater cause for self-congratulation if those two gentleman had been returned from the province of Ontario. For while the right hon. gentleman has high regard for public opinion in the province of Quebec, I am sure that, under present circumstances, he would have been much more gratified if he could count on the good opinion of the people of Ontario as well for himself personally as for his administration. In all probability, if we are to have another session, there will be two elections during recess, one in North Wellington and one in East Northumberland, and we shall then have an opportunity of seeing how the people of Ontario judge the record of this administration and the right hon. gentleman.

No doubt throughout the debate on the subject before the House, we shall hear from hon. gentlemen opposite about insinuations made on this side on the honour and reputation of members of the cabinet and their supporters. But the right hon. First Minister must recollect that not only are insinuations made from this side but charges also, and those charges are not met in such a manner as to convince either those who may be politically opposed to this government or their strongest admirers, that there is nothing in them. Coming as they do, right in the wake of charges made in this and preceding sessions, the charges now made cannot but inflame to a considerable extent the public mind. Does not the right hon. gentleman know that the country was rather startled a couple of sessions ago when the then Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) publicly announced that grave suspicion existed in his mind and that of his colleagues that members of parliament were taking advantage of their position to share in contracts and profit by the promotion of Bills and participate in emoluments which members of parliament could not, consistent with their dignity and independence, accept. What was the result? The result was the introduction of legislation by the then Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), which practically made such practices prohibitory. Yet this session the Public Accounts Committee has been kept busy investigating deals which certainly do not commend themselves to fair minded honest people. Take the very document issued by this government, and you will have evidence of improper dealings in connection with public matters. Let me first take up a case to which I specially draw the right hon. gentleman's attention. Take up the Auditor General's Report page B—92. An account is advanced to the Public Works Department. It runs the gauntlet of that department. It is certified to by the minister of that department (Mr. Hyman) as a proper, fair and honest bill, but when it reaches the Auditor General's department, what is the result? In order that the matter may be fairly laid before parliament, I shall read the correspondence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. This does not appear to be relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. I am going to cite this by way of illustration to show how the expenditure of public moneys is dealt with, and compare that with the expenditure in this instance. With all due deference, Mr. Speaker, I submit that I am within the purview of fair debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the illustration is applicable to the motion to refer the report back to the Public Accounts Committee for the proposed purpose, the hon. gentleman would be in order but otherwise not.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the ground upon which I propose to adduce it.

Port Arthur harbour—Breaking ice in 1902-3.

Audit Office, Ottawa, October 30, 1906.

Sir,—Let me acknowledge receipt of application No. 313 from your department, for $1,402.50 in favour of the Great Lakes Dredging Company for services of tugs breaking ice in Port Arthur harbour, December, 1902, and April and December, 1903.

For accounts of such remote date, there should be an explanation of the delay in rendering the Bill.

It is also usual to obtain orders in council for all services so far removed from ordinary routine that payment does not follow closely upon performance.

Please let me have copies of the engineer's letters ordering the work to be done.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. FRASER,
Auditor General.

The Deputy Minister of Public Works.

(Note by Auditor General, December 4, 1906—No answer has been received to this letter and the claim of $1,402.50 has not yet been paid.)

Now what does that mean? It means that this Great Lakes Dredging Company, nearly six months ago, had presented to the department the Bill for which the services are detailed, and yet in face of the fact that that Bill passes the Department of Public Works, secures the approval and endorsation of the minister, when it comes to the Auditor General's Department, it is there pointed out that this Bill is not of a nature to commend itself for payment. Is the Bill pressed? Is any thing further done? No, Sir, but six months remain, and this old account, frosted with age, which

the Minister of Public Works was quite willing to pay, has not been paid, and apparently up to this day there is nothing to show that it has ever been pressed. Now is that not enough to make the people of this country regard with suspicion and distrust payments that are approved by ministers of the Crown?

Let me instance another case to show the suspicion that is entertained by people in dealing with the Crown. This same company, the Great Lakes Dredging Company, is a company incorporated under a charter of the province of Ontario. There is no question as to the position of that concern, it is a joint stock company. One of the parties who has standing in his name practically half the stock of that company, is a son-in-law of the hon. member for Rainy river (Mr. Conmee); the other half of the stock is held by Mr. Charles Bowman, member for provincial parliament, and his brother, A. F. Bowman. Now these gentlemen are desirous of tendering for hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of dredging at Port Arthur and Fort William, and what do we find from the records and returns brought down last year? We find that when this company tendered for dredging they do it under what, to say the least, are most suspicious circumstances. Turning to the 'Hansard' of last year, under date of May 7, I find that a question was asked as to the contractors who had tendered for that work, and it brought forth the answer as to the Mission and Kaministiqui River Dredging that this Great Lakes Dredging Company had placed a tender before the department at 9 cents per yard, and that Mr. A. F. Bowman had placed a tender for precisely the same work at 18 cents a yard. Now there can be no question as to these persons being the same parties, because a reference to the Auditor General's Report discloses the fact that upon page V-26 Mr. A. F. Bowman puts in a bill for services for a dredge called the 'Dominion' for a large amount, totalling $15,376.36; while on the next page the Great Lakes Dredging Company, for services performed by them, place a large bill, at different dates I am free to admit, for nearly $7,000 for the same dredge. I can show by another instance where certain work is performed by a dredge called 'No. 1,' in the name of A. F. Bowman, and it is placed in the name of the Great Lakes Dredging Company. Now he who runs can read, and any man can understand that this group of contractors, this favoured company, felt that they had such an influence with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. C. S. Hyman) that, had no tender intervened between their tenders at 9 cents and 18 cents, they had such a low opinion, I say, of the Minister of Public Works for Canada, that they suspected he would be privy to and a party to allowing them to withdraw their low tender and substitute their higher tender. There can be no other conclusion reached, it is palpable and plain on the evidence adduced. There is no need of dealing with insinuations from this side of the House, when the public record proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that hon. gentlemen or at least some ministers of the Crown, are regarded by their own friends in the manner that this firm regarded the Minister of Public Works.

Now, Sir, the 'Globe' newspaper has lately undertaken to bolster up this party in the Senate, apparently by reason of the fact that they can see very little in the every day action of hon. gentlemen opposite to commend them where it comes down to an expenditure of dollars and cents. So the other day in the Senate, when it came to a vote on a certain railway measure involving the question of the construction of a bridge in the city of Toronto in which certain railway companies were greatly interested, what was the result? Why, Sir, the result was that because certain hon. gentlemen whose political affiliations are in accord with hon. gentlemen opposite, saw fit not to vote on that particular Bill, the 'Globe' acclaims them from one end of the country to the other as being veritable brands snatched from the burning, and men that are beyond voting on such occasions. Well, the 'Globe' should not have called so loud before they were out of the woods, because if it will puruse the public accounts it will find that there are other Senators of Canada who do not forget, under the shelter of a joint stock company, to participate in large contracts that are not given by tender by the Dominion government.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman will see that this is not pertinent to the question before the House.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. The same as he delivered last summer.

Mr. BENNETT. I know that the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) is in a hurry to hie back to his green pastures and cows, and he is awfully annoyed when hon. gentlemen rise in this House to discuss any public expenditure. Well, Sir, I have instanced these cases as cases that are to-day under review. I know something of the people of the province of Ontario, and I ask the First Minister to recollect, that from that province he wishes to obtain for his government the highest possible commendation and respect, and it is along the lines of expenditure that public attention in that province is being focused to-day. For that reason, every fair investigation should be given into an examination of these accounts. In some of these accounts are involved the names of

a number of gentlemen in this country, the names of a number of gentlemen have been laid before the committee in this connection, and it goes without saying that people are making insinuations as to the character of these expenditures. No man in his senses will believe that the Grand Trunk ever wanted these expenditures to be made. No man will believe that Mr. Hays, president of the Grand Trunk Railway, who occupies in Great Britain a deservedly prominent position as a railway manager, would wish to see the money of this company spent as it has been. I say that it is in the interest of the good names of the men who have been involved in this expenditure, in the interest of good government and particularly in the interest of government administration that every facility should be afforded the Public Accounts Committee to have these matters probed to the bottom—aye, Sir, to the very bottom—and that can only be done by passing the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from East Hamilton which, I think, should commend itself to every fair minded and impartial gentleman in this House.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton). Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to make any remarks on this matter which is now before the House. As it appears to me that it has been pretty thoroughly threshed out and as the position taken by the members of the Public Accounts Committee has been thoroughly justified little more need be said along those lines. I have listened to the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who has just taken his seat, and it does strike one who is not a very old member of this House, that when questions are being debated by the House it would perhaps be for the benefit of the country and for the members of this House if hon. members were to debate the matter that is under consideration. We listened yesterday and we have listened to-day to the hon. member for East Simcoe and he has gone down the whole line from A to Z and discussed everything that has been raked up by himself in this House many times. He has gone into dredging contracts, he has gone into the question of the Empire Construction Company and many other things has he gone into, but as far as I have been able to see or hear there has been nothing particularly said regarding the question under debate as to the accounts of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. It may be that the hon. gentleman does like to get away from the subject in dispute for the pure and simple reason that he has not a good and valid argument to address to this House as to why his opinions should be upheld. It certainly would look to me that that is the light in which he viewed it because he goes on to speak of the Empire Construction Company and, without making any charge whatever or without saying more than that the Empire Construction Company is composed of certain people, or is about to be composed of certain people who are making application for incorporation, notice of which is published in the Canada 'Gazette,' expresses the belief or says that he knows that they have endeavoured to get a contract from this government illegally, and that the contract which they tendered for was not given to them for the reason that their's was not as good a tender as another tender which was received.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Pardee) will see that he is not confining himself strictly to the question.

Mr. PARDEE. Well, I bow to the ruling of the Speaker, of course, but I was only answering the argument which had been advanced by the hon. gentleman. In so far as this subject under consideration is concerned, what are the facts ?

The facts are that a request was made before the Public Accounts Committee that certain accounts which had not been paid should be produced. There were certain accounts presented to the government for payment by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. These accounts were not paid for the reason that upon going to the Finance Department the minister ruled that the accounts that were put in, or a certain portion of them, should not be paid. Certain accounts were put in, they were withdrawn, another Bill was substituted and because the Finance Department did not pay the accounts that had been put in and which they admitted were not properly put in, the argument of the hon. gentleman opposite seems to be that the department should be censured. I cannot see it in that light at all. I listened to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) yesterday. I followed him through the speech which he made and through the reading of the evidence which was given before the Public Accounts Committee. The whole trend of the argument and the idea of the evidence which he read was that these accounts were put in, that efforts were made by the persons by whom they were put in, or by the corporation by which they were put in, to get the government to pay them, but that the government had turned them down, had refused to pay these accounts and that consequently the government were censurable therefor. That appeared to me to be the argument which was advanced by the hon. member for Toronto, but instead of the government being censurable in any way at all rather does it redound to their credit that instead of having permitted these, as he terms them, bogus claims, to be paid, they were turned down and not paid. It does appear to me that instead of being censurable for such a course the Finance Department and the office of the Auditor General fulfilled the very object for which these offices were originally created and that they should be commended rather than blamed for the

course they took. Even suppose the hon. gentlemen were to have their way and that these accounts were to be produced I ask the House what good would it do if they were produced? The accounts which were not paid are gone. They have not been paid, they have been destroyed; so, what benefit would it be to have them produced now? No one has been prejudiced by the non-production or non-payment of these accounts. In no way has any one been hurt, but rather has it been shown that the government, acting as the trustees of the bondholders, who invested in the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, have amply taken care of them, and these bondholders have perhaps been better taken care of than they could have expected by the Finance Department. Therefore it seems to me that no wrong has been done to any one by reason of these accounts not having been produced, and as I understand it the only thing that the Public Accounts Committee has a right to inquire into are the accounts brought down in the reports that are laid upon the table by the Auditor General and which are proper subjects for investigation. This account in dispute, amounting to $156,000, does not appear in the report of the Auditor General, consequently it has not been paid and this House has no right whatever to look into that matter for the pure and simple reason that it has not been paid. No person has been hurt, the bondholders have suffered no prejudice whatever and it is of no consequence to any one at all. That appears to me to be the logical and true reasoning that must be applied to the matter. If there had been certain statements put in the report of the Auditor General showing that a payment of $162.000 or $160,000 had been made illegally, that thereby some one had been prejudiced and that the bondholders had been hurt by that payment, that their rights were not being looked after, then, therefore any member of this House or any one else would have the right to come to us and say: We must have every dollar of that expenditure investigated, we must see exactly where that money went, we must know if our interests have not been properly protected and consequently we ask a committee of this House to look into it to the very last possible detail and see wherein we have been hurt.

But, Sir, that has not been the question at all. The only fact I want to bring before the House is that instead of that being the state of affairs it has been absolutely shown, and hon. gentlemen must admit this, that those accounts did come in, that they were not paid and consequently everybody's interest was protected and no good purpose could be served by further investigation along those lines. If any one had been hurt it would have been right that that expenditure should have been examined most closely, but, Sir, the people are protected, the bondholders are protected, every one was protected, the expenditure was not made, the account put in was not allowed, and if the account was not allowed and the expenditure not made then I say that every one has been protected and no possible harm has been done. If you read the evidence taken before the committee and printed, if you follow the very evidence which the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Bristol) read yesterday, you will see that that fact is beyond question, so that every possible safeguard has been thrown around the expenditure and consequently everybody has been and is being protected.

For these reasons it does appear to me that it is useless to take up the time of the House or of the committee in going into expenditure that has not been made, expenditure that has been absolutely thrown out by the government and which they have refused to pay. No good purpose would be served by further investigation; the committee are doing everything that possibly could be done to show where every dollar of this money went, and to ascertain if it was spent legitimately and if it went into channels into which it ought to go.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine). The resolution that has been presented to this House by the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is one that cannot be disregarded. It is a resolution that deals with a great national undertaking and also with a great principle of British liberty. We are, I think, all interested in the successful accomplishment of this great national undertaking. We desire that if this road is to be built it should be built honestly and that it should represent the full value of the investment. We desire that the interests not only of Canada but of the bondholders be protected. In this particular case the government is a trustee. The government guarantee the bonds to the extent of 75 per cent of their issue up to a maximum amount. Had not the government placed this guarantee upon the back of those bonds they could not have been sold in the British market for the price at which they were sold. The £3,200,000 of bonds that were issued in October, 1905, would never have fetched $14,750,000, or 95 cents on the dollar, had it not been for the government guarantee behind them. Therefore it is the fact that the government is the trustee that has inspired confidence in those bonds on the part of the investing public. The proceeds of those bonds have been placed in certain chartered banks of Canada, and they are released from time to time to be applied to the cost of construction of the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific only on joint application by the Grand Trunk Pacific authorities and the government. It requires that joint demand, that joint certification before a dollar of those funds can be distributed

or expended. Then, again, those bonds constitute a liability; the credit of the Dominion of Canada is pledged to the payment, principal and interest, of those bonds. You will readily see that while we are permitted to guarantee bonds to the extent of $13,000 per mile on the prairie section and $30,000 per mile on the mountain section that represents an actual expenditure of $17,000 per mile on the prairie section and $40,000 on the mountain section. It will be readily seen that the less the cost the less the guarantee and the less the guarantee the less the liability of the government. Consequently it is most decidedly in the interest of the government that nothing shall go into cost of construction except what is legitimately chargeable thereto, nothing except what may become a revenue bearing expenditure and, if items are permitted to creep in there, that are not strictly chargeable to the cost of construction, that could never in any way increase the revenue-producing ability of that investment, such items are certainly to be excluded. The bondholders and the government are both willing that the actual cost of construction should be charged; they are desirous, however that that cost of construction should include nothing but revenue producing expenditure; that it should not include promotion costs. The government in its own interest and in the interest of the bondholders provided by statute what should constitute cost of construction, and the government also most carefully provided how the accounts should be checked to make sure that only items legitimately chargeable to cost of construction should enter into the account and be paid for.

Operations on the construction of this western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific commenced in the year 1904-5, and in October of 1905 the company notified the government to make their first audit. The audit was to cover the period ending 30th June, 1905. A statement summarizing all the claims which the Grand Trunk considered to be legitimately chargeable to the cost of construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific was accordingly prepared by the auditor of the Grand Trunk in the offices at Montreal, and that statement was sent through the official channels to the government. The modus operandi is simply this: This official statement is prepared; it is a mere list of vouchers; it contains the number of each voucher, to whom paid, for what paid, and the amount, and the Department of Railways and Canals is notified from time to time that such a statement has been prepared for the express purpose of being submitted for audit for no other purpose except that the government should audit that statement, and then after that statement had been prepared and the government has been notified, the government accountant goes down to Montreal and he audits the statement, checking the vouchers one by one, and making his marks upon the statement as to whether a voucher is or is not allowed, and this statement is the only receipt in detail which remains in the hands of the government; it is the only record left with the government that may show at any future date the items whereby a large sum of money which may be paid on certificate has been paid. It is checked accordingly by the accountant, it has his mark upon it, it becomes a document belonging to the department, a document of record, a document that it is essential should be kept with the government if the government at any future date are to determine what accounts have and what accounts have not been paid.

There are statements of that kind at present in the department. There are the statements that have been submitted to the government in every case except for the first audit. Those statements are known to be at the present time in the possession of the accountant of the government. Members of the committee desired to see those papers, and they have not been permitted to see them in time to discuss them this afternoon.

The first statement, when it was prepared, was for the amount of $926,000. This statement was presented about the first of October, and it covered the period ending the 30th of June, 1905. In due course, Mr. Shannon, the accountant of the department, undertook to make an audit of this statement, and what did he find? He tells us most freely and readily, in the evidence which is printed and in the hands of hon. members, and it should be read by every member of the House who wishes to know the story of this transaction. What does Mr. Shannon say of the items in that statement? He describes at length the various efforts on the part of the Grand Trunk officials to secure his acceptance of their entire account for $926,000, and he says: 'I found many of the accounts unsatisfactory; in many instances they would give me no details; in many instances I made inquiries, and they would tell me nothing as to what the payments were for.' And yet the company had the audacity to present such accounts to be passed by the auditor of the Railway Department and to be paid on the authority of the government, without giving any detail or explanation as to what certain of the moneys had been expended for. I will make a quotation from the evidence of Mr. Power in order that the House may see the character of the statement. The question was asked him:

Q. Was a statement prepared summarizing the claims?—A. Always.

Q. What was that prepared for?—A. For expedition in checking, and for submission to the government on which we expected payment.

The auditor of the Grand Trunk distinctly states that the only purpose for which the

statement was prepared was that it might be submitted to the government in order that the government might pay upon it.

Q. That was prepared to facilitate the work and for delivering to the government, was it not ?—A. Yes.

Q. Showing the amount you expected payment for ?—A. Yes.

Now, Mr. Shannon, after he had been through that first statement of $926,000, and after he in many instances had had most unsatisfactory interviews with the representatives of the Grand Trunk, and after he had, although repeatedly asking for them, been refused details on many of the items he was asked to pay, Mr. Shannon makes his report, and it is necessary that I should read a part of it as having a bearing on what I wish to say afterwards :

Pursuant to instructions, I made an inspection last week of the books, vouchers, &c., of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in Montreal, to ascertain the amount of expenditure made by the Grand Trunk Pacific upon the prairie and mountian sections of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from its inception to June 30, 1905, and have the honour to report as follows :

Then he states the amounts. At the end of his report there is this significant sentence :

I would draw attention to the item of proportion of preliminary expenses in the statement of the prairie section, amounting to $106,-433, this being a portion of a voucher submitted to me for $162,000 in round figures, but which subvouchers to the extent only of $106,-650 were shown me—an amount in excess of the proportion charged—but the details were insufficient to enable me to state whether they were a proper charge against the prairie section or not.

It is very obvious what Mr. Shannon means by these words : he intimates that a voucher for $162,000 was submitted to him, and that of that amount there were some but unsatisfactory details for $106,650, and that there was $55,000 or $56,000 for which there were no subvouchers whatever. That Mr. Shannon should have been asked to pass $162,000, two-thirds of the amount on insufficient evidence, and one-third on no evidence whatever, shows certainly that the company imagined that this government would not be very particular in dealing with them. When we come to ask Mr. Shannon something about the items that went into this account, we find that Mr. Wainwright figured very frequently. We find also, in obtaining evidence from Mr. Power and others, that it was customary for the Grand Trunk, whenever a voucher was prepared, signed by the general manager, for the advance of large sums of money to Mr. Wainwright, that no questions should be asked. The advances to Mr. Wainwright must have been considerable. Mr. Shannon admits in his evidence that he was asked several times to pass vouchers for large amounts payable to Mr. Wainwright without any information whatever. Can we not imagine what Mr. Wainwright wanted that money for, knowing as we do the work he generally does for the promotion of his company ?

When Mr. Shannon made this report he sent it to the deputy minister, as he was in duty bound to do. It contained the statement, showing that Mr. Shannon had placed his finger on the weak spot, that $162,000 should not be allowed. Shannon pointed this out in his report and sent it to the minister. And let me say here that it appears in this transaction that Mr. Shannon is the man who deserves the encomiums not only of this House, but of the country, inasmuch as it is apparent that he, probably not altogether with the greatest ease, succeeded in checking the payment of a large sum of money which would have been improperly paid if he had not so acted.

But this statement, however necessary it may have been, was only a preliminary. Payment was not made on the statement, but was made on certificate. The certificates were presented to the department by the Grand Trunk Pacific people, generally shortly after the statement had been made up ; and it is well that we should see just how these certificates read, because this is an official application for payments, and upon this form of official application many millions of dollars have already been paid and many millions of dollars will yet be paid. It is headed the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and it is addressed directly to the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General of Canada, an official document intended to reach these gentlemen. It states that the sum of so much has been expended in construction work on the prairie or mountain section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, as follows. It makes the distinct statement that the money has been already expended on construction work, seventy-five per cent of which is payable by the government. This is certified to by the president, the second vice-president and the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and reads as follows :

I certify the above statement of expenditure to be correct, that the prices paid for the work are not in excess of the fair value thereof, and that all proceeds of the bonds heretofore received have been used for the purpose for which the payment thereof was made.

That is the certificate signed by the highest officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific. It states distinctly that the sums mentioned therein have been expended according to law on cost of construction and on nothing else. As I have said, no money can be paid out except on the joint

certificate of the railway officials and the officers of the government. Therefore, we find here at the bottom, this further note :

I hereby certify that I have examined the accounts, books and vouchers, &c., of the company and at its office, and I find the above statement of expenditure to be in accord with the same. Further in my opinion the expenditure as set down fairly represents the reasonable value of the work done.

COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,
On behalf of the Dominion government.

Here we have a further certificate by the engineer representing the government that he also must be satisfied that every dollar of this money has been spent as alleged, according to law, on cost of construction and on nothing else. When this statement has been thus doubly certified, it becomes payable, and in ordinary instances it would have been paid almost without question. It would be something very unusual if a statement so endorsed and certified was not paid on presentation, almost without question. But when this first account was presented what happened? The day after Mr. Shannon's report we find that Mr. Schreiber, the special engineer deputed by the government to represent them in this matter, reports in his official capacity as the chief engineer of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway. Mr. Schreiber, in his report, states as follows :

The accountant of the Department of Railways and Canals, having carefully examined the vouchers in connection with the accounts submitted by the Grand Trunk Pacific for preliminary expenses and interest on bonds in connection with the construction of their railway, which expenditure I am aware is such as is usually charged by railway companies to capital construction account, and which expenses the Department of Justice, from the description given them, consider to be such as should be included in the cost of construction, and the accountant having found the vouchers to correspond with the accounts rendered, with the exception of three vouchers aggregating $242.28, which do not form a charge on the mountain section and were deducted accordingly, I have therefore, in my capacity of chief engineer of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway, certified to the following amounts.

These amounts aggregate $926,293.73. Then Mr. Schreiber continues :

I submit the accounts as corrected duly certified.

This is addressed to the Hon. H. R. Emmerson, Minister of Railways and Canals. An examination of this letter of Mr. Schreiber cannot but lead to two conclusions. In the first place, that he did not truly and accurately represent the position taken by the accountant in this matter. The letter seems to allege—and would, under ordinary circumstances, be taken to mean—that the accountant was satisfied with the payment of the whole sum of $926,000. But this we know was not the case. Mr. Schreiber then has alleged what he knew was not exactly in accord with the facts, namely, that his accountant approved of the payment of the whole amount without curtailment. Those who know Mr. Schreiber, and his long service to this country, will know that he would not have done that had he been left entirely to his own volition. I think the inference can be drawn, without going too far, that Mr. Schreiber must have acted under pressure. Otherwise he would not have written a letter so assuredly out of accord with the actual facts. Then again, he quotes the ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), and states that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) had ruled that these accounts might be included. Evidently Mr. Schreiber had verbal communications with the then Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) had apparently told him to pass those accounts, and we cannot but wonder whether the wish was father to the thought in that case. The Minister of Justice of that day (Mr. Fitzpatrick) appears to have given his verbal consent to the passing of those accounts, although we find on the 15th November, when the then Minister of Justice was asked to put his opinion in writing, that the written opinion which he gave is not in accord with his first decision. One cannot but wonder whether Mr. Schreiber, in this matter, is not being made somewhat of a scapegoat, and whether those who induced him to take this position have as yet been fully disclosed.

It has been customary, when discussing this in the House, to give great credit to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for having prevented, practically at the last ditch, this raid on the treasury. But these hon. gentlemen, who thus glorify the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), forget that in so doing they are placing the ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) in a very unenviable position. If it was so praiseworthy an act for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to stop the payment of these accounts, what about the Department of Railways and Canals, which apparently desired that the whole amount should be paid and was anxious to facilitate its payment? Evidently in that department there are no watchdogs.

But let us again take up this matter of the first claim. This first claim of $926,000 is set forth in the certificates. These certificates were duly forwarded to the Hon, W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance). On the 19th October, 1905, Mr. Jones, secretary of the Railway Department, wrote to Mr. Fielding as follows :

I have the honour, by direction, to inclose herewith, for the necessary action by your department, four certificates—

These certificates aggregated 75 per cent of $926,000.

—for the necessary action by your department.

That means, of course, the actual payment. These certificates had come in the regular channel. Every formality had been complied with, and one would expect that they would be paid out of hand as is the usual custom. But, strange to say, in this particular instance, the certificates were not promptly honoured. I expect that right here again more credit is due the accountant of the Railway and Canals Department than has been given him. I expect it was the accountant who had been misrepresented by Mr. Schreiber's letter, and who took the precaution to set himself right. I think it will be found that Mr. Shannon was the one who gave the Department of Finance an inkling that it might be necessary to investigate carefully before paying the whole $926,000. At all events, notwithstanding the special pleading, the account did not go through. The Grand Trunk Railway were hard up and exceedingly anxious to be paid, and paid promptly. But they were not. The accounts remained a month, three weeks of which time they were in the Department of Finance, and then they were withdrawn. The Grand Trunk Railway Company had for a month been unsuccessfully endeavouring to get the whole amount paid, and it then began to dawn upon them that they had made a mistake. They apparently had experience in the past of such friendliness on the part of this government that they did not hesitate to ask the limit, and it must have been something of a surprise to them to find that they had asked it once too often. Anything in reason would have been cheerfully given, but apparently in this case they went beyond reason, and so we find them starting to beat a retreat and endeavouring to cover up their tracks.

Perhaps they knew that it might be dangerous to leave in the department a statement which the curiosity of a succeeding government, possibly unfrendly, might lead them to examine. Even the railway authorities seem to have felt that there were very good reasons why the statement which they had endeavoured to have honoured in full should be withdrawn. What I cannot see, and what the country cannot understand is why the government should have been so anxious to assist them in beating this retreat, and in covering up the tracks of this attempted raid upon the trust funds. If the company had simply made an attempt to secure moneys that were not properly chargeable to the cost of construction, I can see no reason why the statement should not have been left on file, with the understanding that the government had refused to pay certain items. But the fact that that statement is removed and that that statement was destroyed would go to show that the government also had reason to believe that it was advisable that the statement should be put out of the way. Was it that the vouchers were equally damning to the government as to the company? Is not that a rightful and natural inference to draw from the fact that the government was so ready to give its assistance to this company not only to retreat but to cover its tracks in making the retreat? Had it been an attempt even to hoodwink the shareholders or bondholders, the government might have said: We cannot allow this, but we will allow the statement to stand. But the fact that the government facilitated the withdrawal and destruction of these documents leads us to believe that the government were as anxious as the company that these details should not be known. If the attempt to obtain the trust funds improperly was wrong, then the government that aided in destroying the evidence compounded a felony.

Now, let us see how the government lent its assistance to the withdrawal of these important documents. We find that on the 9th of November, 1905 after the statement had been nearly a month in the possession of the government and after many efforts had been made to have the full amount paid, Mr. H. W. Walker, chief auditor of the Grand Trunk Pacific writes to the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals saying:

Will you kindly return statements of expenditure which Mr. Shannon took with him to complete his audit, as I wish to amend them? Also the certificates which will have to be withdrawn to correspond.

And Mr. Butler on receipt of this, notified Mr. Jones to write to Mr. Courtney—which was immediately done asking Mr. Courtney to return the certificate. Mr. Courtney returns the certificates to Mr. Jones and Mr. Jones returns them to Mr. Walker stating that he does so by direction for the purpose of modification. And Mr. Walker on the 13th of November writes to Mr. Jones acknowledging that he has received these certificates. I call attention also to the fact that Mr. Wainwright on the 14th of December, 1905, writes to Mr. Jones, and again we hear of the presence of these certificates. They have been returned for purposes of modification. We would naturally suppose that that meant the alteration of the figures to make them represent lesser amount, as is the universal custom. There are on file certificates of all the succeeding payments, or copies of them, and in every case the original amount appears in black ink and the altered amount in red ink. It would be the natural inference that in this case also the certificates would come back with the figures altered. But these certificates go back to the Grand Trunk Pacific

and Mr. Wainwright writes on the 14th of December, 1905 :

I send you herewith the certificates originally signed, and which have been withdrawn, for cancellation and which perhaps you will kindly hand to Mr. Schreiber in order that he may destroy them, or take his name off, whichever he desires to do.

Mr. Schreiber, securing possession of his original report, writes, 'Not to be acted upon.' And the mystery is how this did not disappear with the rest of the documents in this case. Where are these certificates ? We cannot learn from any witnesses. Perhaps the defenders of the government may know. These essential public documents have been mutilated and have disappeared.

As to this statement it is important that we should know what became of it. I have described how that statement was prepared; how it was a summary of the vouchers for audit; I have shown how the name and the amount, and what it was for, appeared on each voucher. These are essential details. Why did not this summary of vouchers remain with the government ? Mr. Walker writes to Mr. Butler and asks for the return of these statements that he may amend them. Let us see how the amendment was carried out. I have here the evidence of Mr. Power :

Q. What became of that first statement? —A. It was destroyed.

Q. By whom ?—A. I do not know.

Q. Eh ?—A. I do not know.

Q. How do you know it was destroyed ?—A. Because I know Mr. Walker gave instructions to have it destroyed, and told me himself that it was destroyed.

Q. Coming from your superior officer, he told you himself that he had ordered it to be destroyed ?—A. And he asked in my presence——

Q. How do you know that he gave orders to have it destroyed ?—A. Because he sent for the clerk and asked him in my presence if he had destroyed it.

And that was not all. The Grand Trunk Pacific in preparing these statements naturally kept several office copies?

Again let me read the evidence of Mr. Power :

Q. By the by, did you ever see the office copy of that first statement ?—A. I saw it at the time it was returned.

Q. Now, the office copy, would that be a press copy ?—A. No, carbons.

Q. What became of that carbon copy ?—A. They were all destroyed at the time the new account was substituted.

Q. You destroyed, not merely the document sent in, but the copy of it ?—A. Yes.

Q. Was there more than one copy ?—A. There may have been.

Q. Was there ?—A. I presume there might have been two.

Q. There might have been 150 ?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you know there were at least two copies ?—A. I think there were.

Q. Were they all destroyed ?—A. Yes, the original account and all the copies were destroyed.

Special precautions were taken to remove all evidence of that tell-tale list of vouchers which it was hoped the government would pass.

And then we have from the evidence a point which is not made quite clear yet, and which, I submit, may possibly be made clearer later on. We have the inference at least, that Mr. Shannon, at the time of that first audit, made some memoranda himself. In his evidence we find this :

Q. Did you initial the statements as you passed them ?—A. No, I ticked over the vouchers to see that I had every voucher before me.

Q. Did you put any mark upon that statement to show that you were not satisfied with it ?—A. If I was not satisfied with any voucher I would make a memorandum as to the reason why I was not satisfied and I would deal with it in my report, the same as Mr. Bell has said in his evidence he dealt with them.

Q. Did you put the mark on the statement furnished to you ?—A. On the statement furnished to me, if I was not certain that a certain voucher was correct I would take a note of it so as to deal with it in my report.

Q. And your statement was left in the department and will show all the vouchers to which you took exception ?—A. Yes, certainly.

It would appear that there were memoranda made from time to time by Mr. Shannon (although that point is not yet cleared up) and can only be cleared up when we have an opportunity to examine Mr. Shannon again. But at all events, if Mr. Shannon, with respect to this first statement, made any memoranda, as we know he did in connection with the second and all subsequent statements, those memoranda too have disappeared, and are not now subject to inquiry. It would seem to me then that the removal of these certificates, that the destruction of this statement, that the disappearance of Mr. Shannon's memoranda, are certainly suspicious transactions.

What do these documents contain that the Grand Trunk Pacific are so anxious to have them removed and destroyed, and that the government is so unwilling should be investigated? Of this $162,000 of rejected accounts in the first statement, part of it came back the second time ; $74,000 were asked the second time that had been rejected the first time. We have a little inkling as to what that $74,000 was made up of, although when we endeavoured to get these statements we were denied the right to do so until this debate is over. We find that among $74,000 certain accounts such as these: Sir Adolphe Caron, several sums totalling $3,500. What and how could Sir Adolphe Caron have rendered in the way of services for that $3,500? What did he do for it? Then we have H. B. McGivern, a young lawyer who is very conspicuous in

the Railway Committee from time to time in connection with railway legislation which this parliament has to pass, and we find him down for $6,421 in large sums, which Mr. Shannon came to the conclusion were not legitimate. The Grand Trunk certified that the money had been paid in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Is not that a suitable subject for investigation? Why should the government not desire that these accounts be looked into?

Then we have Mr. Wainwright down for several thousands for advertising large accounts each time, but no details of any kind. What he advertised in, nobody knows. Yet we have him down for several thousands among these rejected accounts. Now if Mr. Shannon, in the second statement, rejected $74,000 which was made up almost exclusively of items of that character, what must the $162,000 have further contained? If the Grand Trunk, when they came back the second time, had not the courage to ask for the other $88,000, how must that sum have been made up? We find that Mr. Shannon says there were a good many more items rejected the first time than there were the second time, but that practically everything rejected the second time had been asked for the first time. We do not find when the claim comes up the second time that there is any mention made of that $56,000 voucher, for which there are no details, and regarding which Shannon could get no satisfaction. There is a great mystery that hangs over $88,000 in these accounts, which even the Grand Trunk themselves had not the effrontery to present a second time, and which are comprised in the statement which they withdraw and destroyed, and of which the government has no copy. In fact Mr. Shannon was convinced from his experience, as the evidence shows, that the company was trying to get every expenditure of every description connected with the promotion and the preliminary expense worked into that sum of railway construction. Mr. Shannon was satisfied as to that, and he stated so in his evidence. Now if the sums for legitimate promotion had been presented for payment and details were given, perhaps the company should not come in for great censure. But what we cannot see is why it should be necessary to destroy all record of this.

We find too, in evidence that large advances have been made from time to time in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific to Mr. William Wainwright. Mr. Shannon tells us he could never get any details from Mr. Wainwright as to what he did with that money, that he frequently asked him for them, and Mr. Wainwright would give him no satisfaction of any kind. Some of the amounts were large, $6,000 or $7,000 at a time, said Mr. Shannon, and they were nearly all contained in the first list of rejected accounts. We know from the evidence of Mr. Power that large advances can be made to Mr. Wainwright merely on the certificate of the general manager, that Mr. Power had instructions not to go behind these in any way. We believe that this $56,000 that was rejected in the first place was an account of that character. These large sums given to Mr. Wainwright for which no explanations are asked, for which no details are given, which are simply on the general manager's certificate, what should we conclude that they were for, knowing as we do the character of the work which Mr. Wainwright is expected to do in connection with legislation and promotion? It seems to me that there is one of the reasons why this statement is destroyed, and why the government is so anxious that it should not be revived.

Now when you come to add to these transactions the fact of the difficulty we have had in getting witnesses to give us light, I think you have a combination of circumstances which tends to aggravate the case. The witness above all others most necessary for the Public Accounts Committee, if they would investigate these payments of the Grand Trunk Pacific trust funds, is H. W. Walker, the general accountant of the company. It was by Mr. Walker that the first statement was prepared, or under his direction, it was Mr. Walker who was accustomed to notify the department when the audit was ready, it was Mr. Walker who took Mr. Shannon in charge and assisted him when he came to Montreal, turning him over at last to Mr. McCombe, it was Mr. Walker who was the superior of Mr. McCombe, and who gave him all instructions upon which he acted, it was Mr. Walker's private room that was used, it was Mr. Walker who was frequently consulted, it was Mr. Walker who wrote for a return of papers, and it was to Mr. Walker that the papers are returned, it is Mr. Walker who knows all about the destruction of the documents, and it was by his order they were destroyed. Mr. Walker, it seems to me, is a most essential witness in connection with this case. Now Mr. Walker is well known in Montreal to be a thoroughly honest and honourable man, a man who, if summoned before this committee would tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. I think it can be easily shown by any one from Montreal that there has been a considerable fluttering in the dove cotes among the Grand Trunk officers during the last few weeks since this investigation has been going on. The Grand Trunk people are pretty well informed as to what is going on here at Ottawa. Even a witness cannot step into a hotel in the evening without being accidentally met by one of their solicitors. They do not keep their lawyers here for nothing, they know pretty well what is happening here in Ottawa. I think, from current rumour in Montreal, that it is pretty apparent that it

has been known for some weeks that this investigation was to go on, and that certain important witnesses would be desired. Now that just at this particular time Mr. Walker should chose to ask leave of absence and go to Europe, is a coincidence very difficult to understand. It looks, on the face of it, very much like a premeditated and deliberate avoidance of a subpœna, it looks like an affront to this House, like a defiance to the authority of this House. Mr. Walker received his subpœna, he received two of them in fact, before he left for Europe, but in absolute defiance of them he went away, and he sent here, as was arranged, Mr. Power, principally because Mr. Power knew absolutely nothing about the transaction. You have only to read Mr. Power's testimony, it is simply a tissue of 'I don't know, I can't say, I have no recollection, I have no knowledge.' That is the witness that was substituted for Mr. Walker, and substituted, I say, with malice prepense. Only Mr. Walker knows the essential details that this committee could get at in this investigation, and Mr. Walker is not available. It would almost seem too as if that committee had been to some extent facilitating his departure, or at least facilitating the non-production of the necessary documents. We were very anxious that Mr. Walker should be summoned and be told to bring papers of any kind whatever, and when a resolution was proposed in the committee, that he should bring his first and second statement, the majority of the committee, led by those gentlemen who generally make themselves so exceedingly active in that committee, determined that he should not be asked to bring the papers which were essential to this inquiry. While the committee were determining that he should bring no papers he quietly left for the other side. If the dignity of parliament as viewed by the gentlemen who are facilitating this fiasco, is regarded as being conserved by this proceeding, I may say that the country as a whole and members on this side of the House do not agree with them.

I want to ask frankly whether the government can afford to have this inquiry stopped at this point, whether the government can afford to deliberately say: Here are $162,000 of accounts, we know that these accounts represent moneys expended, we know that the money was paid by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on account of the Grand Trunk Pacific, we know that it was paid in connection with the promotion and preliminary expenses of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and yet we will not allow any investigation that will enable it to be found to whom it was paid or by whom or for what purpose it was dispensed. Does the government want to have this investigation stop at that point? Does the government want to have this whole investigation cease and have the country inquiring as to what these $162,000 could have been paid for when everybody is so anxious to have the matter investigated? Hon. gentlemen say that the public Accounts Committee have no power. I do not pretend to argue whether they have power or not at this present moment, but if they have not power, parliament can give it to them and parliament can give it to them immediately by passing this resolution. This resolution is one that confers upon the committee the widest powers to investigate every thing in connection with this transaction and if parliament passes this resolution the Public Accounts Committee will be in a position to do the rest. It is not a new thing to amplify the powers of the Public Accounts Committee. It has been done again and again. We sometimes desire to examine accounts that run over several years and we have our powers amplified in that way so that we can go back in the Auditor General's Report for two or three successive years and inquire into the whole transaction. That is nothing unusual. It is quite customary and proper that the Public Accounts Committee should have their powers enlarged and parliament can confer on this committee the power which is necessary to enable it to proceed with this investigation. If I may be allowed in support of this contention I might quote from Todd the following extract:

> All public transactions are necessarily official and no public officer would be justified in withholding from official record and access, any document emanating from himself in his official capacity in relation to public affairs.

If no official or officer of the government can withhold a document how can an officer of the government acquire and dispossess the government of an official document as has been done in this particular case? These statements that were withdrawn in this correspondence follow closely the line of procedure laid down in Smith's 'Parliamentary Remembrancer':

The statement withdrawn was on a subject affecting the public.

It was prepared in consequence of legislative requirements.

It was intended for the assistance of the government.

It was freely handed to an official of the government, acting in his official capacity.

Were it still in the possession of the government it would have been quite reasonable to have demanded its production.

It was not marked nor considered confidential.

It would have been produced if demanded.

If all these qualifications hold and if this statement is a document of which the gov-

ernment was possessed, it seems to me that the government had no right to allow that document to pass out of the authority of parliament.

The government and the Grand Trunk Railway jointly guaranteed an enormous sum of money. It may aggregate, before the western division of the road is constructed, upwards of $50,000,000. The partner in this joint guarantee has been trying, to some extent, it would appear, to overreach the persons who loaned the money. Why is the government so solicitous that this wicked partner should not have these transactions brought home to him? Is it not just as well at this particular time to bring him to book lest he forget and lest a similar attempt be made again in the future? We are informed that this statement has been destroyed. We are informed that the copies have been destroyed. This statement is a necessary and essential document to anything like a fair investigation of this transaction. The vouchers are on the files of the company from which the certificate is drawn, there is no physical difficulty to prevent them being produced and there is no reason why they should not be placed at the disposal of the Committee on Public Accounts. The company has not refused to produce them; it is only the committee that has refused to ask for them, and if we desire to have an investigation of these vouchers all that is necessary is to instruct the committee that it secure an opportunity of examining the vouchers and in that way the substance of the statement will again become the property of the government. That is exactly what this resolution calls for. This resolution says:

5. That the claims, payments and accounts upon which the said statement for audit and substituted statements were based be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts for inquiry, investigation and report.

That is the crux of the whole matter. That is all that is asked by the resolution. The resolution would have asked for the statement if the statement had been extant; but the statement had been destroyed; consequently the resolution simply asks that the document from which that statement was drawn be placed at the disposal of the committee in order that it may be examined, inquired into and reported upon.

Now, just to recapitulate before I take my seat, the points I have endeavoured to make: There is no doubt, at least no doubt has been expressed and I think no doubt will be expressed, that $162,000 —true, a very large sum—was spent by the Grand Trunk and has been charged to the account of the Grand Trunk Pacific in connection with the preliminary and promotion expenses. There is no doubt that that money has been spent. It still stands on the books of the Grand Trunk as an unpaid claim against the Grand Trunk Pacific. That extraordinarily large amount is too large, it seems to me, to be absolutely legitimate. The sum is too large for us to pass without at least having a suspicion that it has not all been spent in the way that the Grand Trunk and the government are willing to represent the matter to the public. Grave suspicion there is throughout the land because the circumstances connected with this whole transaction are so extraordinary. If a part of this amount has been used improperly, has been used illegally, has been used illegitimately, then the honour of parliament is at stake and it certainly seems to me that the government makes an admission of fear which is tantamount to guilt when it refuses to permit this payment to be investigated.

Mr. JOSEPH C. WALSH (Montreal, St. Anne's). I have no reason to offer for joining in the debate at this hour, but I have an excuse, that is, I shall be brief. The hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) and the other hon. gentlemen who preceded him have arraigned the Grand Trunk on charges of corruption, fraud and all kinds of penal offences, especially forgery and the taking away of documents. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has endeavoured also to blame the government and to foist upon the government, and especially upon the Public Accounts Committee, the charge that they are screening something from the country at large. Evidently those gentlemen have admitted the fact that nothing has been shown against the government, that no stealing and no complicity in corruption or fraud has been shown against the government and they now want to discover a motive and reason for the government not having been guilty of such misconduct. It seems to me strange that the Public Accounts Committee should be called upon to allow an investigation of a thing that never happened. The government had nothing to do with any attempted fraud on the part of the Grand Trunk—and I do not say there was any fraud—but even admitting for a moment and for the sake of argument that there was an attempt at fraud, it has not been shown that there was any fraud or complicity in fraud on the part of the government. Therefore, I do not see why the government or the Public Accounts Committee should allow the investigation of a matter that is altogether foreign to the subject under inquiry by the committee, that is, whether there was any impropriety on the part of the government or of its officials.

I do not intend to go very fully into this matter, but it seems to me that quotations from Todd and May or from any other author have nothing to do with the case in point. It is a question of discovering whether the

government acted properly or not. We have allowed the investigation of something that really has happened, something that may be right or may be wrong, but at least, of something that has occurred. Here, however, there is absolutely nothing, for, as my hon. friend stated a moment ago, it was all presumption, 'the government may presumably do this or the government must do that, it is all a mystery.' I think the hon. gentleman should show that there has been some wrong-doing, that there has been complicity on the part of the government or of the Public Accounts Committee when they screened the government and its officials, and that we should have something presented to us other than all these myths and presumptions.

After all the whole question is a question of a disputed account. The Grand Trunk Pacific presents an account for some $160,000 odd. It may be wrong or it may be right, that matters little. One of the officials of the government, Mr. Schreiber, finding that the account was correct, misinterpreting the statute or following the interpretation of some one, arrives at a certain conclusion and certifies the account. He may have been right or he may have been wrong in doing this. Another official of the government checks him; that is what officials are there for; that is what we have them for. Why not say that the government did not intend to do wrong? Why not, once in a while, attribute good motives to a government or party; why not be generous or charitable and say that if a wrong has not been done the evident intention of the party not doing the wrong was to do right and therefore we must give some credit for that good intention. It seems to me it is going far afield and arguing beside the facts when an attempt is made to blame a government or a Public Accounts Committee for not allowing a discussion on a subject that will throw no light on the transaction under investigation. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) has said that we desire to learn something. Out of his own mouth I have learned that he did discover something and that is simply that an attempt was made by the Grand Trunk Pacific—I do not say it, but the hon. gentleman says so—he says, and this resulted from the investigation in the Public Accounts Committee, that the Grand Trunk Pacific attempted to take money from the public coffers. Evidently we have allowed something to be discovered, but if he has discovered that, he has discovered more than I have, because there could be no doubt that the Grand Trunk Pacific may have made an erroneous account and produced that account and subsequently asked to have it withdrawn. That happens every day in the ordinary course of business. What will be lost to the country? The Grand Trunk Pacific will not obtain the $162,000 unless they produce vouchers and it is the vouchers for this amount which has not been paid that the hon. gentlemen are asking for. These vouchers will have to be produced by the Grand Trunk if the company asks for that money, and if they do not ask for the money we do not want the vouchers.

The hon. member brings forward the statement of Mr. Walker. He is absolutely a side issue. He might probably have acted more politely by communicating with the Public Accounts Committee and saying that he could not attend for such and such a reason; he did not show due deference to the committee; he was not courteous, but what has Mr. Walker to do with this question? The Public Accounts Committee did not intend to allow an investigation of the subject; Mr. Walker could not produce the vouchers; he could not show anything; he could simply say that this government, through its officials, did not act in complicity with the Grand Trunk Pacific and allow a fraud to be perpetrated by any company, if fraud was intended, and I do not say it was.

My hon. friend has not been fair in his treatment of the case. How could he presume fraud? In the absence of evidence of bad intention good intention must always be presumed. We cannot accuse a man of crime, forgery, or any of the felonies alleged by my hon. friend in an off-hand fashion; we must show that malice was intended and the Criminal Code and even common sense will not allow us to go so far as to presume anything of the kind. No intent of fraud is shown on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I do not think my hon. friend had any right to arraign the Grand Trunk Pacific and say that it had been guilty of any crime, or had any evil intentions or made any attempt on the coffers of this country. I think he was unfair in his treatment of the Grand Trunk Pacific as in his treatment of the government, and he goes too far when he asks for an investigation of a thing that never happened. He has no right to ask us to find the motive which prompted the government to do a good action. If I do not place my hand in my neighbour's pocket there is no reason why I should be questioned; I do not do it because I know it is not right, and I have nothing to answer. The members of the Public Accounts Committee simply told the hon. gentlemen, asking to have that investigation, that the government, through its officials, had acted wisely and that neither he nor any member had any right to ask why they had been actuated by those good motives.

I think that the discussion of this question has gone far enough. I rose merely because I wanted to show that we who have

been present in the committee simply desired to have the truth brought out and only the truth. We do not want any travelling beyond the realms of truth. We do not want to go into presumptions and possibilities and probabilities, and discover what might have been or what might not have been wrong in other accounts not before us. If there had been any other accounts wrong the Public Accounts Committee would have allowed my hon. friend to investigate and discover the wrong, but the Public Accounts Committee, as I understood their wishes the other day, had no intention of allowing my hon. friend to go forward and travel through any kind of questions that are not relevant, that could serve no purpose except to arrive at the conclusion at which he arrived himself—and he arrived at that conclusion without investigation; he solved this mythical problem and decided that an attempt at fraud was committed by the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have some misgivings about the conclusions he has drawn in reference to that, but if he is satisfied with drawing those conclusions let him do so.

I shall now ask leave to move the following amendment:

That all the words after 'that' when it appears the first time in the proposed motion, be struck out and the following added instead thereof.

The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company presented to the government certain claims for expenditures on account of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway for the purpose of receiving payment for the same out of the proceeds of the company's securities, guaranteed by the government, deposited to the credit of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General;

That objection having been taken to the claim by the government on the ground that part of the moneys were not properly chargeable to the cost of construction of the said railway the claims were thereupon withdrawn by the company;

That inasmuch as no money was paid by the government in respect of such claims, either out of the fund referred to or out of any other public fund, there is nothing before the Committee on Public Accounts requiring any inquiry respecting the said claims.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, were it not for the reason that I am under contract with my hon. friend the chief whip of the Conservative party of the House of Commons, I would be tempted to make some extended observations in reply to the remarks of my hon. friend for St. Antoine division, Montreal (Mr. Ames).

Mr. LENNOX. Don't restrain yourself.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have some regard for my hon. friend for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), who I understand is to take the floor, and I am anxious to fulfil my part of the contract so that he may have the opportunity of making his speech at the earliest possible moment. That is my apology for the few remarks I have to make. My hon. friend from St. Antoine division has treated us to another of those frock-coat orations which he is in the habit of delivering to this House from time to time, which are mere repetitions of what has taken place in the Public Accounts Committee in the last few weeks; and the absolute want of interest shown in the observations of my hon. friend this afternoon is proof positive that both the House and the country are becoming weary of the efforts of the hon. gentleman to instruct the people of this country. Of course we are not all as fortunate as my hon. friend. We are not all walking around the streets and the corridors and appearing in the committee rooms and pounding our breasts and thanking the gods that we are not as other men are. With regard to the transaction immediately before the House, I have this to say, that no member of the Public Accounts Committee has been more faithful in his attendance on that committee than I have been; I have watched every detail of this matter since it started, and there is absolutely nothing in the position taken by our hon. friends opposite. The question between them and this side of the House is a perfectly clear one. Our hon. friends opposite seem to be very much annoyed that the government refused to entertain a claim which my hon. friend from St. Antoine with his usual accuracy says is $162,000. In that statement my hon. friend is about as accurate as he usually is. When I tell the House that he is only about $60,000 out of the way hon. members will not be surprised, knowing that the statement comes from that hon. gentleman. Now, the position which I take as a member of the Public Accounts Committee and which I hope my associates on this side of the House on that committee will take, is this, that any expenditure of public money made by the government of this country is an expenditure to be inquired into in every possible detail by that committee, but that it has no right to waste its time inquiring into claims that some people may have against the government until such time as those claims are presented, approved, and paid by the government. I am not satisfied that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for St. Anne's division (Mr. J. C. Walsh) makes the position I desire to take on this question absolutely clear, and therefore I desire to move in amendment to the amendment, seconded by Mr. Ross:

That the amendment be amended by adding the following: That this House will at all times insist on its right to make, through its committees, the fullest investigation of all public expenditures, but does not deem it necessary or proper to authorize the Committee on Public Accounts to enforce the production of papers that do not relate to any payment of public money.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have an amendment and an amendment to the am-

endment indicates, I think, pretty fully the position in which the government find themselves. Driven from post to pillar, from one position to another, they are compelled to place in the hands of one hon. gentleman an amendment, and in the hands of another an amendment to the amendment, in the hope that in the midst of the confusion they may possibly escape. That idea is borne out by the diversity of arguments, if we can dignify them by the name of arguments, which have been presented by the various gentlemen who have come to the support of the government-arguments which are not directed to the point at issue, but are an effort, evidently concerted, to lead away for the time being, if they possibly can, the attention of the members from the real issue in the case. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat made the statement that what we have to investigate in the Public Accounts Committee are moneys that have actually been paid and that beyond that we should not go. That is a remarkable proposition in face of the fact that not only was an account presented but that account had been certified by large contractors with whom this government is connected at the present time, and with whom it is going to be connected for years to come. That was certified by the most important officials of that company to be correct; that was in the hands of the government for over a month and was passed upon by an official whom these hon. gentlemen are putting forward to-day as an example of an honest and efficient officer, namely Mr. Schreiber. I shall have a word or two to say on that point further on. It will be difficult for the people to understand how an official in an important department, knowing that the government auditor had rejected certain items in an account, could have undertaken to certify that that account was correct. And then when we are seeking to investigate this matter, we are to be confined purely to the question as to how much the government did pay and are not to be allowed to inquire whether the official, who certified to a fradulent account, acted honestly or dishonestly. The hon. gentleman says that the House is weary of these efforts of the hon. member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames). No doubt the supporters of the government in the Public Accounts Committee are very weary of the efforts of my hon. friend, because from day to day he and others on this side are making things a little too hot for the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) and others supporting the government. I do not think I need say much about the other hon. gentleman for it appears I have two to answer. I am particularly honoured in that regard.

Mr. TAYLOR. Double barrelled.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, but the weapon is not as dangerous as some of the arms which are put into the hands of our volunteers. I do not think I would do the hon. gentleman any injustice if I were to say he has not given the matter much consideration. An hon. gentleman who could say that the amount involved was only $160 has evidently not gone very deeply into the matter, and so I might pass over his remarks without comment, were I not led to inquire what was the parentage of the very well worded and thoughtful resolution which he introduced. I think I would not have to go very far out of the government ranks for the draftsman of this resolution; and although it seems to come from an innocent source, it points to the argument that the government are casting about and trying by the most skilful devices and by the most skilfully worded resolutions to draw the attention of the public from the real issue. What is involved in the matter before the House? There is involved the custody and the control and direction of the public records of this country. It involves the question whether the public affairs of this country are to be honestly recorded and whether these records are to be inviolate or to be at the mercy of those who choose to destroy them and rob the people of what they are entitled to at the hands of the government. The documents in question were not merely documents prepared by the Grand Trunk Pacific. They were documents placed in the custody of the government, which were rejected by Mr. Shannon, a government official, which were then submitted to the Department of Railways, which were accepted and certified to by the Department of Railways, notwithstanding Mr. Shannon's rejection, which remained in the custody of the government for a month, and which afterwards were allowed to be taken away and the main portion of them destroyed by the Grand Trunk Pacific. Just examine this matter for a moment. Would any government in the civilized world, under similar conditions, after certain documents had been put in its custody, dare to destroy them? This government has transgressed the constitutional rules of government to a great extent. I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if those documents had been filed with his department, and passed upon by his department, would he have dared to destroy them? If he would not dare to destroy them himself, if the government dared not destroy them, how could the government honestly give them into the hands of a railway company and allow that company to destroy them? What the government dared not do directly, they did indirectly by placing these in the hands of the railway company.

Another important question, which the government supporters are endeavouring to get away from is this. In the Public Accounts Committee, the supporters of the government do not wait for the person whose

accounts are being investigated to refuse to produce any document that may be asked for, but they take the position that before any such refusal is given they will themselves object to the production of such documents. So eager are these representatives of the people to protect the corporations that they make objections even when none are made by those directly interested. That is what was done in this connection. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken moved for a subpœna. He got it and the subpœna directed that certain papers should be produced. But when the matter came up again, the supporters of the government did not wait for the railway company to object but moved a resolution that Mr. Walker should not be permitted to produce the papers, and consequently instructions were sent him not to bring them. That was the course taken by those hon. gentlemen, and then they stand up here and vie with each other in lauding the honesty of Mr. Schreiber. But nobody on this side has attacked Mr. Schreiber. Mr. Schreiber, however has done that which in the eyes of the country, was wrong, and he is upon trial at present, and we are trying to ascertain whether or not he was negligent, honest or dishonest.

It is a matter that is not to be overlooked, that while Mr. Schreiber says he was guided by the instructions of the Justice Department in allowing the items, Mr. Shannon, who opposed the items before they came to Mr. Schreiber, was also acting under the guidance of the Justice Department. Is it not a matter to demand our careful consideration when we find that Mr. Shannon, acting as he swears under the instructions and guidance of the Minister of Justice, was compelled to reject these accounts, yet, when they have passed Mr. Shannon and come to another gentleman who is acting under exactly the same advice that gentleman says, that acting under this advice he was compelled to pass the account. The public record when it was produced showed what was the deliberate opinion of the Minister of Justice. Hon. gentlemen opposite, seeking something to talk about, laud Mr. Schreiber as a marvellously honest man. And they tell us that we need not investigate the circumstances of the refusal to pay this money or attempt to ascertain the bona fides of these transactions. When these hon. gentlemen laud Mr. Schreiber let it be well understood that nobody is attacking that gentleman's honesty. But we have not forgotten, and are not likely to forget, that if you search the public records of the Treasury Board overrulings in this country in which the former Auditor General was on one side and Mr. Schreiber on the other, you will probably not find one case but the Auditor General was standing for the people and Mr. Schreiber for the monopolist or contractor or grafter who was trying to acquire the moneys of this country. I need not go over the instances, but I may remind the House of the case of Corry & Laverdure. Where was Mr. Schreiber in that case? On the side of the contractors against the people whose rights were upheld by the Auditor General. Take the more recent and even more glaring case, involving thousands of dollars of the Farran's Point canal and M. P. Davis. Where was Mr. Schreiber in that case? On the side of the man who was taking the money of this country dishonestly, and on the other side, on the side of the people, was the Auditor General. And where is Mr. Schreiber to-day? Why, he is the pet of the government And where is the former Auditor General? He is out of office. And Mr. Shannon who rejected these accounts of which we are speaking and who was overruled by Mr. Schreiber—where is he? He stood by the people and by the opinion of the Minister of Justice. He was right, and he followed up the matter until he got the Minister of Finance to finally decide against these items. And Mr. Shannon is no longer in the department, while Mr. Schreiber is again in control.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) a question? Is he not aware that Mr. Shannon since he made this report has been promoted to a better position, at a higher salary?

Mr. LENNOX. I am not. I am aware that Mr. Shannon is in the employ of the government but he is no longer auditor—he is no longer the watch-dog of the interests of the people of this country and that is the important point.

Mr. CARVELL. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Where is the evidence that Mr. Shannon acted under the direction of the Minister of Justice?

Mr. LENNOX. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) was not paying so much attention to the real issue in the committee as he might be. The evidence is that of a witness who stated the other day that Mr. Shannon, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance were in consultation with regard to this matter. I would not want to rob the Minister of Finance of one tittle of the applause to which he is entitled. I recognize to the fullest extent the absolute honesty of the Minister of Finance in the matter. But I think enough of the Minister of Finance to believe that he does not need any bouquets from the government supporters as tributes to his honesty. These hon. gentlemen on the other side seem to think that as soon as one speck of honesty

shows in any department it is a manifestation at which they should throw up their hats and shout for joy. The conditions are bad enough, but still I think it is a little unseemly, when it is shown that the Minister of Finance has been honest in this transaction, that hon. gentlemen opposite should treat as an exceptional circumstance and one that should be shouted from the house-tops as a signal victory for their side. What are the circumstances? The Minister of Finance, no doubt, would have acted honestly in this matter of his own motion, had the case come to his knowledge. But it might never have come to his knowledge had that amity and goodwill existed between Mr. Courtney and Mr. Schreiber which exists among some of the officials of the government. So we can well understand that Mr. Courtney having knowledge that Mr. Shannon had rejected this item and that Mr. Schreiber had allowed it, was on the alert. And, even if the Minister of Finance had not been called in at all, it is probably that Mr. Courtney, the Deputy Minister of Finance, and Mr. Shannon would have blocked the way. It is a pity, it is something that I really regret, to see hon. gentlemen on the other side, because of the dismal instances of dishonesty in the various departments, when they find one little patch of light in the darkness driven to make a great display over it and laud as something exceptional and peculiar the honesty of the Minister of Finance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the matter can be boiled down in very condensed form. Are we or are we not to have public records in this country intact and safe? We had it the other day that one minister decided that there should be no public records of public transactions. He decided that for months and months during the progress of the important Insurance Commission, preservation of the facts was to be left to the uncertain record of memory alone. Then we have in the same department, the unfortunate loss of documents in reference to Judge Henderson. That cannot be avoided. Then, in reference to the purchase of the sub-target gun machine, we have, as will be shown before long, a second agreement falsely reciting the first agreement. Then, we have the case in the Public Accounts Committee to-day of orders in council falsely reciting former orders in council and mistakenly reciting the facts on which a third order in council is based. We have such circumstances as these all along the line. What we want to know is this, must the people come to the conclusion that a document may come into the custody of the servants of the people, may remain there for months, may be identified, passed upon—rejected if you will—and then may be handed out to be destroyed when the government themselves would not dare to destroy it. That is the great issue that is before the people, and that is the important issue, even if we wiped this transaction out of sight altogether. Shall we have honest records, honestly kept and faithfully preserved by the representatives of the people.

Mr. LENNOX.

House divided on amendment to the amendment.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beland,
Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carrier,
Carvell
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Cyr,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin (Nicolet),
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Galliher
Gauvreau,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Grant,
Greenway,
Hall,
Harty,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Lavergne (Montmagny).
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud.
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Robitaille,
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rousseau,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford).
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—114.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clare,
Clements,
Crocket,
Elson,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Gunn,
Haggart,
Herron,
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Macdonell,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin, (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Morin,
Paquet,
Perley,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilmot,
Worthington.—49.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
McColl,	Ward,
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),	Monk,
Gervais,	Borden (Carleton),
Savoie,	Wilson,
Belcourt,	Marshall,
Tobin,	MacLaren,
Macpherson,	Foster,
Sifton,	Northrup,
Adamson,	Seagram,
Bickerdike,	Osler,
Bole,	Henderson,
Boyer,	Leonard,
Devlin (Wright),	Hughes (Victoria),
Roche (Halifax),	Wright (Muskoka),
Guthrie,	Pringle,
Geoffrion,	Cockshutt,
Beauparlant,	Porter,
Bourbonnais,	Daniel,
Hunt,	Boyce,
Fortier,	Lewis,
Gladu.	Forget.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the motion as amended.

Mr. SPROULE. I merely wish to draw your attention to the fact that the mover and seconder of the first amendment voted afterwards against their own motion.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

SUPPLY—COLD STORAGE SYSTEM.

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

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, before going into Committee of Supply, I beg to move the following amendment :

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out and the following words substituted therefor :

It is the immediate duty of the government to take such steps as are necessary to thoroughly ensure, so far as practicable, the safe transportation of Canadian perishable food products from the point of production to their ultimate market.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have to call your attention to the fact that the hon. member (Mr. Smith) who moved this motion has already on the order paper a motion to the same effect. At page 13 of the order paper of this date there is the following notice of motion by Mr. Smith (Wentworth) :

January 28—Mr. Smith (Wentworth)—Proposed resolution—That it is the duty of the government——

And further, that it is the duty of the government to take such steps as will ensure that all its regulations shall be carried fully into effect.

I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, whether or not this is not practically the same motion and if so whether a motion covering practically the same subject can be moved at this time ?

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I would draw your attention to the fact that the motion is not the same. It may be dealing with the same subject, but you cannot get over the fact that it is not only the right but the duty of the opposition to have grievances redressed or to present their views upon any question before this House on the motion to go into Committee of Supply regardless of whether a motion may be on the order paper or not. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is aware of the fact that there is no opportunity to reach and discuss any motion on the order paper before the prorogation of parliament, but we have to deal with these questions every time we go into supply because that is the only opportunity we have of presenting our views to the House and the public. Therefore we have a right in my judgment to avail ourselves of this opportunity and I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to keep that in mind when giving your ruling.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. This subject is much wider than that covered by the motion on the order paper. That only deals with transportation on the sea ; this covers transportation on land and sea.

Mr. SPEAKER. It being so close to six o'clock I will call it six o'clock and give my ruling on the matter after dinner.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The decision of Mr. Speaker on the question of order raised at six o'clock is:

The motion on the order paper in the name of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) purports on its face to deal mainly, if not entirely, with regulations and appliances as to cold storage, cold air and ventilating chambers in vessels.

The motion now submitted by the same hon. member, by way of amendment to the motion that the Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, is one dealing with the wide and general question of the safe transportation of Canadian perishable food products from the point of production to their ultimate market.

I think this is not the same question, and does not anticipate a question already appointed for consideration by the House; I therefore rule that it is in order.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). This is a subject of very great importance to the very large class of people in this country engaged in agriculture, as well as to the country at large. The motion deals with perishable food products. Our annual export of these perishable food products amount to over $50,000,000. Their value depends very largely, being perishable, upon their safe transportation from the point of production to the ultimate market. No matter how valuable they may be when produced, unless they are carried to the market safely, that value is very materially reduced. My contention is that the government, during the past number of years, have not taken all the steps which they might have taken to ensure this safe transportation. These products consist chiefly of four or five articles. First of all, meats; secondly, cheese (the greatest in value, being about one-half the whole); third, butter; fourth, fruits of various kinds. These are all products that are more or less concentrated in form. They are the most valuable products, the products which agricultural experts tell the farmers of this country are the products which they ought to grow. They are the products which produce, not only the greatest amount of value from a given number of acres of land, but which take from the land the least amount of nutriment, that exhaust the farms of the country to the least possible extent. Therefore, there are many reasons why this is one of the most important interests in the country—the production of these perishable products for export. They are carried by rail from the point of production to the ship's side, a journey of one or two days. They are then carried across the ocean, a journey of ten or twelve days, and then they are a certain length of time in getting into the hands of the consumer. I have always laid the greatest stress upon the journey across the ocean, because it consumes the greater length of time. It would be of very little use to make sure that the goods were delivered to the ship's side in good condition, if the ten or twelve days' journey across the ocean spoiled them; and it would be of very little use to make provision for their safe handling on the other side for the short time they would be there in getting into the hands of the consumer, if, in the journey across the ocean, they were not properly cared for. Consequently, I have always laid the greatest stress on this portion of the journey, although the journey from the point of production to the ship's side, for the length of time it takes, is equally important.

Originally, these products were all carried practically in one way; they were carried in box cars to the ship's side, and in unventilated chambers or holds of the vessels across the ocean. This was the condition many years ago, and at that time and up to within a very few years of the present day, an enormous loss was sustained on these products. Professor Robertson pointed out, before the Agricultural Committee, about three or four years ago that the loss upon cheese, of which we export about $25,000,000 worth annually, would be about two and a half million dollars in the following year on account of the lack of ventilation in the ships' chambers where the cheese was carried. A careful study of the figures next year proved his estimate to be approximately correct, that we had in that year a loss of approximately two and a half million dollars in the value of the cheese exported from Canada on account of the bad ventilation in the ships. I pointed out in this House, as far back as seven years ago, and showed from statistics, which were corroborated by statistics collected by Professor Robertson and read before the Agricultural Committee, that the loss on apples was not less than 25 per cent, which, as the value of a barrel of apples is more than $2, would amount to at least $1,000,000 a year. This made at least three and a half million dollars that was being wasted at that time on these two products alone. Since that time, I am free to admit and glad to admit, much improvement has been made in the means of transportation on sea, due, I believe, almost, if not quite, entirely to the agitation in this House and

out of this House by those interested in this subject. Later on, when this agitation gained force, and the steamship companies took some cognizance of it, some ventilation was provided. That ventilation I contend is to-day, after all these years, still extremely inadequate. I have always maintained that if the ship's holds and chambers were properly and thoroughly ventilated, and the air in those chambers was made of the same temperature as that of the ocean air outside, which could be done easily and cheaply, with practically no expense and at no increased cost to the shipper, we could carry our cheese and winter apples across the ocean in perfect, safe and sound condition without any extra expense or charges to the shipper or the government for the ventilation, the cool air or cold storage for these products. At last—and I wish to thank the minister for this—we have the proofs in our hands that this would be, and should be, and can be the case. I have asked that we should have thermograph records on these boats carrying these perishable products, in all the chambers, in order that we might ascertain with certainty whether on the steamers on which they had fans the fans were going or not, and whether on those that had not fans the temperature was not so high as to damage and destroy the fruit. At last we have a considerable number of those records, and from these records it is not difficult to demonstrate that there is a vast deal of difference between the ships that are ventilated and those that are not ventilated, and that there is a vast deal of difference between the holds and chambers that are ventilated and those that are not ventilated, although they pretend to be, on the same steamer. That is the reason why I have always maintained, and maintain still, that the only way we can possibly secure the safe transportation of these products is for the government of this country to make regulations, and to see that these regulations are enforced, requiring that the temperatures in all these chambers for carrying perishable products across the ocean shall be maintained at the temperature of the ocean surrounding the ship. If that is done, we need not go to the expense of $100,000 for the purpose of fitting up cooled chambers in the ships. I want, first of all, to demonstrate what I contend, that in some of these ships the temperature in one chamber is vastly different from what it is in another. It should not be so, it is not necessary to be so, and at no expense either to the government or the shipper this could be corrected. I will give the dates of sailing from Montreal and three temperatures on each ship—the first, forty-eight hours after the ship leaves port; the second, the lowest point reached on the voyage; and the third, immediately before the ship is unloaded:

Date.	Name of Steamer.	Temperature
Aug. 3..	Virginian	68—60—68
" 4..	Lake Champlain	62—52—54
" 11..	The Ottawa	64—64—68
" 11..	"	62—57—60
Sept. 1..	Lake Manitoba	61—58—60
" 1..	" "	55—48—59
" 15..	Lake Champlain	62—52—57
" 15..	" "	48—42—50
" 21..	Ionian	70—58—65
" 21..	"	70—54—58
" 22..	Dominion	68—61—64
" 22..	"	60—49—57
Oct. 14..	Kensington	44—42—48
" 14..	"	45—34—35
May 26..	Englishman	68—66—73
" 26..	Kensington	58—54—56
July 7..	Englishman	80—83—86
" 7..	Sardinian	57—52—61
Aug. 18.	Englishman	80—64—74
" 18.	Dominion	64—58—62
" 17..	Victorian	62—58—62
July 28..	Monfort	60—56—62
" 28..	"	64—63—66
Sept. 20..	Pretorian	75—68—78
" 20..	"	72—60—64
June 7..	Virginian	48—45—52
" 7..	"	63—51—58
" 5..	Dominion	67—58—64
" 5..	"	68—66—69
" 14..	Tunisian	61—60—66
" 14..	Lake Manitoba	57—52—56

These figures show a difference in some cases of as much as 20 degrees; in one of the chambers winter apples or cheese would go across the ocean in perfect safety while in another chamber in the same ship they would be entirely spoiled. Think of perishables being carried across the ocean in a temperature of 80 degrees, as this record shows was the case in two instances. The results would be that the value of the cargo would be reduced 25 per cent if not 50 per cent, and the loss would ultimately fall on the producer in this country. I contend that this was entirely and absolutely unnecessary, and that without any expense the government could provide regulations, and see that these regulations were enforced, requiring every one of these chambers to be properly ventilated and the cargo carried at the temperature of the surrounding ocean air, which would have been perfectly suitable to the carrying of these two articles, cheese and apples. I might point out that at a later date the Minister of Agriculture came before this House and asked for a vote of $100,000 for the purpose of installing in some of these ships what is called a cool air plant, that is, a plant that would produce a cool temperature. The $100,000 was freely granted. It was shown then that the temperatures in the unventilated holds were so bad that these perishable products could not be carried safely, and it was pointed out that it was necessary to do something. I urged then

on the minister that what was most necessary was to insure that these chambers should be ventilated, so that the temperature in them would be brought to the temperature of the surrounding ocean air, which would not cost this country one cent. The minister contended that it was necessary to put in this cool air plant. I voted for it willingly, on the ground that even if it did cost the country $100,000, we would then be sure at any rate of having cool air provided in these chambers, so that these perishable products would be carried safely. But I pointed out that the shipper would probably be charged a largely increased rate for carrying in these cool air chambers—which I wish to emphasize are not cold storage chambers—while in all probability the same result could be achieved by securing the ventilation of the ordinary chambers of the vessels. The minister stated at that time that there would be no extra charge for carrying the products in these cool air chambers; but we find that there is an extra charge of from 20 to 40 per cent over the ordinary freight rates. Up to the present time, no shipper can be sure of getting a chamber properly ventilated. Many have paid this extra charge, in order to get the advantage of something which they might have obtained by the ventilation of the chambers without any extra charge. Look at the loss this is to the shippers. They pay from 20 to 40 per cent extra freight for the purpose of securing what they could have secured without paying anything extra; and, moreover, a very large number of those chambers are not ventilated. Some of them do not pretend to be ventilated, while some of them are supposed to be ventilated by what is called a ventilating shaft, which is merely a small chimney from the chamber to the outer air on deck. This is practically of no use. If there were some inlet for the air, as there is in a house through the chinks of the windows and doors, there would be some ventilation by this chimney; but without that, in a ship surrounded by water, there is no ingress for the air, so that that sort of ventilation is practically of no use whatever. Then, we have another system of ventilation called the cowl system. This is a very good system while the ship is in motion. It is the system installed in the Dominion Express cars that carry our fruits to distant markets, and for that purpose it is an excellent system, the air being carried down a duct to the bottom of the car, and then being forced by pressure up through the fruit and going through an outlet at the top. If the shafts attached to these cowls were fitted as they are on the cars, this would be a fairly good system when the ship is in motion; but when the ship is standing at the dock loading or unloading, there is no ventilation.

And if it should transpire, as probably it

does sometimes, that the wind is blowing with the vessel at as rapid a rate as the vessel is going, there would then be no ventilation. The only absolute thorough system is the artificial system—driving air into the chamber or sucking it out by fans driven by steam or other means. We have only that in a few of the ships, and the records show that in many of these chambers, in crossing the ocean, even in the hottest months of the year, the temperature was practically 60 and that only for a very short time in the hottest months does it ever reach 65. In nearly all the ventilated steamers, in the hottest months, it never reaches 60, and for ten months it rarely goes above 65. I think for nine months rarely above 50. These are all temperatures nearly as good as those in the chambers fitted up by the cool air plant. With the exception of a very short interval these chambers maintain by ventilation temperature equally as good as those provided with cool air plants. Let me read some comparisons of ventilation versus cold air.

Rec. No.	Name of Str.	Date.	Temp.
11. Vent	'Montfort,'	June 16,	3 d. below 50 9 d. below 60

Record number, 11. Vent.
Names of steamer, 'Fontfort.'
Date, June 16.
Temperature, 3 days below 50; 9 days below 60.

On the same steamer in a chamber that was provided with cold air at an expense of from 20 to 40 per cent additional freight, the temperature never ran below 50 and the average was 60. In other words the chamber ventilated was cooler than the chamber fitted out with cold air provided at an expense of $100,000 by this government, and 20 to 40 per cent additional freight to the shippers.

On September 29 the 'Kildona' record showed in one chamber, a ventilated chamber, a temperature 54 to 52, 54; and in another chamber provided with an expensive cold air plant, a temperature of 54, 52, 50, or practically the same. Only when we reached the other side there was a difference of four degrees.

The 'Lake Champlain' June 30 in a ventilated chamber the temperature was 60, 54, 57. In cold air chamber on the 'Monmouth' on June 30 the temperature was 66, 56, 60. On the 'Latona' in a cold air chamber on the same day the temperature was 66, 50, 56. In other words the ventilated chamber on the 'Lake Champlain' was cooler than the cool air chamber fitted out at heavy expense on the other two boats crossing on the same day.

The 'Sardinian,' with ventilated chamber, on July 7, the temperature was 60, 52, 61; and in the Cervona, fitted with cold air, on the same day the temperatures were 59, 56, 53, or just about the same average.

'Mount Royal,' ventilated chamber, July 24, 67, 54, 58; The 'Kildona,' ventilated

chamber, July 21, 67, 57, 64; and the 'Kildona' with cold air chamber July 21, 61, 58, 56.

I do not say that these were the temperatures which all the boats maintained that had cold air, but these were some of them. There were a number of them that carried goods at a lower temperature. What I wish to point out is either one thing or the other —either the temperatures I have read were too high, and if they were too high, it should have been provided by government regulations that they should not have been so high; or if they were not too high, there was no necessity for cool air chambers at all, because ventilated chambers gave exactly the same results.

Most of these perishable products are carried across in one or other of these steamers. Only a very small portion is carried in cold storage, which I have not spoken of yet. Out of our total exports of over $50,000,000, only $6,000,000, is carried in cold storage. Over $45,000,000 are carried on an average in these chambers which, if properly ventilated, would provide all that is necessary. Even yet, only a very small portion is carried in the cool air chambers provided at such expense. In the cool air chambers of this last year, 394,000 packages were carried. In chambers ventilated and not ventilated, there were carried 1,801,500 packages or about four times as much were carried outside the cool air chambers as in them. Many of the shippers no doubt take the chance that they would catch a ventilated vessel and they probably know which vessels usually carry these goods in properly ventilated chambers. They take the chances of carrying them in these chambers rather than pay the extra freight charged for carrying them in cool air chambers. I do not say that cool air chambers are not at all necessary. A shipper may desire to have his goods carried at 40 degrees in July and be willing to pay the extra price, but he cannot be sure that they will be carried at 40 or any other temperature in these cool air chambers, so that he does not know whether he is going to get that temperature at all or not. That is the main contention I have to make, namely, that by government regulation these chambers, whether ventilated or cool air, or cold storage, might be maintained at a temperature suitable to carry safely to market these perishable food products.

The other method of carrying goods is in cold storage. Cold storage is used for the carriage of our butter which requires to be carried at a temperature below freezing point, and also for our fruits which require to be carried at a temperature as close to and above freezing point as is safe. I am bound to say that now most of the steamers carrying butter in cold storage are carrying it at a temperature below freezing point. The minister has said in his report at one time that it should be carried at 10, and at another time at 20. I am not going to cavil about the exact temperature. If the butter is carried below freezing point, I dare say it is not so very bad after all. In some of the chambers, however, the goods were carried above freezing point though very close to it, and I am not going to quarrel about that at present. But that is an easy matter which ought to have been arranged seven or eight years ago instead of only at present. In carrying butter all the man in charge of the plant has to do is to see that he gets it below freezing point. Whether he gets it down to 10, 20, or 30, he is pretty safe and any kind of a man can manage that. But when it comes to fruit, the case is entirely different, yet these men who have charge of the plants seem to think that all they have to do, in carrying fruit, is to carry it above the freezing point. If they get butter below the freezing point all right; and if they get fruit above the freezing point, that is equally all right, but anybody who knows anything about carrying fruit in cold storage knows that to obtain the best results it must be carried as close to freezing point as is safe. A proper cold storage chamber can be kept at an even temperature practically within one degree. It is idle to say that it is necessary that the temperature should fluctate 3, 4, 5, 10, or 15 degrees as it does in some of these chambers. Any one who is acquainted with cold storage knows that that is not satisfactory and that the goods can be carried at an absolutely even temperature for weeks and months. The temperature at which fruits should be carried is immediately above freezing point. Let us examine some of these temperatures and see at what temperature the fruit is carried.

Record 128, 'Marina,' pears and plums, 38-42-44-45.
Record 253, 'Tunisian,' fruit, 50-44-47-45.
Record 259, 'Kensington,' fruit, 50-38-40.
Record 276, 'Dominion,' apples and boxed meats, 50-40-38.
Record 412, 'Sicilian,' fruit, 42-37-40-50.
Record 433, 'Ionian,' fruit, 50-40-42.
Record 99, 'Marina,' apples, 60-40-38-44-36.
Record, 104, 'Mongolian,' United States fruit, 60-50-40-41.
Record 129, 'Marina,' apples, 40-32-40-38.
Record 136, 'Athena,' fruit, 32-38-36-38-40-36.

In many of these cases, the temperature jumped up and down four or five degrees or more, and, in many of them, for a large portion of the journey—and not the first portion either—the temperature was from five to ten degrees higher than it ought to have been. I do not wish to imply that this was the case in all the boats. The temperatures in most of the boats were good, but here are a number of cases which I have quoted in which the temperatures were entirely wrong. Now Mr. McNeil, in the committee the other day, said that shippers ought to have confidence. But how can a shipper have confidence when he does not

know, when he ships his fruit, that the temperature will not be ten or fifteen degrees higher than it ought to be? He may send off two or three shipments that go through all right. But if, on the third or fourth shipment, the fruit is carried at a temperature that damages it materially, he will probably lose more than he gained on his previous shipments. If these wrong temperatures were unavoidable, shippers might be willing to take some chances, or they might be reconciled to doing what they feel compelled to do now—not ship at all. At the inception of the shipping in cold storage, we had a fairly liberal quantity of fruit shipped—largely for experimental purposes of course; but to-day the whole quantity of tender fruit shipped last season, was 35,000 packages, a large proportion of which was United States fruit. And as to the United States fruits, we know that they can be put in the hold of the vessel or in these unventilated chambers without suffering much injury. They are largely California plums and peaches, and dealers know that these can be put on the shelves and kept for two or three weeks without rotting. It is not necessary to have the finest system of cold storage for this kind of fruits. Of the remainder the greater portion was apples, which, even if placed in a properly ventilated chamber, would probably have gone over in fair condition. I had an experience myself which illustrates this. I shipped three cars of summer apples. One car happened to be put in a chamber that was not a cold storage chamber, while the other went into cold storage. But the man who sold them on the other side said that one was just as good as the other. In other words, the temperature maintained outside the cold storage chamber was just as good as that within the chamber.

Now, the minister may object, and may ask: How are you going to regulate these temperatures? Well, there are many ways of doing it. In the first place a large number of these cold storage chambers and cool air chambers were put in with government money, that is, half the cost of installation was paid by the government. The minister had an opportunity, when granting this money, to make regulations such as he is making now with regard to his cold storage warehouses on land. He is learning wisdom by experience. He has discovered that it is possible to make regulations that will cover not merely two or three years while the subsidies are being paid, but all time to come. The hon. minister missed this golden opportunity in the case of these vessels. Then, again, we are paying to-day subsidies of about $1,000,000 a year for ships to come to our ports. When granting these subsidies, it would not be difficult to insert a clause that the perishable products carried in the cold storage chambers shall be carried at temperature named by the government, or that these ships shall be ventilated according to regulations made by the government, otherwise the subsidy shall not be paid. That is another way. In addition to that, I wish to point out that we have in our statute-books a law that provides that no ship can leave any port in Canada—that is no ship can get her clearance papers—if she carries cattle, until the government inspector has been aboard and inspected the ship to see that the regulations made under Act of this parliament are carried out. In the same way, provision might be made that no ship shall get her clearance papers or touch at our ports unless the company owning that ship is ready to submit to the regulations made by the government. These regulations do not need to be onerous. The regulations with regard to ventilation would simply require these ships to do what all of them pretend to do now, and some of them actually carry out. If the shippers in the west to-day could have a guarantee from the steamship company that their fruit would be carried at a certain temperature desired by the shipper, there would be a large quantity of our fruits offered for transportation. There is no reason why we should not ship peaches to the old country. We have peaches that could be carried and delivered in that market in perfect condition. Scores of carloads could be sent to the English market, and sold at three or four times the profit that is gained in Canada, if the cold storage system were what it ought to be. We can load a car at a point on the Niagara peninsula at six o'clock in the evening, transport it to Quebec and have it put in the cold storage chamber before twenty-four hours have elapsed. That fruit could be landed in the Liverpool market within six days from that time. And, if the cold storage on these ships was what the shippers desired, and if the steamship company would guarantee the temperature as they ought, or if this government would guarantee the temperature, this fruit would be shipped and a lot of money would be turned into the pockets of the people of this country. The problem is an easy and simple one, and I maintain that it ought to be dealt with in an energetic manner by the government. The thing can be done, and it does not need a vote of $100,000 a year from this parliament, either; the minister does not need to ask for a single cent more than is already voted. It is only necessary that he should provide these regulations and insist upon their enforcement.

Now I want to point out that the government or somebody probably with the knowledge of the minister, has actually provided in some of these contracts with the steamships companies, that they should be subject to regulation. Now what would you expect following that? Would you not expect the government to issue regulations?

M. E. D. SMITH.

They have provided in most of the contracts last year that they are subject to regulations. The whole year has gone by, and not a regulation has been issued. In order to make sure of this, I asked for a return showing what regulations have been issued, and I want to read that return because it is very brief, it is a curiosity :

Return to an order of the House calling for a copy of all regulations submitted by the government to Trans-atlantic steamship companies for their guidance in regard to the storage of perishable products, or temperatures to be maintained in cold storage, or cold air chambers, or ventilation required in ordinary storage chambers on their steamships.

The contracts entered into by the Department of Agriculture with the Trans-atlantic steamship companies have long since expired, and there are no such regulations as are called for by this order in existence so far as that department is concerned.

Now if that is not an acknowledgment of impotency beyond description, I would like to know what it is. Here we have actually provided in a few contracts that regulations may be made, but so utterly negligent and careless of the matter have this government been that they have not made any regulations at all. The Minister of Trade and Commerce by inserting that clause in these contracts has admitted that it is necessary, and why has it not been done ? Simply because it would not bring to the minister any applause, perhaps. When he comes down to this House and asks for $100,000 it sounds big, it goes over the country that he is going to spend $100,000 in the interest of the agriculturists, and he goes to the people and asks for their support on the ground that he is doing something for them. To do these things would require nothing but an order in council, we require no money, it would be a plain business affair, but probably it would not bring the minister so much attention as it does to come down to this House and ask for a large sum of money. I cannot imagine any other reason, at any rate it has not been done, nothing has been done by the government, no regulation has been made. We are in the position that those of us who are shippers of goods have got to take what the steamship companies think it to their interest to give us. The minister will say, perhaps, that the steamship companies know their own business, and that if we give them time they will provide the accommodation, that there has been great progress, and I admit there has been ; he will probably maintain that if they are only let alone they will in time provide a sufficient accommodation for the shipment of these perishable products. But what I maintain is that we should not be asked to wait for ten or twenty years when the thing could be brought about in one year. We have now waited many years. This matter has been pressed time and again on the attention of the steamship companies and on the attention of this House, yet up to the present time nothing definite has been done, nothing that will bring about definite results.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the carriage of these perishable products across the sea is the main question, but there is also the question of carrying them on land, and I want to say a word with regard to that. Our goods are frequently placed in box cars. We could not possibly get refrigerator cars if we wanted them. Refrigerator cars are not necessary for winter apples or for cheese. But during a large portion of the year, these cars need to be ventilated. I have urged it before this House, and the minister did one year make an experiment by which a few cars were ventilated, and he stated in this House that the Grand Trunk were going to provide a number of ventilated cars. That was three years ago. Up to the present time practically nothing has been done. I know he will say that the matter of ventilating cars is in the hands of the Railway Commission. That may be true, to a certain extent. But I imagine that no one will contend that because the control of the traffic is to a certain extent given over to the Railway Commission, it is therefore taken out of the purview of this House. I maintain that it is the duty of the government to see to it that the Railway Commission take this matter up earnestly and vigorously, and see that the cars carrying perishable products are ventilated. It means a great deal. In a ventilated car most of these products can be carried with perfect safety ; in an unventilated car, with temperature ten or fifteen degrees higher, they are greatly damaged. Then the goods should be taken care of in some way when they land on the other side. But I will not trespass further upon the time of this House. The subject I feel is very important, it means several million dollars a year to those who produce these perishable food products. I maintain it is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture and of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to take this matter up seriously, and to provide, as is suggested in this resolution, that in future we shall know for a certainty that these goods can be carried safely.

Mr. D. DERBYSHIRE (Brockville). I am sure that we cannot find a great deal of fault with the speech of the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith). I was somewhat surprised that he should complain of the service last year. In the history of our country, possibly, we never had so good a service as we had in 1906, we never delivered our goods on the British market in so fine a condition, nor received as much money for them as we did this last year. In connection with our butter business, we had over 200 cars more than

we did the year before, employed in carrying butter on the different railways at Montreal. We also had a very efficient inspector in Montreal who, as soon as the cars arrived in Montreal, made an inspection to see if the butter or cheese was in proper condition, and if it was not in proper condition, the companies received no pay for the carriage, and they were at once notified of the fact, as well as the Dairy Commissioner at Ottawa. That was one great improvement effected last year, when this inspection was provided at Montreal in order to keep a perfect check on the goods as they arrived there, to know what, condition they were in, what cars were to be paid for and what were not. In this respect our service last year was a great deal better than ever. In connection with our cheese business we had 300 cars more in 1906 than we ever had before. These, of course, were inspected in the same way with the same results and reports were made to the dairy commissioner showing how the goods were arriving from time to time. Last year we provided for the first time an efficient service in connection with our fruit, there being iced cars from the farm to Montreal and iced chambers from there to the old country. We had a good service and we gained in the volume of our business last year.

Mr. SPROULE. You do not mean to say that was the case throughout the country?

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. What I am trying to show is that we have been improving from year to year. We have been giving a better service to the producer each year, delivering the goods in better condition than ever before, and this last year was a record breaker in connection with that service.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that last year, for the first time, iced cars were carrying fruit from the farm to Montreal?

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Yes; from all sections of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. That is simply in the hon. gentleman's imagination. I have never heard of such a thing in the country, and I have seen a large amount of fruit shipped.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. We had refrigerator car service there last year, with the result that we delivered a large quantity of goods in first-class condition.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In the western part of the country?

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Yes. The president of the Montreal Produce Merchants' Association, Mr. Hodgson, in his official report, states that the service was satisfactory. In response to our requests, the minister agreed to start the service three weeks before we usually had it in operation on account of the hot weather coming in earlier than usual, so that the goods were delivered from the beginning to the end of the season in proper condition. The goods were delivered in Montreal in first-class condition last year. In cases where goods did not reach their destination in first-class condition, it will generally be found that it is due to the fact that the shippers did not look after them properly at the time of shipping. They should notify the agents when they require refrigerator cars, make arrangements to have the car available at a certain time and then be prepared to load and ship it. If the goods are put into the car and everything that is necessary to be done in connection with their shipment is done, and if they are promptly delivered, they will arrive in good condition. The great incentive to railways last year to deliver the goods in proper condition was that we had a car inspector at Montreal, who examined these goods upon their arrival, who noted the temperature of the goods delivered, and who reported the result, not only to the railway company, but to the commissioner here at Ottawa. In regard to ocean steamships, in 1902 we sent 80,337 boxes of cheese in cooled air chambers; 1903, 80,284; 1904, 102,238; and in 1905, 127,680. In 1906, 406,029, showing that we made great improvements in the system of handling and delivering our cheese. We not only had at these steamships an inspector to watch the goods as they went in to see that they were placed in compartments at a proper temperature and to see that proper provision was made in the handling of these goods, but the ships which delivered their goods in proper condition were reported, and the shippers were notified as to which vessels were giving the best service. In self-defence these steamship companies had to give a better service, and did give a better service in 1906, under the careful watchfulness of our dairy commissioner at Ottawa. We had men to inspect these goods on their arrival in the old country. When vessels landed at Liverpool they were watched to see at what temperature the goods were kept in when they were delivered. Last year was most satisfactory in that respect, and, as a result of this service, the consumption increased and better prices were obtained. Thermographs in 1905 were 272 and in 1906, 488 in number. There is another thing that happened this last year. The Surrey dock at London was built, and they put in a refrigerator there for the accommodation of the goods delivered, and this constitutes a most important improvement in the method of handling our goods in the old country. Right near Tooley street, the great distributing point of the city of London, we have this accommodation for our

produce. There they have the best refrigerator service in the world. These goods are unloaded from the vessel into these refrigerator compartments, and on account of the service they gave last year they placed these goods before the consumer in first-class condition. One result was that steps were taken to improve the conditions in connection with other docks. At Bristol they are going to spend a large amount of money in improving their docks, so that they can receive the goods in as good condition as they are received at London. The goods will be transferred from the vessel into refrigerator compartments and delivered to the proper parties for distribution. These are important improvements, and they show the steady gain that we have been making in connection with our refrigerator service. Of course, we expect an increased service this year. We expect that Mr. Ruddick will devote most of his attention to this work. Last year he had butter, cheese, cow testing and other work on his hands, and his attention was divided, but this year he is going to devote his attention to cool curing and cold storage systems, so that we will have a better refrigerator service in connection with the production and shipment of butter, cheese and fruit, and in connection with the delivery of these goods, not only at Montreal, but also at London, Liverpool, Glasgow and Bristol. We will therefore be able to extend our market, obtain better prices and deliver the goods in a condition which will be satisfactory to the producers in Canada and the consumers abroad. Last year we shipped $6,500,000 worth of butter, and I may say that the report showed that that butter was delivered in fine condition in the old country. We shipped $25,000,000 worth of cheese and this cheese was never delivered in the old country in as fine condition. I know, because I have seen the letters which have been received from our friends in Britain. We never got as much money, and there never was as good a demand or as good prospects as there are for 1907, on account of the careful management of the refrigerator service in connection with the shipment of our butter, cheese and fruit. We shipped $15,000,000 worth of bacon, and it is due to the continuous improvement in the system that we are getting this large amount of money, which is $6,000,000 more than we received in any previous year in the history of the country. We know the value of this $6,000,000 to the people of Canada. It means that every industry in our land will be prosperous, and that there will be increased buying power on account of this large amount of money that they got in excess of that which they received in any previous year. A good deal has been done at the request of the Eastern Dairymen's Association and other associations, by our cool curing rooms in educating the farmers in connection with the curing of their cheese, and it shows the vast improvement that can be made by having this cooling system in operation from the commencement of the life of the cheese until it is finally put on the consumer's table in the British market. It has been so improved that I am sure we will be able to do a great deal better in 1907. I am delighted with the service; I am delighted with what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has done in connection with the cold storage system. I am delighted that he is now giving the services of Dr. Ruddick to this service so that the whole system, from the factory right through to the British market, can be watched, and I am sure we will see that in 1907 we will be able to do even better than we have ever done in the past. The increasingly satisfactory results, the great improvements that have been made from year to year, are very commendable, and I feel proud of the Minister of Agriculture because he has had the good judgment to secure the improvement of this service, and I have no doubt that even the Conservatives feel proud of the Minister of Agriculture on account of his energy in directing the affairs of this important department of the government of Canada. As I said, I am sure that we will see that the results for 1907 will be even better than for 1906. While the reports that we have had on our goods that have been delivered indicate that they have been satisfactory, still we intend to do better and we will be able to do better in the near future. This will redound to the credit of the Minister of Agriculture and it will place our goods in the position of being, beyond dispute, the finest made anywhere in the world.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I am sure after hearing the speech of the hon. member from Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) it will be folly almost to make any remarks detrimental to the Minister of Agriculture, if we are to believe all that the last speaker has said. He has been telling us of the splendid service and of the excellent minister that we have, and that everything is lovely and delightful, but I want to tell the hon. gentleman that if he goes into western Ontario or even into the Northwest provinces he will find that the Minister of Agriculture and his policy in general are not popular, and that the farmers of this country are demanding that a very different policy from the one being carried out, be very soon instituted with reference to this department.

However, there is before us to-night a very important question, the transportation of our perishable products, not only across the ocean but throughout our country, on the railroads east and west, and I am sure that this House could not devote its time to any question of more general interest. Can

ada is favourably situated as regards agriculture. On the east she has the markets of Great Britain, Germany and the continent and on the west of China and Japan. There is no country in the world so favourably situated or so well adapted to the requirements of agriculture, and I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada has better opportunities than any minister of any other nation in the civilized world. We are not taking advantage of our position in this particular. The Argentine Republic, 6,000 miles from the markets of Europe, has an altogether better system of cold storage than we have to-day. There is no comparison between the boats carrying the goods of the Argentine Republic to the markets of Europe and the boats carrying our products only 2,500 or 2,600 miles. If you will investigate the cold storage systems of the Argentine Republic, New Zealand and Australia and compare the careful manner in which these countries look after their perishable products with our cold storage system and transportation facilities you will readily see that we are a long way behind them in that particular.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Why do they not sell their goods for as much money? Why have we 75 per cent of the cheese trade?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the hon. gentleman goes to the markets of Europe and looks at the Argentine chilled meat going into those markets he will find there is no comparison between the manner in which that meat is cared for from the time it is killed until it goes to the table of the consumer and the manner in which our meats are carried across the Atlantic. If the hon. gentleman will look into the beef trade and the cold storage system that takes the carcases not only from the Argentine Republic, 6,000 miles away, but from New Zealand, 11,000 miles away, and from Australia, 12,000 miles away, to the European markets, he will find that the most careful system of cold storage is installed in the ships carrying those products and instead of the temperature varying, as the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) has told you, some 15 degrees or 20 degrees, in the carriage of these products the temperature will not vary over 2 degrees or 3 degrees; otherwise it would be impossible to carry the goods from those countries to the European markets. As for the farmers of Canada being able to ship their meats to Great Britain and sell them as chilled meats on the market at practically the same price as fresh meat is being sold there, it is impossible, because they have to accept a system of cold storage which is given to them by the boats coming to our shores, that is, to say the least, inadequate.

With reference to the transportation question in general, there was a time some years ago when we were able to build our own ships and when boats of 2,000 tons were built in the little towns on our coasts; but the building of ships has gone to Great Britain and the continent and instead of boats of 2,000 tons we have to-day ships of 30,000 or 40,000 tons. These boats are made of steel, the insurance on them is less, their freight charges are less, and they are able to carry our goods in better condition than they could have been carried at the time when we were manufacturing our own boats. But still, though our shipping industry is practically out of existence and we have to depend on foreign boats to come to our shores and take away our products, we have, as I claim, practically no control over these boats and over the temperature in them, although we have materially assisted to place the machinery to develop cold storage in the boats that cross the Atlantic. As my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) has already shown, we have no control over these temperatures and our goods are allowed to go across the Atlantic under conditions that are, to say the least, not favourable. Great Britain and the United States possess to-day the greatest and best transportation system in the world. The United States has invested $10,000,000,000 in railways. Great Britain has invested $750,000,000 in her ships, and has a costly railway system as well. Canada is making great strides in building railways but is paying little heed to her merchant marine or the exportation of her products. The railway statistics for Canada for 1906, give the capital invested in Canadian railways as $1,332,000,000. The following grants have been made towards the railway system by the people of Canada:

Dominion government grants ..	$194,000,000
Provincial government grants ..	43,000,000
Municipal grants..	17,000,000
A total of..	$254,000,000

This amount has been granted towards the railway transportation system of the Dominion of Canada by the people of Canada, so that the people are directly interested in this transportation question and in the railways of our country. In justice to the railways I should say that the Intercolonial Railway and the Temiskaming Railway have been built out of that amount. $500,000,000 of transportation improvements in the United States have been approved of by government experts and are awaiting appropriations for their construction, to assist in the transportation of their products. Canada in the past three years has assumed obligations to assist railways, and improve harbours and rivers to the extent of $300,000,000. This is a large sum for a small nation and only cares for the transportation within our borders. At the same time we are neglecting our merchant marine and the

transportation of Canadian products to the markets of the world.

The question of transportation is one of the most important factors in the upbuilding and general development of our country. The hon. member for Wentworth has told us that the Canadian people are paying a million dollars extra freight on their exports, and the transportation of our products is a serious question for the Minister of Agriculture to deal with, not only on our railways, but on vessels. Comparing transportation charges, we find that freight is carried from Liverpool to New York for 7s. 6d. a ton, while from Liverpool to Halifax it costs 15s. a ton, and the freight charges in the opposite direction show the same advantage in favour of the people of the United States. We may boast of our natural products, of our lands and mines and forests, but unless these products can be carried to the markets in proper condition and at low rates, we need not expect the development we should. What Canada needs to-day is a live, active Minister of Trade and Commerce. The hon. member for Wentworth referred to the Department of Trade and Commerce. I want to say that the greatest kind of opportunities are awaiting the thorough development of the trade and commerce of this country by that department, and I am sorry to say that not sufficient attention is being paid to that development. We also need a representative at Washington and one in Germany to look after our interests. We have to-day commercial representatives in several foreign countries, but when you read their reports you find that we are not receiving the advantages we should receive in those countries for the goods we send to them. The United States has the cheapest freight transportation in the world. According to Mulhall the cost of transporting one ton of freight one mile in cents in different countries is as follows: United Kingdom, $2.80; Italy, $2.50; Russia, $2.40; France, $2.20; Germany, $1.64; Belgium, $1.60; Holland, $1.56; United States, 80 cents. A diminution of one cent per ton mile freight in the United States would effect a saving of $100,000,000 a year to the people of that country, so that we can readily see that the Railway Commission in properly caring for the reduction of freight rates in the Dominion will materially aid the farmers. Ocean rates are gradually being reduced in the United States. Grain from St. Louis to Liverpool cost in 1882 via New Orleans, 22·66 cents and via New York, 23·66 cents. In 1905 it cost via New Orleans 10 cents, and via New York 16·62 cents, showing the benefit of water transportation. Freight rates on wheat from Chicago to New York showing reductions per bushel, have been as follows: By lake and canal in 1868, 22·79 cents; in 1905, 5·51 cents. By lake and rail—in 1868, 29 cents; in 1905, 6·44 cents. By all rail, in 1868, 42·6 cents; in 1905, 10·29 cents. Showing water transportation at about half the cost of rail. Ocean rates have also been reduced as follows: Grain from St. Louis to Liverpool:

Year.	Via New Orleans. cents.	Via New York. cents.
1882..	22·66	23·66
1905..	10.00	16·62

From New York to Liverpool:

1864.. .. ..3 3-16 pence.
1905.. .. ..1⅝ pence.

Canada possesses extensive coal deposits at tide water which afford a marine traffic of over 4,000,000 tons per annum. Canada ships a million thousand feet of lumber products annually. Canada's export of grain will soon reach a hundred million bushels. Canada's exports of perishable products are now over $60,000,000, besides hundreds of thousands of tons of other products. The census of 1901 gives the total value of milk produced for direct consumption and for the manufacture of butter, cheese and condensed milk as $66,470,953. It is to-day, I believe, over $80,000,000. Fruit and vegetables are given together, the total being $12,994,900 worth. The total value of fish products in the same year was $19,768,449. For the same year the export value of apples and other fruits was $2,010,016. The export value of cheese and butter for that year was $23,992,614. I am merely giving these figures to call to your attention the immense quantity of these perishable products being produced in our country, and to the fact that too much attention cannot be paid to their proper transportation to the markets of the world. Our sea-going tonnage in and out in 1904 amounted to 15,826,705 tons of which only 1,968,803 tons were carried in Canadian ships, while the United States claimed 3,524,497 tons and the balance went in British and foreign bottoms. The nations of the world are paying every attention to their merchant marines. Germany is creating a merchant marine as the basis of a navy; she is paying nine per cent of the capital invested, and is fast taking away the shipping formerly done by Great Britain in the East Africa and continental trade. France is spending large sums to maintain a commercial position on the sea; Russia has a subsidized fleet; Austria, Holland and Japan are all improving their water transportation, while Canada only takes care of twelve per cent of her trade, the other eighty-eight per cent being carried in British ships and foreign vessels and we have no legislation that has the slightest control over these ships coming to our shores. Last year 1,200,000 tons of coal were carried from Cape Breton up the St. Lawrence under the Norwegian flag, and many foreign ships are doing the coast-

ing trade along our shores. Only a few days ago the members from the eastern provinces were urging on the government the necessity of looking after our shipping and getting back to the position when we had towns along our coasts where a great deal of shipbuilding was done. The traffic on our great lakes has been marvellous. The increase of the tonnage since 1868 has been eighty-three per cent. Last season 60,000,000 tons of produce was shipped from the west to the east, of which less than three per cent was carried in Canadian ships. In 1904 the traffic between the United States shore and the Canadian shore amounted to 15,375,500 tons. The coastwise trade has also made great progress between 1876 and 1904, the increase being from 10,000,000 tons to 45,000,000 tons. We are building hundreds of miles of railway each year, opening up new lands, population is increasing, acreage and production are increasing, and the result is a great car shortage, motive power shortage, main line shortage; so that instead of a bright outlook for the future for our farmers in the matter of transportation, there is a very serious outlook indeed.

In the Northwest at present, it is estimated that 50 per cent of the wheat in Saskatchewan is still out in the fields waiting for railway transportation and the railways are not able to cope with the difficulties in that country. On the other hand, when we come to the eastern provinces, in spite of the development in industrial matters in those provinces, we find that the railways have not been giving us anything like the service we require. Much of the fruit grown in the east was not marketed last year owing to the lack of proper transportation facilities, and the shippers of perishable products do not look forward to better prospects in the near future. Let me draw attention to the fact that the province of Ontario produced last year 12,000,000 barrels of apples and the rest of the Dominion 4,000,000 barrels. Out of that production they were only able to export 1,500,000. Add to that export, the evaporated apples, jams, &c., amounting to another 1,000,000 barrels, and then give the people 3,500,000 barrels to eat, making 6,000,000, and you have still 10,000,000 that were wasted or rotted on the ground or were eaten up by the stock throughout the country. These are estimates which were given by Mr. McNeil the other day in the Agricultural Committee. Suppose on that ten million of barrels, our farmers were to receive a profit of seventy-five cents per barrel, that would amount to $7,500,000. This government are urging the farmers to plant orchards and increase their acreage, to take care of their trees and their apple crop in particular, sending men out to educate them in the proper growing of fruit trees, yet at the same time they are are not looking to the proper transportation and marketing of those products. It is estimated that in the Leamington district last year there was little or no fruit shipped, although it is one of the best apple producing districts we have. In fact the farmers there are cutting down their orchards, believing it is foolish to keep on expending large amounts in the development of these orchards, when they cannot get their fruit into market in proper condition. Whereas the United States last year exported 27,000,000 pounds of dried apples and received in return $2,000,000, this country only exported $212,000 worth. When we come to consider that the total exports of perishable goods out of our country amount to nearly $60,000,000 and compare that with the wheat exported last year, amounting to some $33,000,000, you can readily see that this is one of the most important industries in the Dominion at present. Our total exports were $246,000,000. To the United States we exported $97,000,000, leaving a balance of trade against us of $153,000,000. When we realize that we cannot get a barrel of apples or a package of fruit into that country and are practically in the same position as regards the United States as we are in with regard to the German market, you must agree that two of the most important markets of the world, we are completely shut out of. I want to urge upon my hon. friend the necessity of opening up the German market to the farmers of the Dominion. If he will take into consideration the best interests of our people, he will set about at once investigating the causes and see that the German market is opened up to our perishable products. Let me call his attention to a letter which I have in my hand. It is a letter from one of the members of the International Apple Shippers Association to the Special Tariff Commission.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Carried.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman from York says 'carried.' Let me say to him that if that is the way in which he thinks the farmers of his constituency want him to treat this matter, he is greatly mistaken. I am satisfied that the farmers of his constituency are as much interested in the German market being open as any farmers in the Dominion. And let me tell him that the day is coming when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and the men on that side, who are pretending to be the friends of the farmers, will get up in their seats and urge upon the First Minister the necessity of opening up that market.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You did it when you got the chance, did you not ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The German market was open then and our goods were allowed to go in at the minimum rate. But where are they to-day? Let that hon. gentleman

listen to what the United States shippers have to say with reference to this question and he will think differently. I have been urging the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) time and again to see that every effort is put forward to open up that market for the farmers of Canada.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why did you vote for the surtax ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not. I was not in the House at the time and it is folly for the hon. gentleman to make such a statement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did you vote against it ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was not here to vote at all at the time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you approve of it ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that it is one of the curses of this country that we are obliged to have the German surtax placed against us. Does he not believe it would be in the interests of the farmers of this Dominion to have a market like the German market open to the people of this Dominion ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Would you vote to remove the surtax on German goods ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Did my hon. friend vote to increase the duty on vegetables ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the hon. gentleman will allow the members of this side to take the government benches, they will very soon remove that surtax. I want to call his attention to the fact, that Germany imported over $200,000,000 worth of agricultural products, and yet this country could hardly get a dollar's worth into that market.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Was there ever a time when we got better prices for our products than we do now ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is that any excuse to make for the closing up of a market which is the second best in the world ? Is that the way the hon. gentleman would legislate for the farmers ? The German market imported over $200,000,000 worth of agricultural products. Does he not think it is important for our agriculturists that they should be able to ship in to the German market $66,000,000 worth of wheat or at least a portion of it ? Germany imported $66,000,000 worth of wheat last year, $34,000,000 worth of barley, $17,000,000 worth of rye. I might go on through the list of her valuable imports of the very things that the farmers of Canada are able to grow in abundance. And I believe the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) would not dare to go on the stump in his riding and repeat the opinions on this question that he has expressed here to-night. Now, let us go back to what the International Apple Shippers' Association has to say:

> Herewith we inclose you a copy of resolutions passed by the National League of Commission Merchants, New York branch, for your information relative to the recent history of the German tariff controversy.
>
> The modus vivendi, or temporary agreement, under which Germany now admits American products at the minimum rate of duty, may be abrogated at any time, and unfriendly measures can be expected on the part of Germany unless suitable legislation is enacted at Washington. Without a permanent trade treaty with Germany, a maximum duty on apples of $1.65 per barrel will be imposed, instead of the minimum duty of 50 cents——

Which the United States are enjoying at the present time and Canada not:

> —and a maximum duty on dried fruit of $1.08 per hundred pounds, instead of a minimum duty of 43 cents. This for items pertinent to the fruit trade only. All farm products are similarly taxed.

The United States shipped into Germany last year $5,000,000 worth of apples, and surely that fact is of interest when we consider that we were not able to ship a barrel into that country. The careful handling of these goods of which I have been speaking would mean millions to the people of Canada. For the past ten years, the Conservative members of this House have been urging upon the Minister of Agriculture the necessity of development of this subject. The system has improved, it would be a poor system that would not improve. The railways and steamships are improving their facilities for handling these goods. But what has the government done to better our transportation facilities in this respect ? What legislation have they promoted that would aid the transportation of our perishable products ? You may look the statute-books through, and you will not find one Act of legislation of theirs that is of material advantage in this respect. The minister may say that this session he brought in a measure by which he will spend $100,000 for cold storage on land. But look at the position in which you are placing the people of Canada. The minister will gather the fruit into cold storage. The car comes alongside in which the goods are to be carried to the seaport. And we are able to prove that these cars are at temperatures as high as sixty or seventy degrees. You may control your temperature in the cold storage establishment, but unless you control the temperature on the way down to the ship, and in the ship while crossing the ocean, and in the European market when it reaches there, you cannot expect satisfactory returns. What we need is a general shaking up of the Agriculture Department. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) has told us that it

costs the people of Canada from 20 to 40 per cent more to carry the goods in cold storage chambers than in ordinary chambers. That is a good reason why we should have a more efficient service. We need a forward policy. But, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is looking after other departments instead of looking after his own. For a few months one year, we find him looking after Militia Department; for a few months the following year he is acting Postmaster General; and this year he has the Public Works Department saddled upon him. It is practically impossible for the hon. gentleman to do justice to the people of Canada when he accepts so much responsibility. We have been urging upon him the necessity of appointing a government weigher at Montreal, but he will not listen to our proposal. Three million packages go out of Montreal a year, and the loss of half a pound in a package means a loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the farmers. The dock facilities in Montreal are old fashioned and inadequate. It may be said that large sums are being spent to improve these facilities. But these matters are not receiving the attention from the Minister of Agriculture that they should receive. Now, let me read very briefly from the 'Hansard' of January 24th. I asked:

What was the weight and average temperature of the butter, cheese, eggs, meats, lard, mixed fruits and apples so inspected?

The Minister of Agriculture answered:

Four thousand and nine packages of butter were tested at Montreal and gave an average temperature of about 54 degrees. 1,173 marked packages butter were tested at country shipping points and again at Montreal. The average temperature at shipping points was 52·6 degrees and at Montreal 53·2 degrees. Temperatures are not taken of other produce.

If butter is at a temperature of 52 or 53 degrees from the factory to the port of Montreal, how can we expect to receive fair returns for it when it is sold in the European market? We have no control over the temperature in the ships. On this point let me call the attention of the minister to page 23 of his own report in which the Canadian butter on its arrival in Europe is spoken of:

Soon after the butter shipping season commenced our inspectors again reported that, at the ports of Liverpool and Glasgow, consignments of Canadian butter were frequently allowed to lie on the docks for periods ranging from twenty-four to seventy-two hours.

How can the farmers obtain good results from butter kept in cold storage in Canada, handled in this careless manner in shipment to the port, in crossing the ocean, and on being landed receive this treatment on the docks in Europe?

All the Canadian butter landed at Liverpool last season was not treated in this careless manner, the major portion of each shipment having been removed with commendable dispatch. But the proportion that was usually allowed to remain on the quays was sufficiently large, if damaged, to affect the general reputation of Canadian butter in the Liverpool market.

We only send $7,000,000 worth of butter while Great Britain imported over $100,000,000 worth of that valuable product. What more do we need in order to prove that the butter industry of Canada is not receiving the attention from the Minister of Agriculture that it ought to receive?

The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) made some remarks about the cheese industry, and told us of the wonderful progress we have made in that respect. Let that hon. gentleman investigate the cheese industry in different parts of this Dominion from some other standpoint than that of a cheese buyer and one of the large exporters of that article, practically controlling the cheese market of this country. Let him read what some of the papers are saying with reference to the care of cheese. I ask the hon. gentleman to take up the minister's own paper, the Montreal 'Herald' of March 1, from which an article is reproduced in the London 'Free Press' of March 5. This is what I find in the 'Free Press':

While the Agricultural Department plumed itself upon having perfected the dairy methods of the country, a recent circular of the Produce Merchants' Association shows that much remains to be done. The newspaper organ of Mr. Sydney Fisher refers to it as demanding 'what seems to amount to a revolution in the trade.' It speaks of 'the crude ways in which cheese continues to be shipped from the factories.' Further, it is said, 'the growing practice of shipping uncured cheese, if persisted in, will ruin the trade. Inspection becomes a farce and the loss of weight is two or three times what it should be. Shame on the factory that allows such a method and on the buyer who will take curd for cheese.'

I want the minister to know that these criticisms are being made, not only in Montreal, but in other parts of the country. I recognize that our factories are not up to the standard they ought to be. If you go down to the fruit convention or the dairy convention, you will hear the member for Brockville lauding the Minister of Agriculture to the skies, and telling what a wonderful man we have in that position. The hon. minister spoke some years ago in the Agricultural Committee about doing away with the curing of cheese. If he will look at the Dairy Commissioner's Report, page 24, he will find that the Dairy Commissioner admitted that if cheese was properly cured and properly cared for from the time it was made until it reached the European market, its price would be increased half a cent a pound. Well, the hon. gentleman may say that he is going to work with these cold storage appliances, that he is going to remedy that evil. But

I want to point out to the minister that although he may place cold storage appliances in different parts of the country, he has no control over the railroads and the temperature on the cars, or the temperature on the vessels crossing the Atlantic.

The minister has been telling the people that he is going to open up new markets to the farmer. It has been nothing but talk. The hon. gentleman has sent an agent to Japan to look after the selling of some wheat, but the amount we shipped to that country was only $37,000 worth in 1904. It will take years to educate the people of Japan to use a large quantity of Canadian wheat, while other markets are being allowed to go by default. We have been urging on him the necessity of trying to remove the embargo on our cattle in Great Britain; and, if I had time, I could quote from some western papers to show that the people of the Northwest are urging upon the minister the necessity of removing the cattle embargo. But he pays no heed to their protests, he simply folds his arms and says that the department is being conducted in the best possible manner. Two years ago a resolution was passed in the Committee of Agriculture recommending the Ministers of Agriculture of the local governments to go in a body across the Atlantic and urge upon the British government the necessity of removing the cattle embargo. But although that resolution was presented to the House, the hon. gentleman has seemingly paid no attention to it. When this government came to power in 1906 there was in his desk, or in the Prime Minister's desk, a contract for a fast Atlantic service across the water, but no attention has been paid to that. The Department of Agriculture has great opportunities, but it is making little use of them.

Transportation on the railroads is a question of enormous importance, particularly the transportation of our perishable products from the east to the west. The member for Brockville perhaps lives in a country where fruit is not produced in great abundance. I would like him to go up into the western part of Ontario and see the tens of thousands of barrels of beautiful apples that rot under the trees, and fruit of many other kinds, all for want of proper transportation to the markets of the world, or even to our own Northwest market. The Minister of Agriculture will say that they are trying to improve transportation facilities to our western country. But I want to urge upon him the necessity of revolutionizing the present facilities for transporting perishable products to that western country, so that the farmers of the east may be able to furnish our own Northwest with a large portion of their fruit products. The dairy conventions, as I said before, are accustomed to laud the minister for what he is doing, instead of criticising him, as they ought to do. The provincial governments deserve great credit for what they are doing for agriculture in the east and western provinces.

If we look at the importation into Great Britain of agricultural products, we find that out of $578,000,000 worth Canada only sent $67,000,000 worth. Now, I want the minister to pay attention to this fact, that vessels brought back from Great Britain last fall some 27,000 boxes of butter, about 1,500,000 pounds, to Canada, not Canadian butter; it was largely butter from the Argentine republic and New Zealand. That butter was thrown on our market, and instead of the farmers in Canada receiving a good round price for their butter, they have not been receiving anything like the price they would have obtained had not this butter been imported. Some attention should be paid to that matter. With reference to that industry, I must say that the minister is not giving it sufficient attention. Surely the industry on which one thousand million depend for their sustenance and two hundred million depend for their daily toil, is an industry that is worthy of the minister's best efforts, and I would, therefore, urge upon him the necessity of taking up this transportation question and dealing with it in an energetic, forward manner, so that the people of the Dominion may realize that he is putting forth his best efforts to serve them and to give them the best possible service for the transportation of their products.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). Mr. Speaker, the subject which has been introduced in this debate is one that we all recognize to be amongst the most important that could engage the attention of this House. It is not a new one. It has been up before this House for discussion nearly every session of this parliament and it is one that is still worthy of consideration. I am glad to see that the government have appreciated its importance. From the day that they assumed the reins of power they took hold of this question and with an intelligence, enterprise and energy that showed their business foresight and their appreciation of the needs of the country they provided for us a better system of cold storage. I suppose there is no part of the policy of this government that has resulted in more good to the people of this Dominion than the policy that was inaugurated in 1897 when the Minister of Agriculture entered into negotiations with the steamship companies to provide a better system of cold storage for the transportation of our perishable products to European markets. Following up what they undertook at that time they have not relaxed their efforts, they have not stood still, but from year to year they have been pressing forward and improving the methods of shipping our products in every possible way

that might suggest itself to them in the interest of the trade of this country. To-day we have one of the best systems of transportation for the carrying of our perishable products that is provided by any country on the face of the earth. There is no country that has better steamship facilities to and from its shores than we have. I am not going to follow the Speaker who has just taken his seat because he travelled far afield, discussing the cattle embargo, the transportation of our wheat from the western provinces, the construction of railways in Canada and the United States, the Australian steamships, the German surtax, and in fact, I do not know what he did not discuss. Hence, I am not going to attempt to reply to many of the statements he made, but, the whole of his discussion was on a par with his statement that some of our steamships now are constructed with a capacity of from 30,000 to 40,000 tons.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. gentleman think that statement is not correct?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I do not think it is correct.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then, I think the hon. gentleman is not acquainted with the boats that are being built at the present time. There are boats being built that are even over 40,000 tons.

Mr. FISHER. Name one.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The—well——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is all right. I have definite information——

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. A boat of 10,000 tons capacity is considered a very large boat. The hon. gentleman's criticism of the several points to which he devoted his attention is so foolish and of such a character that I am sure a discerning public will relegate it to the scrap heap where it properly belongs. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) seemed to have, I think, I may safely and fairly say, a proper appreciation of this subject and his remarks were practically commendatory of the policy of the government in regard to this system of transportation. He referred to some figures that Prof. Robertson gave before the installation of this service showing the loss that resulted to the country because of the want of proper transportation facilities of our steamships, amounting, as he said, to some $3,500,000 annually. We quite agree with that statement and I agree with the hon. member for Wentworth that the policy that has been introduced has in a very large measure brought to us such benefits that the loss that we sustained heretofore has been overcome and we are now obtaining many millions of dollars annually more for our perishable products than we were in 1897 when the government entered into the first contract with steamship companies for the providing of cold storage transportation. The government had some difficulty in getting our steamship companies to enter into the first contract. They demurred, they were not willing to do it without assistance and our government, seeing the importance of the question, put up half the cost of providing cold storage on the boats of one or two steamship companies as an experiment. The amount of money involved was not very large but was sufficient as an experiment to prove to the people of the country and to the steamship companies that such a service was wanted. That contract was for three years. In 1898 they entered into another contract which was also for three years. After the expiration of these contracts the question had been so fully solved, the need of such cold storage accommodation was so clearly proven that the other steamship companies with whom no contracts had been entered into and also those steamship companies with whom the contracts had been made, but who had not installed that service in their other steamers, saw the necessity of providing such a service in all of their other steamers if they were going to hold their own. At the expiration of these contracts in 1901 the government was not required to continue any further assistance in this direction. It was in 1900, I think, that the government also took up the matter of cool storage with the steamship companies. They again were loath to enter into an arrangement of this kind. It was with the greatest difficulty, we are assured, that the steamship companies were induced to entertain the proposition. However, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) succeeded in making an arrangement by which a cool storage service would be provided on two or three of the steamships as an experiment.

That contract ran for two or three years, I am not sure which, but at the expiration of that time the system of cool storage was demonstrated to be so much in the interest of the trade of this country that all of the steamship companies, practically, plying between our ports and European ports were compelled to introduce the system of cool storage and that without any further assistance from the government. So I say that the initiative taken by this government in 1897 in this regard has not only clearly demonstrated to the people of this country the need of this cool storage system, but has compelled the steamship companies to introduce a system of cool and cold storage in practically every steamship that is plying between our ports and European ports. I want to direct attention briefly to some

figures in connection with this cold storage question. I fancy that it is not very generally known how efficient a service is provided for the people of this Dominion by the various steamships operating between Montreal and Quebec and the European markets. We will take, for instance, the steamers going to Liverpool. The Allan line have 5 steamers sailing regularly during the season, having an average capacity of 13,222 cubic feet of cold storage. Of these five steamers all, with the exception of one, have four chambers devoted to cold storage. The total capacity of storage is 66,111 feet.

Going to London the same line have six steamships, providing on an average of 10,232 cubic feet of cold storage. Each of these steamers has from two to four chambers devoted for that purpose. Operating between Montreal and Glasgow, by the Allan line, there are five steamers which are fitted up with an average capacity of 10,242 cubic feet of cold storage space, and each are equipped with two or three chambers.

The Canadian Pacific Railway line have three steamers sailing to Liverpool. I have not the exact amount of space that is devoted to cold storage on the 'Empress of Ireland,' and the 'Empress of Britain,' but the 'Lake Erie' has 24,000 cubic feet. The 'Empress of Britain' and the 'Empress of Ireland' are new boats, but I understand that they have a very large amount of space devoted to cold storage.

To London the Canadian Pacific Railway have but one boat, the 'Montrose,' with four chambers and 28,154 cubic feet of cold storage space.

Going to Bristol there are three steamers, two of which have 39,000 cubic feet. I have not the exact amount of space that is devoted to cold storage on the 'Monmouth,' but at least I suppose it would be on a par with the other steamers, which would show about 15,000 cubic feet.

The Dominion line have five boats with an average space of 33,584 feet.

To Bristol the same line of steamships have three steamers with an average of 37,754 cubic feet.

Then there is the Donaldson line to Glasgow with six steamers, having an average of 30,148 cubic feet.

The Manchester line have two boats sailing to Manchester, having 7,500 cubic feet to each steamer.

The Thomson line to London have six boats sailing with an average of 21,997 cubic feet of space devoted to cold storage.

Summarizing those figures I find that the combined cold storage space on the above named steamships sailing to the above-named ports in 1906 was :

Number of Boats.	Destination.	Sailings.	Cubic feet of cold storage space.
2	Manchester....	10	75,500
6	Bristol	17	156,300
11	Glasgow.....	61	732,185
13	London..	63	1,101,283
13	Liverpool	75	1,752,898
Total 45	.....	226	3,817,666

I shall also give you some figures in connection with cool storage space.

The Allan line have six boats fitted up with cool storage space, with an average of 27,371 cubic feet.

The Canadian Pacific Railway line has one boat, the 'Montcalm,' with 18,688 cubic feet. The Empress of Britain and the Empress of Ireland have each a large amount of cool storage space, but not having the exact figures, I am not including it in my summary.

The Dominion line has three boats with an average of 43,533 cubic feet.

The Thomson line has six boats with an average of 84,100 cubic feet.

The total space given above amounts to 818,116 cubic feet.

There were 82 sailings of these steamers, making a total available space for the season of 4,200,952 cubic feet, distributed as follows :

Destination.	Cubic feet of cool storage space.
Liverpool.....	783,600
London	3,228,912
Bristol.....	93,440
Glasgow	95,000
Total..... .	4,200,952

I have taken a little time to read these figures for the information of the House, because I am confident there is not a member in this House, not a person, apart from those who are closely identified with the steamship services, who has had the faintest idea of the provision made by the steamship companies for cold and cool storage, for the transportation of our perishable products to the European markets. It is something of which this government and the people of Canada have reason to be proud, that from the small outlay that has been made during the years between 1897 and 1902, or 1903, by this government as an experiment to introduce this system on the steamships, such gratifying results have come to. The equipment of these experimental ships by the government compelled

all steamship companies, if they wished to prevent the entire trade going to the ships so equipped, to provide a similar service, and as I have said the result is something on which the government and the people of this country have reasons to congratulate themselves.

I wish now to draw attention to another phase of this question, and again in this connection I urge that the government have shown a spirit of progress and business enterprise that is most commendable.

We have heard a good deal in this House about thermograph records, and the criticism has been of such a nature that I verily believe many hon. members have thought that there was ground for criticism, and that the government were not doing much in endeavouring to ascertain whether the service was a good service or not. I want to call your attention to what has been done in that direction. We find that during the last season the government have had 448 thermograph records taken, which are divided as follows: to Bristol 53 charts; to Glasgow, 100 charts; to Liverpool, 159 charts; to London, 128 charts; to Manchester, 21 charts. These were from Montreal and Quebec, and the charts showed the temperature and the conditions of the goods when placed in the steamers on this side and the condition in which they arrived on the other side. From Halifax to Liverpool there were 4 charts; to London, 23 charts. Printed on the face of each chart are the particulars which were asked for by the hon. member for Wentworth in a return he moved for on the 3rd of December. I want to call your attention to some of these records to show you that the government are taking the greatest possible interest to ensure, as far as it is possible with any reason, the very best service that can be given for the carrying of our perishable products; and I want to say that these records, one of which I am now going to present, was just taken at random in the department. I have taken some interest in this question. Even before I came to the House I made somewhat of a study of it, and I want to present to you some facts in connection with these records to show this House and the country that the government are doing something that deserves the thanks of this House and the thanks of the people of this Dominion. The government have inspectors at our ports examining the goods upon their arrival in the cars. They take the temperature of the goods as they come from the cars, their temperature as they stand in the sheds awaiting shipment, their temperature on being placed in the vessel, and the temperature of the vessel. They gather all practicable information in regard to the condition of the goods on their arrival and as they are being put on board the steamers. I have a record in my hand with regard to 34 boxes of Bartlett pears. The steamer was the 'Tunisian,' sailing for Liverpool, on September 7. The record gives the name of the shipper, the name of the packer, the port to which the fruit is destined, the number of boxes, the variety, the grade, the number of boxes examined, if any were found wrong, the section of the Fruit Marks Act violated (if any) the temperature of the shed (in this case 76), the temperature of the fruit (70), where it was stowed in the ship, (in a refrigerator chamber), the condition of the packages (in this case very good). I have also here a record of bacon which went on board the same steamer. There were fourteen lots. It gives the brand under which it was shipped, the name of the shipper, where each lot was stowed in the steamer, the condition of the goods, and general remarks showing how the goods were handled. I have another record in regard to butter. There were nine lots. The same examination was made, and the same particulars reported upon. All this information is available for any one who wishes to examine these records. There is another record here of cheese, of which eighteen lots were shipped. It gives the brand, the name of the shipper, and the condition of the cheese in each case. Special attention is given to the condition in which the boxes arrive at the sea-board and the condition in which they go on board the steamer, and very special attention is given to the places where they are stowed in the different compartments. I have here a record of the thermographs used in this steamer, the 'Tunisian' and in connection with the goods now under consideration. The number of each thermograph is given, where it was placed in the steamer and the goods with which it was placed. Here, for instance, is No. 4380 placed in ordinary storage with cheese; the position being specially described, viz., No. 6 orlop, about 12 feet from aft, bulkhead port side, and one box from amidships. Also No. 4383, placed in refrigerator chamber with butter, with location in chamber also clearly described. Also No. 4529, also placed in refrigerator chamber with apples, pears and lard. Also designating the exact position in which it was placed in the cold storage compartment. Here, which I hold in my hand, is a general report which was issued by the inspector at Montreal, covering various goods that were placed in the different compartments.

Here also is a report from Liverpool showing that at the other end of the line just as important information was gathered as the inspector was securing for us at this end. Here is a report on the condition of some apples and pears that went on board that same steamer and showing also how they were sold in that market. It gives the brand, the shippers' name, the variety of fruit, in what chamber carried, the condition and the quality of the fruit. The

fruit was reported to be in excellent condition. This report was made with regard to apples and a similar report was made with regard to pears, giving the brand, the shipper's name, the quantity and condition. I hold here an account of the sale, which gives interesting information to any one who will care to make a study of the question, and I may say that the prices obtained by the apples, which were tender summer fruit, were certainly very remunerative. I have also in my hand one of the thermograph records. People generally do not know what a thermograph record is, but no doubt most of the members of parliament do. When it is placed in a steamer, it begins to operate and leaves a mark on the paper provided for that special purpose. When it was put in the steamer, the temperature was seventy. It was placed in the steamer on September 6, the steamer sailed on the 7th, arrived at Liverpool on the 15th, and the goods were taken out that same day. The thermograph was put in the refrigerated chamber, in which were apples and pears. The temperature was seventy degrees when it was put in. Inside of twenty-four hours it ran down to below fifty and continued at about forty-five not varying two degrees from the first day out of port until it arrived at Liverpool, in all that journey across the Atlantic. There could not be anything better. It was practically a perfect service. The temperature evidently was as low as was required. Some would say that a lower temperature would be preferable, but those tender fruits—and Bartlett pears are known to be the tenderest variety of fruit—even at that temperature of forty-five degrees arrived in perfect condition and were sold at very remunerative prices. A lower temperature could have been obtained if desired. I know enough about the arranging of temperature to be provided by steamship companies to know that you can get them to provide you with the temperature you require, or within four or five degrees of it, provided you have sufficient goods to occupy any considerable space. But you cannot be sure of getting any temperature if you have only a small shipment of any particular article as perhaps that may have to go in with some other goods that will not stand such low temperature. A man shipping poultry can get a temperature of twenty-four or eighteen or twenty or whatever he may require, provided there is considerable portion of the poultry or goods that will stand such a low temperature. The same with regard to fruit. If you want a temperature of thirty-five degrees, and you have a sufficient quantity, the company will give you the temperature almost that you ask for. I want to call your attention briefly to these other records. Here is one for butter as it reached Liverpool. Here are other reports for butter also giving full particulars—giving the temperature of the butter on its arrival, also the temperature in which it was stored, showing that there is a double check on the steamship companies—giving the surface temperature of the butter as well as the interior temperature. I mention this to show how particular the government have been in their instructions to the inspector so that the service is looked after with the greatest possible care. Here is the thermograph record for No. 4,383, showing that the goods were placed on September 6, that the vessel sailed on the 7th and arrived on the 15th in Liverpool, and that the goods were removed on the 17th. The thermograph was placed in a refrigerator chamber with butter. The temperature was 70 when placed. It ran down at once, before the steamer left the port of Montreal, to below 30, and the first day out it had gone down to twenty, and it kept going down gradually all the way in transit until it was about fourteen degrees below freezing point on the arrival of the steamer at Liverpool. This is practically a perfect record for carrying butter. It is a service that could not be improved on, I care not if all the inspectors were put on that the opposition might desire. A better service could not possibly be provided than these records show. I have also here another thermograph record No. 4,380 which was placed in ordinary storage—placed with cheese. This cheese was carried in ordinary storage and not in either cool or cold storage. The thermograph record shows that the temperature was seventy at the outset. It at once went down, when the steamer left port, to fifty-eight, and lowered a little below that to about fifty seven. But it did not vary more than one degree in all the journey from Montreal to Liverpool. That indicates that the fan service must have been practically perfect.

When I read three records such as I have in my hand of goods placed in three different chambers on board the steamer and giving these results, we need not have any fear for the service that is being rendered to the shippers of this country. We cannot doubt that it is the very best. We have the reports of the dealers also in Liverpool acknowledging the efficiency of the service thus provided by our transportation companies. Letters have been referred to, especially the letter that Mr. Hodgson wrote, in which he referred to the service as being entirely satisfactory. There are other handlers of our products in the European markets whose testimony might be given. Let me read a statement from one of these firms relating to the apple industry. Here is a letter from Messrs James Lindsay & Son, Fruit Importers, of Edinburgh. I may say that they are one of the largest firms of apple dealers and commission merchants, as well as direct buyers, in Great Britain thoroughly responsible and reliable people. They say :

We find that inspection is also carried out as to the carrying of goods while on board steamer. Ventilation has been examined and inquired into, also the temperature throughout the journey generally taken, and if anything unusual has transpired it is generally discussed between the inspector and the receivers, so as to improve any defect that may have taken place, or that exists.

Such inspections and reports, we are certain, will tend greatly to the benefit and improvement of the trade between Canada and the mother country.

And here is a letter from Messrs. Simons, Shuttleworth & Company, of Liverpool, also very large handlers of apples at that port.

We certainly think there has been an improvement in the handling of fruit and other produce since your government has maintained inspectors at this port, and we should be very sorry to see them withdrawn. It has also been beneficial to have you report the manner in which the apples have been turning out, not only as opened on the dock, but in the sale room, and with shippers knowing that they are being watched in this manner. We feel that they are using more care in the selecting and packing of the fruit. We, of course, can only speak regarding apples, as that is the only Canadian product that we handle to any extent. We cannot at the moment state where we can see any chance of improving the work that you have been doing since you came to Liverpool, and in our opinion you have looked after the interests of Canadian shippers in splendid shape.

I could give other letters to the same effect showing that our fruit, our cheese, our butter and our poultry are being landed in the English ports in practically perfect condition. I do not say that the service is absolutely perfect. In fact, I believe, that in one respect some improvement may be made. I refer to the one point upon which the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) touched in anything like criticism of the present service—the fan service for ordinary storage. The government have dealt with the cold storage and cool storage problems, and, so far as these points are concerned, I think we have a service as nearly perfect as it is practically possible to obtain. But some of the steamers have not as good fan ventilation for ordinary storage as they should have. I think that is something the government may well look into, something that they will look into; and, if there is a possibility of providing a better service in this connection, I am sure the government will be only too willing to use their best endeavours with the steamship companies to provide a service which will be in this respect also as nearly perfect as possible. But I wish to say that, even in this respect, the steamships have provided an admirable service. Not so many years ago it was very risky to ship apples to the European market; to-day there is a reasonable certainty, that, even in ordinary storage, the apples or other perishable products that do not require cold storage will be landed in absolutely perfect condition. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) read a great many thermograph records in connection with the ordinary storage. He showed that the temperature in nearly all the steamers ranged from 55 to 65 degrees. That is an admirable temperature for ordinary storage. One steamer to which he particularly referred showed a temperature of about 80 degrees, and another of about 75 or 78 degrees. But nine out of ten of the records he read indicated a service in connection with the ordinary storage which was most admirable. In fact, the steamship companies have themselves seen the necessity, in order that they may cater to this trade, of providing, sirocco fans and other appliances to properly ventilate their steamships. Reference has been made to the American service in this connection. As showing that our service is better than the American, I may say that, even during last season, large quantities of American apples were shipped from the western states over our Canadian railways to the port of Montreal in order that they might have the advantage of our steamship service between Montreal and Liverpool. There were thousands and thousands of barrels of Ben Davis apples shipped over our route in preference to the Portland, the Boston or New York route. What better evidence could we desire than the fact that the American apple dealers prefer the Canadian route and the Canadian steamship service to the American even though their rates are a little lower than ours. Everybody knows that the rate from New York is a little lower than from Montreal; yet every Canadian shipper knows that he would be following a suicidal course, from a business point of view if he were to use the service from the port of New York rather than the Canadian service. I did it once, foolishly and to my own sorrow, losing hundreds of dollars in one season. So, I know what I am speaking about when I say that the service from Montreal is infinitely better than that from New York. There are some boats running from Boston that give an excellent service. But, take it as a whole, the boats operating from Montreal, and from Quebec now that the 'Empresses' of the Canadian Pacific Railway, being too large to come up the channel are operating between Quebec and Liverpool, and from Portland or St. John when navigation is closed give a better service than the American lines. I say we are supplied with the best service of any people on the face of the earth, the people of the Argentine Republic or New Zealand not excepted. We have the best transportation facilities provided by steamship companies that are to be found in any country. This government has done what the government of the United States has never done in the matter of providing a good transportation service by our steamships.

The hon. member for Lambton said that thousands and thousands of barrels of apples went to waste this last year for want of adequate transportation facilities. Now, I want to say that there was no need of a solitary barrel of apples going to waste for the want of good transportation facilities. There was a market for every apple grown in Canada this last year that was fit for export, either to Europe or to western Canada, and there were buyers all over the country glad to get the apples if they could be used. The only trouble this year was that the apples were not very good—windfalls, scabby apples, wormy apples, early apples. The fault is with the farmers, who won't spray, who won't prune, who won't fertilize, who won't cultivate, who won't take care of their orchards; that is the reason why nine-tenths of the apples that are left in the orchards are not shipped—it is because they are not fit to handle for export.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us the prices that the farmers received for these apples after they had spent a large amount of money in caring for the trees?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Yes; they received all the way from $1 to $2 a barrel.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Never less than $1?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I don't know of a single barrel that was sold for less than $1, unless it was in the case of some foolish farmer who was too lazy to hand-pick his apples. I am sorry to say there are some farmers who don't like picking apples, and who prefer to sacrifice their fruit than to pick it themselves. But in regard to transportation, the government have not only provided for a service by steamships, but they have also taken up the question of improving the transportation over the railways. This last season there were 1,168 cars iced and paid for by the government to carry cheese to the sea-board; there were over 1,300 cars iced for carrying butter. In addition, the government guaranteed the cost up to two-thirds of a carload, in order to assist this manner of transportation, giving practically a perfect service for the carriage of butter and cheese from the factory where it was produced to the sea-board. This last year they have also made an offer, of which I am glad to see some shippers have availed themselves, of iced cars for carrying apples the early portion of the season; and if the cars are properly iced, and proper care is exercised at the time of shipment to see that the apples are put on board in proper condition, there is no difficulty whatever in carrying our apples, or any other of our tender fruits, from the orchards, or from the point of shipment, to the sea-board. I mention these facts to show that the government are exercising the most intelligent and the most commendable care, and are endeavouring to assist this trade so far as circumstances will justify them in doing.

The hon. member for Lambton referred to the German surtax. I am not going to discuss that, except to say that the German government this last year imposed a duty upon Canadian apples. But this government have nothing to do with that duty. We are not going to get down on our knees and beg the Germans to take off that duty. When we were allowed to ship apples to Germany on the same terms as the United States, a certain portion of our apples went to the German market, but that market was no better than the English market or the French market. I may say that the amount shipped from the United States this last year, as quoted by my hon. friend, namely, $5,000,000 worth, is very wide of the mark; it was about $500,000 instead of $5,000,000 worth that the Americans shipped to Germany.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I beg to differ with the hon. gentleman. If he will take apples and their products, he will find that I was right. Dried apples alone amounted to over $2,000,000.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I thought he was referring to green apples.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No; apples and their products, such as jams. I was well within the mark. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, to make another remark, I would like to refer to the hon. gentleman's statement that I did not know what I was talking about when I said that boats were being built of 40,000 tons. If he will look at the March issue of the 'Canadian Engineer,' he will find an account of the building of a ship of 40,000 tons, and he will see the picture of that boat and all the dimensions. If he has been following the progress of the shipping industry during the last year, he will have noticed that there are several boats of that nature being built at the present time.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Was that a commercial boat? Let me call attention to the tonnage of some of the steamers that are operating between our own ports and Europe, and that will give some idea which of us is right. The 'Empress of Ireland'—I suppose the hon. gentleman knows something about that boat—it is one of the best and largest boats plying between Liverpool and American ports, coming to Quebec, that is 14,500 tons; the 'Empress of Britain' is of the same capacity; the 'Lake Manitoba,' another boat coming to Montreal, is 8,852 tons; the 'Lake Champlain,' 7,392 tons; the 'Lake Erie,' 7,550 tons; the 'Lake Michigan,' 7,000 tons; the 'Mount Temple,' 7,056 tons; 'Montesuma,' 7,345 tons; 'Milwaukee,' 7,323 tons; 'Montfort,' 7,101 tons; 'Montcalm,' 5,505 tons; 'Montrose,' 7,094; 'Montreal,'

6,870 tons; Mount Royal,' 7,064 tons; 'Monmouth,' 4,078. All these boats come to Montreal. So there are only two boats that exceed 10,000 tons.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This 40,000-ton boat that I speak of does not come to our own ports, but to New York.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Nobody would use those very large boats for the transportation of some of our perishable products.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman said I was exaggerating when I made that statement. I do not do that.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Reference was made by the hon. member for Wentworth to the subsidies. There are no subsidies granted for the purpose of providing cold storage or cool storage on steamships. Subsidies are granted especially for the purpose of carrying the mails, and in this connection I want to say that the Department of Trade and Commerce—by whom these subsidy contracts are made, not by the Department of Agriculture—insert a provision in their contracts with the steamship companies that cold storage shall be provided. Here is clause 10 of the contract:

It is understood and agreed that each steamer, while run under this contract, shall be fitted with adequate cold storage accommodation to the satisfaction of the minister.

I may say that although a subsidy was granted to the Allan line last year, which was the only line operating between Montreal and Liverpool, that received a subsidy they as well as other lines, provide a cold storage service whether they get subsidies or not. The clause in the resolution that was introduced by the hon. gentleman stipulating that the government should impose a penalty by withholding the subsidy in case vessels are not provided with proper cold storage facilities is entirely unnecessary as the government do not require to grant a subsidy for the cold storage service. It has already been very effectively dealt with by reason of the trade demand; that is cold storage, cool storage and the best possible facilities have been provided as a matter of competition in trade. So, I say that the reference to the subsidies that are granted is entirely unnecessary. We do not need to exercise any fear in regard to the paying of subsidies or that we will not get the service that we should receive from the steamship companies. I want to congratulate the government, on what they have been doing in this connection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do it quickly.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Well, I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) does not like to hear very much about this question. I have heard him criticise the government on their curing stations and I have never heard anything that seemed to show as poor judgment as my hon. friend displays when he attempts to criticise the government upon their cool curing stations.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you go much further you will stir him up again.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Well, it would not do much harm if I did. The government has taken a very advanced position and I am sure we have every reason to be satisfied with what they have accomplished during the few years in which they have been dealing with this question. The opposition are very prone to criticise but they did nothing during the eighteen years that they were in power; at least, they did very little. If you can point to anything that was done by them it is so small that you would require a microscope to see what was accomplished during the whole of those eighteen years and just as soon as the government come in and undertake to deal with the question they say that there should be something else done. But, I am glad to say that the government have been in the van, that while they have realized that there was something to be gained by an advanced policy they have not been slow to adapt themselves to every condition that presented itself and to adopt such methods as seem practicable and feasible in order to provide not only the best transportation facilities by rail but also to give us the best transportation by our steamships and in that way ensure the carrying of our goods from the points of shipment to the English market, the result of which has been that we have been able to command better prices for our products than are obtained for similar products from other countries that are shipping to the same markets. We have captured the market in England for our cheese. We are obtaining to-day from one to two cents a pound more for our cheese than the price which is obtained by the Americans, we are supplying 75 per cent of the cheese that is imported by Great Britain and we are also obtaining a better price for our bacon, fruit and poultry than our competitors across the line. This is largely due—not altogether—to our better transportation facilities and to the fostering care this government have given to the production of the best possible article on this side and to the transportation of these goods to the markets of the world.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE (South Bruce). Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on this subject before the debate is closed. I realize that the hour is getting very late and that we have perhaps stretched out the debate on this subject longer than we should have. I feel sorry that this matter has been brought up without notice having been given because otherwise we might have been prepared to deal with it a little more fully than we are at the

present time. I am personally greatly satisfied with the progress which has been made by this government in regard to cold storage and I feel quite satisfied that progress is the motto of this government, that this government are not satisfied that they have done everything that can be done in the direction of cold storage but that they do intend to improve the service in every line possible. Something was said about what had been done in providing improved cold storage on cars. The cold storage car service has been increased this year considerably. Fifty-six different routes leading to Montreal were provided with iced cold storage cars last year for the purpose of carrying perishable products. Likewise the number of thermographs has been largely increased. Some sixty new thermographs were bought by the government this year for the same object; that is, in the endeavour to safeguard the conveyance of perishable products to market. While I am speaking on the matter of a better service of cars leading to Montreal for the products of this country I would like to call the attention of the government to the fact that there are still complaints being made and the special complaint this year seems to have reference to the matter of frosted fruit. In the late shipments of apples that trouble was very marked. I know very well and I have also learned from conversations with apple shippers that it has been a very difficult matter to get railway companies to pay sufficient attention to the shipment of apples during the season which is now about closed but which was in full swing a month ago.

I have been talking with the officials of the Department of Agriculture on this matter and they are very anxious to, if possible, provide safer conveyance for the winter apples of Canada. The very best of our fruit, the fruit which is most appreciated in the British market, goes forward during the period from New Years on, and it is a pity that it should be in any way damaged, and I would call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that this year there has been considerable loss on fruit on account of the extreme cold weather, but at the same time a great deal of that loss has been owing to the carelessness of the companies in not providing proper cars or attending to those cars as they should do. Possibly it would be a good idea to have the railway companies provide trains of cars for shippers of apples at that season and have a man go along with each shipment to see that the temperatures are attended to.

My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) called attention to the fact that thousands, in fact almost millions, of barrels of apples were lost this year through the want of proper transportation. I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that a great deal of the loss is due to other causes. My hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Schell) called attention to this matter and I wish to repeat and to emphasize more strongly the fact that the loss has not been altogether due to the want of accommodation in transportation; the fault lies to a much larger extent with the farmers, and here is the testimony of a fruitman who has recently visited South Huron, a constituency that lies very near that represented by the hon. member from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). This is what he says:

> One line of agriculture, I am sorry to say, seems to be on the wane, I mean fruit growing. There used to be a good many orchards in South Huron, but taking the average, nothing else is so neglected as the orchards are. Farmers say there is no money in fruit. There will never be any money in fruit if more care is not taken of the trees, and a better system followed in disposing of the crop.

That is the testimony in regard to South Huron, and I think it could be given in regard to Bruce, and I am pretty sure it could be with regard to Lambton. When this enormous loss is charged against the want of proper facilities for transportation it is not fairly charged. We are willing to say that some of it is chargeable against transportation in the fall, for at that season of the year we have too great heat in the cars and the apples suffer on that account, but the great loss is due to the carelessness of the farmers in not attending to their orchards and growing a good, merchantable fruit.

There is another matter on which I wish to say a word and that was brought up by the hon. member for Lambton when he spoke about the excellent facilities for transporting chilled meat from the Argentine Republic, New Zealand and Australia. We are much nearer the meat markets of the world than those countries. We have not had to develop the dead meat trade particularly up to this time in our history, but I now recall the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to this fact, that the time has come when Canada should have a dead meat trade, and I think the Minister of Agriculture has had that in view in the Meat Inspection Bill that he has this year passed through the House and that by that measure he has prepared the way so that when Canada embarks in a dead meat trade, as she will have to do at an early date she will place on the market an article above suspicion.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). I wish to say a few words in regard to this matter in which I take a deep interest, but I shall not detain the House at any length. Our perishable products are a very important branch of our export trade. As you are aware, I drew attention to this matter at the beginning of the session. The minister then

took the matter up and promised to make an effort to remedy the defects in our system. Before proceeding I might refer, however, to a little incident. I noticed the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. M. S. Schell), who undoubtedly made a very good speech and showed the necessity of this system of cold storage thoroughly and well, but, who unfortunately in his reference to shipping referred to the member from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) as having made some incorrect statements about the tonnage of certain ships. The hon. member for Lambton gave an example; he told us where he got his information and all that, and then the member for Oxford (Mr. M. S. Schell) read a number of examples that did not come up to the figures quoted by my hon. friend from Lambton. That put me in mind of the story of an Irishman who was called up before a magistrate for having hit another with a shillalah. Two men proved conclusively that they saw him do so. The magistrate asked the Irishman: How are you to get over this testimony; two men swear positively that they saw you hit this man? Oh, said Pat, I can bring twenty men who will swear that they didn't see me hit him. There were two men to prove that they saw him hit the other man and twenty to prove that he did not These other ships like Pat's twenty witnesses have no bearing on this subject at all. My hon. friend from Lambton has proved his case, I think, and it would have been well if my hon. friend from Oxford had omitted that portion of his argument.

I think that too much emphasis is placed on the question of shipping. I have had occasion before to draw attention to the fact that the whole system must be a chain, it must be complete. The shipping part of it is only one part of it; it is just like a bridge, you may finish the two ends of the bridge as completely and nicely and grade them as well as you can, but if you have not the centre arch your bridge is of no use. Similarly, if you have the centre arch and the ends are not graded up the bridge is of no use. The ship in this case is simply the centre arch, and although this matter was taken up in the time of the Conservatives by the Hon. Mr. Montague there is no doubt at all that the system has been greatly improved. I think we must admit that.

But the shipping industry and the carriage of our products on the water have been blamed for many things of which they are not guilty. We must begin on the farm. I liked the remarks of my hon. friend from South Bruce (Mr. McKenzie) on this subject. The farmer will watch his field of grain very carefully indeed and say: Tomorrow we must reap the harvest. But he does not watch his apple orchard so carefully; all apples are not plucked the day they are ripe; they are often left on the trees until the germs of decay have been taken in. It is like a man going on a journey; you may have the best inspector in the world to examine him when he is about to start on his journey and he may be pronounced perfectly healthy, but he may have the germs of smallpox or typhoid in his system and may take sick at the end of the journey. That is the way with our fruit; our fruit often has the germs of decay so thoroughly established in it before it leaves the orchard or even before it leaves the tree that it is impossible for it to arrive in England in proper condition. The fruit should be plucked on the proper day and cooled in a proper way. It should then be kept in a proper condition until it is put aboard of the cars. It may be impossible for us to have cold storage on the cars with mechanical refrigeration, because we cannot get the water to cool the ammonia. It is impossible to have mechanical cold storage on the cars at the present time, but perhaps that may be overcome, possibly by some system of compressed air or some such means as that. It is, of course, an established scientific fact that when a solid turns to a liquid it absorbs heat and when a liquid turns to a vapour it absorbes heat; that is the principle of latent heat which has to be considered. Air, which has been compressed to a liquid, as it expands will absorb heat because a liquid is turning to a vapour, but I believe that we can get cold storage on board cars yet and we must have the land carriages perfect. I like the part of the motion of my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) referring to the land carriage as well as the water carriage of our products. This whole thing must be a system, and I may say that I believe the minister is now trying to establish a system. I was very much displeased up to this time with the way things were going. I looked around at home and saw hundreds and thousands of barrels of apples going to waste upon our farms, yet no attempt was made to overcome this condition of affairs, and now I think the minister is trying to overcome it.

I feel that we should give the minister time. Let us wait until next year and if he does not do something better than he has done in the past, I shall be as ready as anyone else to find fault with him. It is impossible for him to carry out a system of cold storage in the winter. Next summer will be the time for the test, and I hope the system will be carried out systematically and completely. To do the whole thing on the ocean is an utter impossibility. We are living in changing conditions. A system of cold storage was not required when I was a boy, but it is required now. The competition we now have in the west compels us in eastern Canada to go into perishable

products, and if so, we must have them cared for from the time they leave the hands of the farmer until they reach the table of the consumer. I must say that the great difficulty is with the farmers. They do not really understand what cold storage means. They do not understand the scientific principle by which cold is produced in hot weather, nor do they understand that the germs of decay may be in apples which look perfectly sound and healthy. The minister is introducing an educational campaign which may do a great deal of good. Let us give him a chance. This is a new thing, and has a right to be fairly tried. I shall be as ready as any one else to condemn the minister if he does not help the farmers out of this difficulty, but in the meantime I will stand by him in his efforts to give the farmers the cold storage system.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from saying a few words after the kindly remarks of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Thomas Chisholm). So far as the motion and the speeches of the mover and the hon. gentlemen who followed him on the opposition side of the House are concerned, they have been pretty completely answered by the remarks carefully thought out and carefully prepared, of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. M. S. Schell). I must compliment that hon. gentleman on the evident pains he has taken to study this question and to gather a mass of facts and details in regard to it which are of the utmost value to the community, and which will be useful to everybody in studying cold storage transportation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Furnished by the department.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and it is one of the things for which the department may take pride, that we do furnish information of this kind. In the old days, when my hon. friend's friends were in power, they did not furnish information to the public at large at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend has not furnished it to the public at large; he stuffed the hon. member who has just made a speech.

Mr. FISHER. No. My hon. friend has not said anything that he did not take from the public records. To disprove the accusation of my hon. friend I have only to refer to the speech of the mover of this amendment, who said that thanks to the minister and the department he had now information which he formerly could not get. I therefore feel that my hon. friend is really reflecting on his own friends, who have endorsed what I said before I said it, and I am only quoting them when I say that this information is now at the disposal of the public, and even at my hon. friend's disposal if he had taken the trouble to look into it in the exhaustive and careful way in which my hon. friend from South Oxford has done. There are a few things, however, that I would like to say. First, practically the whole accusation is that we have not done enough. One and another on the other side of the House, rather by implication than by actual statement, have shown that we have done so much that they themselves are bound to bring forward the proof in discussing the question at issue. They have had to quote over and over again things we have done which were never dreamed of before this administration came into power. But they claim that we have not done enough. As to my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith), I can really hardly make out what he is complaining of. He said himself that cool air accommodation was necessary, but that many products were sent forward in the ordinary hold of vessels and did not need cooled air. That is quite true. He gave the proportion of the cheese sent in cool air compartments and the proportion sent in the ordinary holds. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman knows very much about the cheese trade; but if he had thought for a moment he would have remembered that by far the larger proportion of our cheese is sent forward late in the fall or in the winter when it does not need cold air or cold storage at all, but when the ordinary hold is just as good for it, and therefore the shippers of cheese do not take the trouble to send in cooled air or cold storage. My hon. friend himself, however, proved that it was necessary in the summer season, because he showed that the temperatures ranged from 65 to 45 in the ordinary hold and in the ventilated chambers without cooled air, but that where there is cooled air the temperature in the ventilated chambers could be reduced to 40 or 35 or 30, if necessary, and very frequently it is necessary. When the outside air is cold enough, we do not need to cool the air and force it into the hold; but in those months of the year when the outer air is too hot, we need the cooled air and the cold storage chambers. My hon. friend's contention is that they are only needed under these circumstances. He has again proved that what we have done is quite right, and that we have accomplished all that is needed. But there is one point on which my hon. friend and I hold absolutely contrary opinions. It is useless for us to provide cooled air chambers or cold storage if the shippers are going to put into them hot fruit in the incipient stages of decay; and my hon. friend, who is a fruit grower himself, had better take to heart his own lessons and put a thermometer into his own warehouses and cool his fruit there by whatever means he finds necessary, and ship it in a cooled condition, so that when it is put into the cooled air cham-

bers on the ships, it will not heat those chambers. Until he and the other fruit growers do this, they must expect that their fruit will have a wrong temperature in the cooled air or cold storage chambers on the ships. It is ridiculous to suppose that any ventilation or the forcing of cooled air into these chambers will accomplish the cooling of hot fruit, hot cheese or hot butter. I have proved over and over again in the Committee on Agriculture, by means of experts, and before meetings of dairy associations and fruit growers' associations, that the difficulty to-day is not in the maintenance of cooled air in the chambers, but that it is in the fact that the people put hot fruit and hot cheese and hot butter into those chambers and ask us to cool them, when we ought only to be required to maintain the already cool condition of the products. Until the shippers undertake to do that, we have no means of keeping the chambers down to the temperatures at which they ought to be kept. The only alternative is one which I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite would suggest, and that is to refuse to accept such products as are not cooled before being put into the cool chamber or the cold storage chamber. That is a remedy I have been tempted sometimes to adopt, but it would be a very extreme measure to refuse to shippers the opportunity of using our cold storage or cold air chambers simply because their goods were not properly cooled before shipment.

There is another step we have taken this year and that is to provide for subsidizing local cold storages, and I would call on hon. gentlemen opposite to try and do something towards the establishment of those facilities. The object of establishing them is to obviate the difficulty and danger I have just pointed out. I grant that up to the present the facilities for cooling fruit, butter or cheese before it goes into cold storage transportation have not been sufficient for the trade. We have been waiting in the hope that private enterprise would provide those facilities, but private enterprise has failed to do so, and we have passed an Act to encourage their establishment. I would ask all those who have the welfare of Canada at heart to try and aid us in bringing about the establishment of these local cold storages, and I am glad to say that since the Act was discussed, a considerable number of applications have come in for permission to operate under its provisions. I hope that these applications will take material shape. From the departmental standpoint, we shall do all we can to encourage this new departure.

A suggestion has been made—but not made very strongly, I am glad to say—that we have been derelict in our duty, because we have not dealt with the accommodation of these perishable products on their arrival in the old land. Well, I have always maintained that that is outside our jurisdiction and that we ought not to do it. But I am glad to say that in consequence of the enterprise of a private company, the Surrey Commercial Docks Company, cold storage accommodation has been provided in London for all the perishable products arriving from Canada on the lines of steamers sailing from Canada to London making use of those docks. Our shippers will, therefore, be able to get cold storage accommodation for their perishable products on arrival in the old land. Complaints have been made by my officers with regard to the treatment of perishable food products in Liverpool. The result has been that Liverpool was thoroughly stirred to its depths by the criticisms made on its arrangements. In consequence of these complaints, the Allan Line have made arrangements by which this season they will be able to give cold storage accommodation at Liverpool and the Canadian Pacific Railway have obtained permission to erect cold storage warehouses on their docks at Liverpool. So that all perishable products shipped by the Allan or the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers will get cold storage facilities on the docks at Liverpool this coming season. And this has been brought about without the expenditure of public money, but simply by discussion of the needs of the trade. They are the results of the reports of my officers who are constantly watching the handling and management of our perishable food products. Hon. gentlemen opposite by the way, entirely ignore the advantage which has come to the shippers and which has come to themselves, from their own standpoint, in giving them data on which they can base attacks against the administration in this House. How does the information they have come to them? Simply by reason of the fact that the department has to-day, what it never had before, a staff of officers in England, and a staff of officers at the various shipping points in Canada, who watch the traffic all over the railways in Canada, who see all that is going on, who report to the shippers all that occurs, and give us a mass of information which has enabled us to carry out the improvements and the benefits which have accrued to Canadian shippers in the last few years. That is one of our most important accomplishments which hon. gentlemen opposite entirely ignore.

My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) spoke about a circular letter which he credited to the Montreal 'Herald.' That journal, he said, was my paper, and I need not say he was wrong in that statement. But it was not an original document in the 'Herald' or any other newspaper. It was a circular letter issued by the Produce Exchange in Montreal, who undertook to lecture the manufacturers of butter and cheese in this country. That letter I think myself has largely failed of its object because of its very severe and in many ways uncalled for strictures with regard to a great deal of the manufacture of butter and

cheese in this country. I agree there is a good deal of remissness here and there throughout the country, but I venture to say, on behalf of the butter and cheese makers in Canada, that there is no country. with the exception of Denmark, where better intelligence, equipment and enterprise are applied to the manufacture of the dairy products than in Canada. I grant that Denmark, I am sorry to say, takes the lead, but there is no other country in the world where Canada is beaten. No doubt there are still improvements to be made, but I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if there are it is not the fault of the department. We have been lecturing our people, urging them, giving them information, and giving them every opportunity to make improvements, and the great mass of our people have followed our advice and taken advantage of our information and made improvements. There is still, however a residuum of our people who have not taken advantage of our teaching, but they are becoming fewer and fewer every year.

Allusion has been made to the dead meat trade. I would like to see that established in Canada, but the department cannot establish it. If our people eat up all the dead meat in the country and there is no surplus to send abroad, we cannot do anything. If our shippers of cattle prefer to send their cattle abroad alive, that is their right and privilege. I think they are mistaken. I think they would do better to establish a dead meat trade. But the men engaged in the export of cattle prefer to send them abroad alive, and I am not going to ask power to compel them to change their methods, nor would I get it if I did.

Mr. W. JACKSON (West Elgin). Might I point out that while in the country to the south of us they have a dead meat trade, they are sending more cattle alive to the old country than we do. If the dead meat trade is so profitable to the people to the south, why do they not discontinue altogether the sending of live stock to the British market in competition with ours ?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend must ask the shippers why they do not do it. I have been urging them to do it but cannot force them.

Mr. W. JACKSON. You are suggesting that they are all wrong and that they would make more money by shipping dead meat instead of live cattle.

Mr. FISHER. I believe they would, but they do not think so, and I am not going to force my opinion on them.

Mr. W. JACKSON. I take exception to the minister's statement, and do not agree with him.

Mr. FISHER. That may be. My hon. friend agrees with the men in the trade, and is perfectly welcome to agree with them. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) alluded to the fact that dead meat was carried from New Zealand and the Argentines, but my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) answered him completely on that point. It is very easy to manage a cold storage system in which the chambers are kept below freezing all the time. My hon. friend from Wentworth pointed out that, so far as butter is concerned, there is no great difficulty in managing cold storage, because it does not matter whether it is ten degrees or twenty degrees below 30. The same thing is true with respect to meat—there is no difficulty where the whole product is frozen before it is put in and kept frozen until it reaches the other side. But when you have a number of different products which require different temperatures, and some of them, at any rate, as the hon. gentleman said, have to be kept within two or three degrees of a certain temperature, it is a much more difficult thing to manage. In fact it is not so easy a problem as the hon. gentleman thinks.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was referring to the chilled meat trade, which is very different from the frozen meat. They do not dare to allow it to be frozen. The meat is chilled and kept chilled from the point of production in Argentine to the market. I have seen that meat on the London market, where it is sold as fresh meat. For that class of trade very careful attention would have to be paid to the temperature.

Mr. FISHER. So far as Argentine is concerned, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) is right ; but the dead meat trade of New Zealand is in meat frozen solid, not chilled. I will not go further into details. I am satisfied with the case as it stands, and I think the country will be satisfied that we are doing what we can, and also that we are making progress, as has been acknowledged by everybody on the other side of the House as well as on this side. We are doing all we can do without disturbing the trade, without interfering with the legitimate work of the trade, without creating more difficulties than we should remove—which would be the case if we went any further than we have done after all, we have to deal with matters and with people as they are. We have not had demands from shippers such as hon. gentlemen opposite are making. We have not had demands from shippers that the steamship companies should give a guarantee, for instance. If a shipper sends his goods by cold storage and they are damaged in transit, he has the same recourse against the steamship company as he would have against the railway company if his fruit were frosted or his potatoes frozen while being transported by train.

There is one point I wish to emphasize—a point which was refered to by my hon.

friend from South Oxford (Mr. Schell). That point is that our cold storage facilities and arrangements are superior to those on the American ports. That is proved absolutely and conclusively by the facts that the American shippers send through our ports and by our lines of steamers in preference to the New York or Boston route. The reports and blue-books show, and the shippers in the United States will acknowledge, that our service is better than the American service. The reports of American consuls in Glasgow and other places in Great Britain show that the fruit from Canadian ports arrives in British ports in better condition than does that from American points of shipment. And these consuls reported to their government that if the American trade in these products is to be improved, they must follow the example which the Canadian government has shown them for the last ten years.

Amendment (Mr. E. D. Smith) negatived on division.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business does the government intend to take up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. The motion for Committee of Supply will be made and the Minister of Railways and Canals will present his estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that the Minister of Railways and Canals will make what we may call his budget speech first.

Mr. FIELDING. That is his intention, and, in committee, he will proceed with his estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before we go into committee, after he makes his speech in reply, the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) will have a few remarks to make in reference to the Ross rifle.

Mr. FIELDING. By way of motion ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 22, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 138) to amend the Railway Act. Mr. W. F. Maclean—by Mr. Lennox.

Mr. FISHER.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House, that I have received the following letter from the Secretary of His Excellency the Governor General :

Ottawa, March 22, 1907.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. the Chief Justice of Canada, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at 4 o'clock for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant
C. J. JONES,
For the Governor General's secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny) Mr. Speaker, I desire to move seconded by Mr. Bourassa :

That the third report of the joint committee of both Houses on the printing of parliament be now considered.

My reason for making this motion is that the committee recommends that the report of the Royal Commission on Life Insurance and the evidence taken before that commission be not printed. I understand that the report and the evidence have been printed in English, and I take it that the effect of the recommendation of the committee would be to prevent these documents being printed in French.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) to say that the Printing Committee has recommended that the report of the Insurance Commission and the evidence before that commission be not printed. I presume that the committee framed that recommendation in the light of the fact that the documents had already been printed, and that they simply wanted to guard against double printing. But if the arrangements that were made did not contemplate the printing in the French language, then I agree with the hon. gentleman that that should be done without any motion being made for that purpose, and I think I can say at once that we will arrange to have them printed in both languages.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). It is not only that report, but there are many other documents that are recommended not to be printed. There are, for example, the documents of the Transcontinental Railway Commission pertaining to the improvements of the Quebec harbour. Those are documents of importance, because they especially con-

cern considerable interests in the province of Quebec. I do not know whether they are yet printed in English, but they should certainly be printed in both languages. It seems to me that this report was made merely to prevent the translation into French. That certainly is the reason with regard to the report of the Insurance Commission, because I know that one of the gentlemen who was charged with a partial translation has been notified not to proceed with it by the chief translator, who in turn received his orders from the committee. Besides, there are the despatches and orders in council relating to the colonial conference; these are printed in English only. I have not had time to look through the whole list, but I claim that every document that is printed in English should be printed in French, whether it is an important document or not. The moment it is printed in one language it should be printed in both. The only effect of the introduction of this report would be to prevent the printing in French, because the printing in English has already been done.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The rule is there, the standing order of the House, that everything that appears in English must be printed in French also. We will let the matter stand until the chairman of the committee can be communicated with.

SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVINCES.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). On Monday next I shall move the resolution, regarding subsidies to provinces.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I move:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday next it stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 2.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

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

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). It has become the custom in this House for the Minister of Railways and Canals to present an annual budget, which heretofore has usually been confined to the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not know how long that practice has been in existence, but I do know that during my incumbency of the office I have largely confined myself to a discussion of the financial affairs of that railway. I have felt, however, that this year I should make some departure from that practice, and that I should invite the attention of the House to the affairs of the department generally. There has been such an unusual expansion, I may almost say such a marvellous expansion, in the jurisdiction of the department that it is perhaps due to the House that other branches of that department than the Intercolonial should receive some attention in this statement. The importance of the department need not be referred to, but I would recall the fact that certain additional branches have been added to it during the past few years; for instance, one of the largest is the Railway Commission, another is the Transcontinental Railway Commission, and the work and operation of these commissions are certainly of importance, not merely to the House, but to the country at large. Then when we recall the further fact that in this department are employed some 14,000 persons of all classes, it will at once be seen how desirable it is to widen out, even at the expense of being somewhat tedious, the discussion of the affairs of that department. We have in the employment of the Department of the Railways and Canals in connection with canal administration some 3,000 persons. This does not include the employees in the inside and outside service of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. In addition, there are annually employed by the Intercolonial Railway on an average of 9,000 persons, this year 9,589. If you add to these some hundreds employed on the Transcontinental Railway Commission, you will see that in this department, in all its branches, are employed some 14,000 persons. These facts will give some idea of the expansion of that department in recent years.

On former occasions I have not dealt with the expenditure on canals, and I presume it is not expected that I should go in detail into the annual expenditures made upon these canals. But it will be well perhaps when we realize that there are many millions of dollars annually expended on the canal system of Canada, to inquire for a moment as to what that expenditure means, and as to the direction in which these moneys annually voted by parliament have been applied. It is sometimes questioned as to whether parliament is doing its duty in this regard and as to whether it has accomplished anything in connection with this expenditure. When we realize that the total capital expenditure on the canals of Canada during the past ten years has been about $24,000,000 it is brought home to us that this money must have gone somewhere and perhaps we do not stop to inquire as to the special directions in which it has been applied. I am sure it will be of interest to the House and the country to have some reference made to the respective canals and as to the amounts that have been expended in con-

nection with each of them. I find from 1897 to 1906, both inclusive, the expenditure on capital account on the canal systems has been as follows:

Statement showing Capital Expenditure on the Canals from 1897 to 1906.

		Description of work done since 1897.
Farrans Point canal.. .. .. ..$	869,256 81	Deepening, straightening and enlarging prism of canal, one mile long, from end to end; constructing a lift lock, 800 feet long, and entrance piers at both ends, in order to increase depth of navigation from 9 feet to 14 feet. Work commenced May, 1897, and completed November, 1902.
Rapide Plat canal..	661,408 40	Completing the deepening and enlarging of the prism from end to end, 3⅝ miles; constructing lift lock, weir, side walls, &c., at lower entrance. Widening, deepening and improving upper entrance, in order to increase scale of navigation from 9 to 14 feet.
Galops canal..	4,559,479 31	Deepening and enlarging prism of canal from 9 to 14 feet navigation; constructing a lift lock at lower end, 800 feet long, with the masonry weir; lower entrance pier; a new cutting north of the village of Cardinal, faced with stone; further widening upper entrance.
North channel.. .. .. (A straight channel 300 feet wide with 14 foot navigation direct to Galops canal.)	1,539,590 72	This work was begun in May, 1897, and completed in November, 1906. It consisted in widening, deepening and straightening the north or Canadian channel of the River St. Lawrence westward from the upper entrance to the Galops canal to deep water in the river about four miles below Prescott. It also included the formation of a dam across 'The Gut,' between Adams and Ogdens islands to prevent cross current in Galops rapids channel.
River Reaches..	202,158 14	This sum is made up of work done on shoals immediately west of Cornwall canal; buoy boat with engines and necessary equipment; gas buoys; land damages from Galops rapids works; surveys at different places in river between Prescott and Cornwall; superintending engineer's pay-lists; dredging in Lake St. Francis, west end; widening upper entrance Cornwall canal.
Galops channel..	348,080 78	This work consisted of forming a new channel through the Galops rapids, abreast of the upper entrance to the Galops canal—that would give a 14-foot navigation. The work was begun in 1879 and operation ceased in October, 1906. The work embraced in this sum was principally for widening and extending the channel through the upper shoal.
Lake St. Louis..	243,513 66	Completion of the contract for forming a channel about 4 miles long, near Lachine, principally through rock, to give a more direct entrance to the Lachine canal, and suitable to a 14 foot scale of navigation. This work was begun in May, 1895, and completed in December, 1899. It also includes the cost of a hydrographic survey of the lake made in the years, 1900, 1901 and 1902.
Lake St. Francis..	75,906 71	This was for dredging a new and more direct channel through St. Regis bar and at Hamilton island—at the western end of the lake—suitable for a 14 foot navigation. The work was begun in May, 1898, and completed in November, 1901.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Statement showing Capital Expenditure on the Canals from 1897 to 1906.

		Description of work done since 1897.
Cornwall canal..	$1,265,404 14	This canal is 11 miles long from Cornwall at its lower end to Dickinson's landing at the western end. It has 6 lift locks and weirs and two bridges, and is adapted to a 14 foot navigation. It overcomes the Long Sault rapids. The work of enlargement to a 12 foot navigation was begun in August, 1876, when the lower entrance locks and weirs were placed under contract and were completed in a few years. In April, 1884, the contract for the upper entrance works was let, which included the guard lock and regulating weir, &c. This was for a 14 foot navigation, and in 1888 the remaining or intervening portion of the work was let. In 1893 it was decided to make a new channel abreast of sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, and the dams at the northeast and northwest of Sheiks island were formed. The electric power for operating the locks, weirs and bridges, as well as for lighting the canal, is obtained from the lower end of this new reach. The work embraced in the above amount was principally for the completion of the contracts between the upper and lower entrance sections, i.e., the widening and deepening of the prism, three locks and weirs and two highway bridges, as well as the Sheiks island dams. There was also a further widening of the upper entrance in 1899-1902. All the above work was completed in 1902.
Lachine canal..	1,452,937 67	The work embraced in this sum is for a deepening of the prism of the canal between St. Gabriel lock and Lachine, enlarging supply weir, Lachine; electric light and power plant; dredging below St. Gabriel locks; new bridges at Cote St. Paul and at Atwater avenue, also, the slope walls along the upper reach. The 12 foot enlargement was begun in 1873, but subsequently in 1884 it was changed to 14 feet, which was completed in 1888.
Beauharnois canal..	25,000 00	This was for an allowance to the corporation of the municipality of Valleyfield for a drainage culvert at that place.
Soulanges canal..	4,615,266 15	The total cost of this canal is $6,891,174.70, which embraced the formation of a new canal 14 miles long, on the north shore of the River St. Lawrence, to connect Lake St. Louis with Lake St. Francis, overcoming the Coteau, Cedars and Cascades rapids, including four lift locks and one guard lock and the necessary weirs; all adapted to a 14 foot navigation, but with 15 feet of water on the sills; highway bridges and a railway bridge; also power house to generate the electricity to operate the locks, weirs, bridges, &c., and for lighting the canal from end to end. The work was begun in 1892 and completed in 1902. Two-thirds of total cost since 1897.
Welland canal..	3,026,210 96	The work embraced in this amount includes improvements at Port Colborne harbour and elevator foundations, deepening summit level between Thorold and Port Colborne; removing all old bridge piers and rebuilding with longer bridges, electric light and power plant, surveys for a new line, &c.

Statement showing Capital Expenditure on the Canals from 1897 to 1906.

		Description of work done since 1897.
Sault Ste. Marie canal..	$1,095,664 16	The work embraced in this amount is for deepening, widening and straightening both upper and lower entrance channels and increasing the draught from 18 feet to 20 feet 4 inches, the depth on the lock sills; extending entrance piers at both ends and building new railway bridges; but in this sum are also included some balances paid to the original contractors under terms of award to them.
Trent canal.. .. .. (Now open for 6 feet navigation from Healey's falls to Lake Simcoe ports, the distance from Healey's falls to Orillia is 159 miles.)	3,738,663 27	This amount is for completing that portion of the canal between Peterborough and Lakefield begun in 1895, and included a hydraulic lift lock at Peterborough, as well as several ordinary locks, dams, weirs, &c., between that place and Lakefield. It also includes the completing of section No. 1 of the Balsam—Simcoe division—consisting of prism of canal, entrance piers and bridge abutments, begun also in 1895. The two other sections of this division were commenced in 1900 and are now practically completed, comprising an hydraulic lift lock at Kirkfield, highway bridges, &c., as well as entrance piers at Lake Simcoe. A considerable sum, included in this amount, has also been expended for surveys from Lake Simcoe to Georgian bay and from Rice lake to Lake Ontario.
Carillon, Grenville canal..	152,304 10	This was for widening and deepening the lower part of the Grenville canal west of Greece's point. The work was begun in June, 1897, and completed in June, 1900. It consisted of rock and earth excavation, side walls, &c.
Culbute lock and dam..	3,282 00	This sum was paid out for damages to properties along the Ottawa river, arising out of the construction of these works. I may say that this work has since been abandoned.
Rideau canal..	1,565 84	This was for surveys of a proposed western extension of the canal to obtain a more constant supply of water for navigation purposes during very dry seasons.
Tay canal..	2,750 00	Damages to property of L. Gemmell for water supply cut off by the construction of this branch of the Rideau canal.
Murray canal..	1,350 00	Amount paid for dwelling house for bridgemaster.
	$23,879,792 82	Total in ten years.

Mr. BERGERON. Were not these figures with reference to the Beauharnois canal given last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. What I have given out is the sum total of the expenditure between 1897 and 1906, both inclusive.

Mr. HAGGART. The expenditure on the Port Colborne canal is what was expended by your department, and does not include the expenditure by the Public Works Department.

Mr. EMMERSON. A statement was presented to the House this session as to the expenditure made at the Port Colborne harbour through the Department of Public Works. The expenditure included in this statement is by the Department of Railways and Canals, on the canal proper.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the work at Port Colborne nearly finished?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be completed shortly.

Mr. HAGGART. Will it be completed next season?

Mr. EMMERSON. I should think so.

Mr. HAGGART. How much will it take to build the Trent canal from Healey's Falls to the Bay of Quinté?

Mr. EMMERSON. The estimate from Simcoe to the Georgian bay entrance for an eight foot canal on the locks and nine

feet waterway is somewhat in the vicinity of a million and a half dollars. My recollection is that the estimate from Healey's Falls to Trenton is somewhere above $3,000,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. In reference to the expenditure on the Cornwall canal, does that include the lighting plant as well?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I will deal with that later, as I have the data. It will be seen that a very considerable amount has thus been expended for the purpose of improving the transportation facilities for traffic which finds an outlet at Montreal by way of the St. Lawrence river.

I mentioned at the outset that the Department of Railways and Canals had been enlarged by reason of the annexing thereto of the branches known as the Railway Commission and the Transcontinental Railway Commission, and that thereby the work of the department was increased and its importance to the people of this country enhanced. I did not advert to the expansion that has been going on in Canada, especially in connection with the construction of new lines of railway in every section of the Dominion, which have been subsidized by this parliament. The construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway alone is a very important factor in connection with the transportation problem of Canada. But altogether apart and aside from that there are many railways which would be considered of small moment in comparison with the great Canadian Pacific Railway and the great Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Northern system but all these railways, of minor importance in the general eye, are of supreme importance to the communities which they serve and these railways contribute very materially to the total of the expansion which is going on in Canada. It will be interesting, I am sure, to the people of the country to have brought to their notice in concrete form the expenditures which have been made, and the increase in mileage in the railway system of Canada, from 1896 to 1906. Up to 1896, the total mileage of railways constructed in Canada was 16,387, and the Dominion parliament had contributed in aid of the construction thereof the sum of $90.395,692.91. That is to say this sum was the total amount of railway subsidies paid by the Dominion of Canada from confederation up to the beginning of the year 1906.

Mr. HAGGART. That does not include the amount contributed to the Grand Trunk?

Mr. EMMERSON. That does not include anything prior to confederation.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only from confederation down.

Mr. EMMERSON. Only from confederation down, and the amount paid in aid of the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway was an amount paid by the united provinces of Canada as I understand it.

Mr. HAGGART. They owe a certain amount yet, over $20,000,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would not be as familiar with that, of course, as my hon. friend, but it is not in any way included in the figures which I am giving.

Mr. BRODER. It was a loan anyway.

Mr. EMMERSON. The figures for each year from 1896 to 1906, are given in the following table:

Year.	Total Mileage.	Increase.	Dominion Aid—Paid.	Increase.
			$ cts.	$ cts.
Up to 1896	16,387	... .	90,395,692 91	.....
1897	16,687	300	90,772,663 71	376,970 80
1898	16,870	183	92,072,790 66	1,300,126 95
1899	17,358	488	95,105,468 24	3,032,677 58
1900	17,824	466	95,715,924 70	610,456 46
1901	18,294	470	98,060,932 43	2,345,007 73
1902	18,868	574	100,039,820 13	1,978,887 70
1903	19,078	210	101,387,142 47	1,347,322 34
1904	19,611	533	103,351,997 31	1,964,854 84
1905	20,601	990	104,512,126 84	1,160,129 53
1906	21,518	917	105,734,201 21	1,222,074 37
Totals	.....	5,131	.....	15,338,508 30

NOTE.—This table does not include cost of either the Intercolonial or Prince Edward Island railways.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was received from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. SPEAKER. His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of your hnourable House in the Chamber of the honourable Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House, that his honour the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name, the Royal assent to the following Bills ?

An Act respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting the London and St. Clair Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Indian River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Dominion Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code.

An Act respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.

An Act to encourage the establishment of Cold Storage Warehouses for the preservation of perishable Food Products.

An Act to confirm certain agreements between the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, and Richard B. Angus and between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal and Richard B. Angus.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Valley and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Athabaska Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.

An Act respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.

An Act respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.

An Act respecting the Annuity Company of Canada.

An Act respecting a patent of Edgar Webster Summers and Hadley Herbert Summers.

An Act respecting the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Prudential Savings Society.

An Act respecting a patent of the George E. Smith Lumber Company.

An Act to amend the Northwest Territories Act.

An Act respecting the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Women's Art Association of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER.

An Act to incorporate the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Surveys of the Public Lands of the Dominion and the Surveyors entitled to make such surveys.

An Act respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Great West Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Joliette and Brandon Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Eastern Townships Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Malone and Hopkins Point Railway Company.

An Act to amend an Act to confirm an agreement entered into by Her late Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway System to the city of Montreal.

An Act to incorporate the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Northwestern Trusts and Loan Company.

An Act to incorporate the Residential Fire Assurance Company.

An Act respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.

An Act to establish the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund.

An Act to amend the Petroleum Bounty Act, 1904.

An Act to aid in the Prevention an Settlement of Strikes and Lockouts in Mines and Industries connected with Public Utilities.

An Act to ratify an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia respecting the Western Boundary of the Railway Belt.

SUPPLY—REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker : Continuing what I was saying when interrupted, perhaps it would be instructive if we were to consider the work of the Railway Commission, which may be considered an adjunct of the Department of Railways and Canals. But, time will not permit of our dealing with that matter. I laid on the table a few days ago, a report of that commission giving very full details of the work done within the past fiscal year. A reference to that report has shown that an immense number of cases have been taken into consideration by the commission ; and I think that a careful perusal of it will lead to the conclusion that the creation of that tribunal and the expenditure necessarily involved in its maintenance are fully justified. On this subject, therefore, I content myself with referring hon. members to that report which has been printed and placed in the hands of hon.

members. On the 10th of December last, I placed on the table the report of the Transcontinental Commission with respect to their work up to the 30th of June last, and there have been placed on the table, from time to time since, reports of the work that has proceeded during the present fiscal year. A few minutes ago, when I was giving the number of employees of the department, I had not under my hand the details of that branch known as the Transcontinental Railway Commission. I find that that commission have in their employ on the surveys and general outside service 1,049 men; in their transport service, 192 men, and at headquarters at Ottawa, 59 men—a total of 1,300. There are employed in connection with the canals 3,074 persons; and the number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway, is 9,589. This makes a grand total of employees in the Department of Railways and Canals of 13,963—in round numbers practically 14,000 persons.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any increase on the Intercolonial Railway over last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there has been a considerable reduction. Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should do wisely if I directed my attention to the matter of railways generally and coming down in this order to the Intercolonial Railway. There have been great changes in the railway system of this continent during even the last ten years. And, certainly any one who covers in memory the period of years that I do must contemplate with wonder the difference between the railways of the early seventies in Canada and the railways in Canada today. Take for instance the period of the opening of the Intercolonial Railway. Let us fix that at July, 1876, which was the time when Mr. (now Sir) Sandford Fleming made his final report to the government announcing that the road had been completed and was ready for operation. The opening of that railway marked an epoch in the history of eastern Canada—indeed the history of all Canada. It was an event which had been looked forward to for years; the building of the railway was a project which had agitated the minds of the people in eastern Canada and Central Canada for a period of at least half a century. But what was that railway then in comparison with the railways of our days? Why, there has been a complete revolution—in the character of the road-bed and the track; in the rolling stock and the furnishings of that rolling stock; in the accommodation for patrons in the railway stations; in all the comforts and luxuries of traffic. In every other branch of railway work, including every part of the operation of the railway there have been changes equally marked. I think we shall all agree that these have been advantageous to those who use the railways of this country.

Of course one might say that when the Intercolonial was completed on the 1st of July, 1876, and when Mr. Fleming, now Sir Sanford Fleming, reported to the government of which he was an honoured official, that that railway was open for operation, the people of Canada might have said: We have built a railway, it is open for operation, our expenditure is ended, our capital expenditure must henceforth cease, we have accomplished our object, we have secured that for which we have been looking for half a century. But we find that if these were their assumptions and their aspirations, they were vain. We now find that from 1876 down to this year of grace, this Dominion has annually expended very large sums on its government railway system, sums which it has paid out of capital account as an investment, and it has become necessary for us to inquire as to that expenditure chargeable to capital account. Was it necessary, has it been in accord with the railway systems in other countries, whether controlled by government or by private corporations? I think we need only to survey this continent to find justification for the action taken by this parliament in annually voting large sums to aid in the maintenance of the Intercolonial, to aid in its betterment, to bring it up to the standard of each year of grace. Because, what was the standard for railways in 1876, at the time of this construction, has ceased to be the standard to-day, and if the Intercolonial of 1876, with the conditions then prevailing, were to be laid down alongside a modern system of railways, it would present as much contrast with a modern railway as there would have been found between Stephenson's railway, running out of Salisbury in 1825, and the Intercolonial of 1876. And yet the year 1876 is not very far back, it is but a brief span to those of us who had the privilege of reaching young manhood at that period, it seems to us but as yesterday. I know that is my experience, it seems but as a day, and yet during that time there has been a revolution, not to say an evolution, in the railway systems of this continent, indeed throughout the world.

Now, the necessity for changes, marked changes began ten or twelve years ago. About that time all the railways on this continent found themselves face to face with a condition of affairs which necessitated enormous expenditures. As a first preliminary, the capactiy of the freight cars was increased until the maximum load was brought up to 100,000 pounds instead of the 40,000 pounds which was the former maximum. The average freight car in use today is 60,000 pounds, a few years ago it was 40,000 pounds, an increase in ten years of fifty per cent. Locomotives have practically doubled in weight, and in price as well. Besides that, they have been improved in a very marked degree. As was the change between the tallow dip of our forefathers

in their homes on a winter's night, as compared with the modern electric light, so is the change in that comparatively unimportant matter, for instance, of the headlights of locomotives. But yesterday we thought that a kerosene lamp with reflectors furnished us with a splendid headlight; to-day, if you wish to modernize your railroad system and your locomotives, you must have electric headlights generating their own electrical power. Some ten or twelve years ago the rails were unable to carry this heavier class of rolling stock and had to be replaced. Additional ballasting was required, heavier bolts and fastenings, heavier switch work, all the bridges had to be renewed to bear the heavier rolling stock, longer sidings had to be provided, the yards had to be increased in length and in the number of tracks, larger coal chutes were necessary, more water and larger tanks also had to be provided. In addition, the passenger rolling stock had to be increased in strength. Greater luxuries are demanded by the travelling public, so that much more extensive cars, first-class coaches, sleeping cars and dining cars had to be provided, and a heavier class of locomotives had to be furnished in order to haul these heavier passenger trains. It followed that the railway and machine shops were wholly inadequate to handle the repairs for such heavy locomotives and cars. The tools were too light, the roundhouses too short; the turn tables had to be increased in length and in strength. Formerly two men could go to any locomotive, carrying a side rod and tools to do any work on it; but to-day it requires the services of a crane, operated in many instances by electrical power. In fact the main lines of the railways throughout the continent of America have been practically rebuilt during the last decade. I have been referring to the procedure connected with the railway systems throughout this continent. The Intercolonial Railway necessarily had to be kept up as near as possible, in proportion to the appropriation of parliament, to the standard, and that railway has been following in the paths of the others as of necessity it had to do or go out of business entirely as a modern railway and be closed down. As on all other railways portions of double track had to be built and reductions in grades had to be made. This latter portion of the work on the Intercolonial Railway, owing to its location, has not been carried out to anything like the extent that it has been on the other railway systems in America.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister state where the reductions in grade have taken place?

Mr. HAGGART. He says that work has not been carried out.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said it has not been carried out to the same extent. There have been reductions here and there in isolated cases but there have not been the reductions in the grades of the railway such as the interests of the Intercolonial Railway demand and such as would have been made if the Intercolonial Railway were a more profitable institution and if the Canadian parliament would furnish sufficient funds for that purpose. But, some work has been done in that direction. There have been great improvements in respect to the ballasting, all of which work has been paid for out of revenue. I make the assertion that the action of the Intercolonial Railway in that regard is without parallel in the history of the Canadian railways. There never has been one single dollar charged up to capital by the Intercolonial Railway on account of the expenditure for additional ballasting that has been from time to time placed upon its roadbed. The Canadian Pacific Railway, a year or two ago, increased its ballast; that is where there was an average of six inches of ballast it was necessary, for the betterment of the road, to increase it to eight or ten inches. That has been done on the Intercolonial Railway as it was done on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on one of its eastern sections, it charged that expenditure for additional ballast to capital account while for every such betterment on the Intercolonial Railway the expenditure has been charged to and paid out of revenue.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman say that the increased ballasting on the Canadian Pacific Railway has been charged to capital account?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have cited one instance and I have made that statement.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do you know where that was?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the eastern section; east of Montreal. Notwithstanding the efforts which have been put forth by the Intercolonial Railway in connection with its cars there has been a great shortage in its car supply. Owing to the peculiar position of the road there will always be a very large number of its cars away from home, inasmuch as the larger portion of its traffic originates on its line and goes abroad. Less traffic comes to the road from foreign roads which compels us to send our cars abroad without the usual compensation of foreign cars coming in to replace our own. The prompt return of our cars would enable us to give much better satisfaction to our customers. I do not know whether the word is too strong or not but I think I will venture to use it and I will say that the dishonest diversion of our rolling stock by certain American roads is a matter that requires the serious attention of the railway management.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend says 'hear, hear.' I am glad I can echo his 'hear, hear' in this instance.

Mr. HAGGART. Not only American but Canadian roads.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend's 'hear, hears' are too often meaningless. In this case they do certainly apply, but I will give the reason why they apply, and I am not saying that in agreeing with my hon. friend I cast any reflection upon the management in that regard, nor are they blameable by reason of it. However, the condition of the Intercolonial Railway makes it impossible for us to square ourselves with the American systems. We have great quantities of pulp wood and lumber traffic originating on our railway. That traffic is destined for the New England and middle states. These cars go into the possession of an American railway. Under the custom applicable in such instances they can hold a car for a certain period of time, then they can pass it on to another railway and that railway, in its turn, can hold that car for a period paying so much per diem. They can only hold it for a certain period and if they keep it for a longer time the per diem charge is larger. But before that time expires they pass it on to another railway and in this way a perfect revolution is kept up. I have seen Intercolonial Railway cars myself away up in the mountains of California just north of San Francisco. I remember that two years ago, when going over these mountains, I saw, away up in the hills, on a secluded siding, one of the best freight cars that we have on the Intercolonial Railway and everywhere over this continent have I noticed these railway cars. But, how can you help it? This question is claiming the attention of the management. There is no international law that will enforce the return of a car and there is no possible application to the courts, which we can make that will bring about redress. Our situation is such that they do not have very much traffic originating with them whereby their cars can come to our road which would enable us to keep them as a retaliatory act, and if we did keep them we could only keep them for a shorter period because we have not those numberless systems that they have in connection with their own roads whereby they can pass these cars from one to the other. We cannot do that and geographically and by environment we are placed at a disadvantage in that regard with the American systems.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you not the same trouble with the Canadian roads?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not to the same extent, because we get more of their cars and we go upon the principle that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. When their cars come we feel, that, they having got a good number of ours, we are justified in keeping theirs in retaliation.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not christian-like; you should not do it because they do it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know it shocks the sensitive nerves of my hon friend (Mr. Haggart), but I am going to tell the truth on all occasions no matter where the chips fall; I cut the tree down with this little hatchet, I have to tell the truth. On November 8, 1906, the total Intercolonial Railway cars off the line was 4,403, and the total foreign cars on our line 1,652, leaving a shortage, owing to exchange of cars and on branch lines, of 2,028.

There is another feature of the car situation to which I feel I should allude. There are a number of branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial Railway, which serve as feeders for it. These railways were constructed by companies who were aided by subsidies from this parliament in many instances, and by subsidies from the provincial legislatures in all instances. In no instance did the aggregate of the aid received by the companies do more than build the road. It did not enable them to supply a sufficiency of equipment and rolling stock, and in almost every instance there was no capital to enable these companies to continue the operation of the road. They issued bonds, too often at a very large discount, and with the proceeds of these bonds they completed the road, but then their sources of supply were exhausted. As, in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, when it was said to be finished, it was only finished for the moment, so with these branch lines. As year by year passed, the communities served by these lines found that they required to be further finished, to be renewed, to have additional rolling stock. The people were disappointed The parliament of Canada and the legislatures of the provinces were disappointed, because the good that was expected from the construction of the road for the aid given, did not follow. In many instances these railways have been continued, by reason of personal sacrifices of the people living along them. They have been struggling to operate them. In no instance has there been any railway constructed in eastern Canada that has been in any sense a bonanza to its shareholders, and in every instance the accommodation has been inadequate for the communities which they were intended to serve. The Intercolonial Railway seeks to gather up all the traffic it can, and it finds that on certain branch lines there is lumber and other freight to be shipped to the eastern states or to points on the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway. But these branch lines have no freight cars. Is that freight to be left lying along these branch lines? The Intercolonial Railway is therefore called upon to furnish cars to these lines in order to get the traffic, and in that way a

great many of the Intercolonial Railway cars are put in this service to the disadvantage, in many instances, of its patrons who live along the trunk line. This accounts in some degree for the shortage of cars on the Intercolonial. The usual remedy for dishonest diversions is to refuse to exchange business with the offending road. Unfortunately, in the case of the Intercolonial, if this remedy were enforced it would mean ruin to its best customers, for the reason that the market for wood products is in the United States, and on the lines of the offending roads. It may be of some interest to compare the railway as it was in 1896 with the year 1906, dealing only with the salient features.

—	1896.	1906.	Increase.
			Per cent.
Length of line..	1,182·5	1,477·92	25
Capital invested	55,267,044·63	81,238,728·63	41
No. of locomotives	204	347	70
Passenger car service	276	429	55
Freight car service	6,667	10,819	62
Work service land	...	...	...
Ploughs, flangers, &c.	77	129	67
Engine mileage	4,714,661	9,304,511	99
Train mileage	3,842,502	7,424,831	93
Car mileage	43,005,684	93,746,123	117

In addition to this, the line has been relaid with 80-pound steel rails, replacing 62½-pound steel rails.

Nearly the entire length has been reballasted.

Bridges have all been replaced, and on a scale adequate for any reasonable increase in weight of rolling stock.

New terminals have been provided at many points, such as Sydney, North Sydney, Halifax, St. John and Moncton.

New roundhouses have been built at Chaudière Junction, Rivière du Loup, Stellarton, Sydney, St. Flavie, Campbellton, St. John and Truro.

A fine modern brick passenger depot has been built at Sydney, another at Pictou, another at Westville, another at Stellarton, another at Antigonish and another at Maccan; one at Windsor, on the line of the Windsor branch, and one at Memramcook, and at many other points. There was one at Drummondville, in Quebec, and a new one at Lévis; in fact, all along the line improvements have been made in this regard at every place, whether of greater or less importance. We have also added a large number of smaller depots for passenger and freight service, wherever the business conditions seemed to warrant. We have constructed two elevators, one at Halifax and the other at St. John. We have given increased dock accommodation and additional sidings as well at both of these important points, which are stopping points in the line of export transportation from this country to European markets.

Every passing track (that is a siding where trains cross on the line) has been relaid and lengthened, and at all important places additional sidings have been added. This has been necessary. The advent of larger locomotives meant additional cars and longer freight trains. The improvements in passenger cars and the additional luxuries that have to be provided to-day, as compared with ten years ago, necessitated more cars and longer trains, and that, in turn, necessitated longer crossing- and passing-sidings. Improvements in one direction necessitated improvements in all directions, and all this meant the betterment of the Intercolonial Railway; it meant the expenditure of money out of capital account in the same way that these expenditures are made, and have been made during the past decade, by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway systems. But the effect of such expenditures on the business of the country and on the railway itself has been beneficial, as is evidenced by the statement which I read to you a few minutes ago, showing the great increase in engine, train and car mileage.

Dealing with the present year in comparison with the preceding one, the following statistical information will, I am sure, be found of interest. I shall give you a comparison of the train, engine and car miles and tons one way, and the earnings, as between the years 1,905 and 1906:

Freight train miles, 1905..	4,404,025
Freight train miles, 1906..	4,730,595
Increase..	326,570
Passenger train miles 1905..	2,892,720
Passenger train miles, 1906..	2,694,236
Decrease..	198,484
Light and shunting engine miles, 1905.	2,103,548
Light and shunting engine miles. 1906.	1,879,680
Decrease..	223,868

The decreases in the last two items are not retrograde movements, but rather improvements, a material advance in the operation of the railway showing that there has been a saving of mileage, especially in the case of the shunting engines. This is a very material advance in the operation of the railway, showing that there has been a material saving in the mileage of the shunting engines.

Mr. HAGGART. Useless trains.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Especially the one from Montreal to Halifax.

Mr. EMMERSON. We will talk about that later. My hon. friend is getting impatient. I am sorry he does not possess the patience I have. This lessening of the light and shunting engine mileage shows an improvement in the operation of the road and the saving of unnecessary expenditure. The total engine miles in 1905 was 9,400,293 and in 1906, 9,304,511, a decrease of 95,782. Here is a comparison very much to the credit of the Intercolonial Railway. It shows we had much less engine miles whereas we had an increase in the freight train miles. That is to say we had fewer engines, but what we had were carrying their full capacity. Where you have a large number of engines going over the road not loaded to the full capacity, you are not efficiently operating the road. But where you have large trains operated by engines equal to the capacity of those trains or where you have engines with cars loaded up to the full capacity of the motive power, you are saving in expense of operation and operating the railway efficiently and advantageously.

In freight car miles we had in 1905, 72,739,921 as compared with 78,399,746 in 1906, being an increase of 5,659,825.

In 1905 we had passenger car miles 15,515,356 as compared with 15,346,377 in 1906, being a decrease of 168,979. There again is an improvement and a marked improvement. The total car miles in 1905 was 88,255,277 as compared with 93,746,123 in 1906 an increase of 5,490,846.

Tons, one mile in 1905..	711,049,733
" " 1906..	851,211,445
Increase..	140,161,712
Tons, per engine mile in 1905..	75·6
" " " 1906..	91·5
Increase..	15·9
Passengers carried, 1905..	2,810,960
" " 1906..	2,737,160
Decrease..	73,800

I cannot account for this because I do not know whether it is due to faultiness in the returns from the conductors or what it was, but it appears that while there was a decrease in the number of passengers in 1906 as compared with 1905, there was an increase in the passenger earnings.

The returns of the gross revenue are as follows:

—	1905.	1906.	Increase.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Passengers....	2,105,066 75	2,297,716 52	192,649 77
Freight.	4,373,178 55	5,019,805 33	646,626 78
Mail and sundries.. ..	305,277 53	326,307 85	21,307 32
Total.....	6,783,522 83	7,643,829 70	860,307 07

Mr. J. D. REID. Have you the earnings in 1896?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; they were just about one half, but that is not a fair comparison because the mileage of 1896 was not the mileage of 1906. But in 1905 and 1906 the mileage was equal.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then there is an increase.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, a very material increase—an increase of upwards of $860,000. Let us turn to the expenditures.

Locomotive power, 1905..	$31,115,653 49
Locomotive power, 1906..	2,930,075 83
Decrease..	$ 186,577 66

This decrease in expenditure was effected, notwithstanding the fact that we carried more tons of traffic. And there again the management of the Intercolonial Railway is to be complimented.

Cars, transportation and repairs, 1905..	$2,040,133 13
Cars, transportation and repairs, 1906..	1,617,119 70
Decrease..	$ 423,013 43
Maintenance of way and works, 1905..	$1,722,616 65
Maintenance of way and works, 1906..	1,397,143 62
Decrease..	$ 325,473 03

Now, if this decrease in the expenditure on maintenance of way and works were due to want of attention through neglect in the maintenance of the road at the high standard already attained, we should not be entitled to the slightest credit. But I speak whereof I know when I say that the road has been maintained up to the standard of 1905—yes, and even at a higher standard. In addition, we laid certain rails, the labour in laying which is chargeable to this item of expenditure.

Station expenses, 1905..	$ 937,816 11
Station expenses, 1906..	1,032,764 20
Increase..	$ 94,948 09

Why this increase? We have furnished additional accommodation, we have provided more and better stations; but this does not account for this increase. The cause of this increase is to be found in the fact, and in that fact alone, that there has been a very material increase in the wages paid to telegraphers, station agents, porters and other employees connected with this branch of operation.

Totals of expenditure, 1905.. ..$8,352,761 23
Totals of expenditure, 1906.. .. 7,563,371 25

We had a car mileage loss of $16,065.62 in 1905, and a gain of $121,456.89 in 1906, an increase as between 1906 and 1905 of $137,522.41.

Rental of leased lines in 1905 was $140,000 and the same in 1906.

Grand total of expenditure, 1905..$8,508,826 75
Grand total of expenditure, 1906.. 7,581,914 36

Decrease in 1906.. .. ..$ 926,912 39

That is to say, we lessened our expenditure legitimately by saving and by improvement of operation to the extent of this decrease. The total improvement in the operation of the Intercolonial Railway in 1906 as compared with 1905 was the magnificent sum of $1,787,219.46.

To give these figures they may be summarized as follows :

EXPENDITURE.

—	1905.	1906.	Decrease or Increase.
Locomotive power	$3,116,653 49	$2,930,075 83	*$186,577 66
Cars, transportation and repairs	2,040,133 13	1,617,119 70	*423,013 43
Maintenance of way and works	1,722,616 65	1,397,143 62	*325,473 03
Station expenses	937,816 11	1,032,764 20	†94,948 09
General charges	535,541 85	586,267 90	†50,726 05
Totals	$8,352,761 23	$7,563,371 25	.....
Car mileage	§16,065 62	‡121,456 89	†137,522 41
Rental leased lines	140,000 00	140,000 00	.....
Totals	$8,508,826 75	$7,581,914 36	$*926,912 39
Total improvement	.....	.....	$1,787,219 46

* Decrease. † Increase. § Loss. ‡ Gain.

Let us now turn to the question of cost of operation. The following figures show the condition of the road in this respect :

Cost per train mile	1·166c.	1·021c.
Cost per engine mile	90·5c.	81·5c.

—	1905.	1906.	—
	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Revenue earned per train mile	0·93	1·0294	Increase 11 per cent.
" freight car mile	0·06	$0·06\frac{4}{10}$	" $6\frac{2}{3}$ "
" ton mile	$0·06\frac{15}{100}$	$0·05\frac{827}{1000}$	Decrease of 4·1 "
" passenger	$0·85\frac{7}{10}$	$0·95\frac{9}{10}$	Increase $10\frac{2}{3}$ cents.
" " mile	$0·19\frac{3}{10}$	$0·19\frac{7}{10}$	" $\frac{4}{10}$ "

For purpose of comparison the revenue earned per ton of freight, per mile, average of all United States railway, for year 1904, latest published, $7\frac{8}{10}$c. or 32 per cent higher than I.C.R., 1906.

Grand Trunk railway, 6 months ending June, 1905, $6\frac{9}{10}$c. or 19 per cent higher than I.C.R., 1906.

Canadian Pacific Railway, year 1905, $7\frac{67}{100}$c. or 30 per cent higher than I.C.R., 1906.

New South Wales, Australia, $22\frac{7}{10}$c. or 350 per cent higher than I.C.R., 1906.

The gross earnings per revenue train mile for the year 1906, on the I.C.R., were $1·0294
Average all United States railways for year 1904 ..... 1·940
Average New Zealand Government railway, 1906 ..... 1·85
Average Victorian railways, Australia ..... $1·93\frac{1}{2}$

Mr. EMMERSON.

There are no statistics in Victoria or in New Zealand showing the revenue earned per ton of freight per mile. We only find that in the returns from New South Wales, although I am informed that they are now doing that in another of the Australian colonies. These figures show that the gross earnings on the Intercolonial were only $1·0294, as compared with the average earnings on the United States Railways of $1·94, and on the New Zealand government railway system for 1906 of $1·85. Their earnings were largely in excess of ours, owing to their rates being larger than the rates chargeable on the Intercolonial. These figures refer to the gross earnings. Now the average on the Victoria railways was $1·935.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you mean by $1·935.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the figures compared with a unit of $1, using the decimal system. Ton mile statistics are not available for the New Zealand and Victorian railways, and while train mile earnings are not as accurate a basis for comparison as the ton mile, it is the only information to be had and as far as it applies, is a measure of the cost of service to the community served by the railway. Taking the Intercolonial as a unit of $1, United States railways, in their gross earnings, average $1.85. That is to say, where we get $1 the United States railways get $1.88, the New Zealand railways get $1.79, the Victorian railways $1.88.

For the fiscal year 1906 we hauled 851,211,445 ton miles of pay freight on the Intercolonial, and as we haul about one ton of tare for every ton of freight, it is fair to infer that we hauled just as many tons of cars one mile. We hauled one loaded car for every 12·47 tons of freight in 1905, and in 1906 we used one car for every 14·22 tons of freight, which means that we made a saving of 120,000,000 mile tons tare over the corresponding last fiscal year. This was due to heavier loads. This is approximately the equivalent of our fast freight trains, Nos. 75 and 76, between Halifax and Montreal, for three months; we made that saving. The increase in net tons hauled is due in part to the full loading of cars of larger capacity built in recent years; and in part, I think, it is due to the fact that special instructions were given, and special care was taken to have those instructions followed, that every engine sent out should, so far as possible, have its full measure of capacity of cars.

The result of the operations of the Intercolonial Railway for the fiscal year 1906 was as follows:

Gross revenue Intercolonial Railway..	$7,643,829 70
Gross expenditure..	7,581,914 36
Difference..	$ 61,915 34
To which must be added profits derived from the Windsor branch..	$ 31,966 34
Total surplus, I.C.R..	$ 93,881 87
Last year, 1905, the Prince Edward Island Raialway made a loss of..	$ 153,133 83
The loss for the fiscal year 1906, was..	$ 36,982 24
Making a betterment of...	$ 116,151 24

I might explain that the accounting system has been brought into harmony with that in use on other Canadian systems and on the American systems of railways, certainly into harmony with the system prevailing on the Canadian Pacific Railway, Grand Trunk Railway, New York Central and other great railways on this continent. Detailed statements of the cost of each item are now placed monthly in the hands of the responsible heads and more ample and accurate statistics are being secured and put in form to enable those responsible for the operation of the railway to bring about improvements. Each Monday morning a statement is made and presented to the head of the department showing what his expenditures were during the preceding week. That can be used in comparison with what these expenditures were the week preceding that. There can be readily made a comparison by the heads demonstrating to them as to whether their expenses are increasing or decreasing, and whether there is economy being shown in the operation of their respective branches.

The disastrous fire that occurred at Moncton in February last totally destroyed the car repair shops and partially destroyed the locomotive repair shops as follows:

	Dimensions of building, feet.
Paint shop, car repairs, a wooden building..	535 x 65
Freight car repair shop, a wooden building..	565 x 78
Car works shop, two stories brick building with all tools..	455 x 78
The roof of the power house was burned, and was otherwise injured.	
A brick store house was destroyed..	50 x 40
The boiler shop was seriously injured, all the wood in the roof, &c., being burned..	160 x 100
The machine shop, wood portions destroyed..	230 x 100

All the tools contained in the shops in question were either destroyed or seriously injured.

All shafting, pulleys, belts, &c., were burned up.

Of rolling stock, the following were burned up:

One official car, one first-class sleeping car, one second-class sleeping car, one dining car, four first-class passenger cars, one second-class passenger car, one postal car, two express and bagage cars, five box cars, seven platform cars, one twenty ton coal car, twenty-six other cars were more or less damaged.

Mr. HAGGART. Was there any insurance?

Mr. EMMERSON. No insurance. There has never been adopted in the history of the Intercolonial Railway the policy of insuring any of its property. I believe it is upon the principle that the government having their property widely spread over the country at different points, one portion will insure the other and that if they were to attempt to insure all their property of that character along the line of the Intercolonial Railway the loss in premiums yearly would be very much larger than the loss occasioned by any possible fires would amount to.

Mr. HAGGART. Did you charge these restorations to the revenue or capital?

Mr. EMMERSON. The restoration of the buildings will be charged to capital, the cars and these other things being replaced out of revenue. Immediate steps were taken to provide temporary repair shops at a direct cost of $60,000 which was paid out of revenue. The indirect cost exceeds the direct outlay as the workmen have to perform their duties at a disadvantage. The old site of the shops was too small and entirely inadequate for the requirements of the Intercolonial Railway even at this date. and, certainly having regard to the future, was very inadequate. As a consequence advantage was taken of the fire to secure an area of 288 acres.

Mr. LENNOX. You said that the government provides the insurance itself?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Do you set aside anything out of earnings from year to year to form an insurance fund?

Mr. EMMERSON. It has never been done in the history of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. LENNOX. It would come out of revenue?

Mr. EMMERSON. The approximate cost of this area was $33,000 and on it we are constructing a new set of shops, modern in lay out, construction and equipment. Contracts have been awarded for the car repair shops, storehouse and locomotive shops. Tenders will shortly be called for the roundhouse, power-house, oil-house and dry kiln. Ample provision for growth in the future has been made in the lay out.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you the full staff on yet?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I will explain that in one moment. At Moncton and at all terminal and divisional points on the Intercolonial Railway improvements are being made to the end that economical operation may be secured and ensured. Of course the destruction of these shops has very materially embarrassed the Intercolonial Railway in its operation. As to repairs we have very limited accommodations and those of the most temporary character in which such men as we have—and we have not been able to reinstate those whose services had to be dispensed with at the time of the fire—work at a very great disadvantage.

The cost of repairs during the past season has been materially enhanced thereby. We have avoided doing any more work than is absolutely necessary. In a measure, that has affected our car supply, and in a measure—as I will show when I come to invite your attention to the financial results of the first six months of the current fiscal year—it has affected our returns; not in the surface showing of our returns, but with respect to the lessened renewals that we have been able to make in the way of supplying cars that have been worn out or destroyed. During the past fiscal year, as far as possible, we have replaced very many of the cars that were worn out, but we have not been able to replace the cars that were destroyed by the fire. However, during the current fiscal year which ends on the 31st of this month, provision has been made for replacing a considerable proportion of these cars.

Mr. HAGGART. It is now six o'clock, and when the hon. gentleman resumes after dinner I would ask him to be kind enough to make a statement as to what the present arrangements are with the Canadian Pacific Railway, as to running rights on the Intercolonial.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RAILWAY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 90) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

On section 1,

Mr. CAMPBELL. This section was amended in the Railway Committee to provide that certain outstanding claims for wages and other expenditures in connection with the construction of the road should be paid to the extent of $50,000. Both parties agreed to have the first section amended to that effect.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that objection was taken that this would revive claims which had expired under the provincial statute of limitation.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No. That was in reference to certain bonuses which were granted some twenty-five years ago and which have been outlawed. Both parties have agreed that these bonuses have all lapsed, and they relinquish all claims to them.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understood the matter rightly, it was entirely different. No Act of this House could revive any bonuses that had lapsed. The statement was made that debts which had lapsed under the statute of limitation had been revived by this Act.

Mr. EMMERSON. That contention was made, but as soon as it was made the solicitor for the railway interest, Mr. T. Chase Casgrain, consented to the proposed amendment whereby the railway would be liable to the event of an amalgamation, and it was agreed to appropriate $50,000 to the liquidation of this indebtedness pro rata. All parties agree to that.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I may say that I was present when Mr. Casgrain agreed that an amount not exceeding $50,000 would be paid on these old claims.

Section agreed to ; Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MANITOBA RADIAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—Mr. Bole, read the first time.

Mr. EMMERSON. I move that clause 9 be restored. I am quite aware of the contention made before the Railway Commit tee——

Mr. SPEAKER. A motion of that kind would not be in order.

Mr. LENNOX. I have a motion here which will have the same effect and which is in accord with rule 113. I move that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 46) to incorporate the Manitoba Radial Railway Company, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines for consideration.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Mr. EMMERSON. When we rose at recess, Mr. Speaker, I had finished a recital of some statistics relating to the Intercolonial Railway—statistics that I think will be of decided advantage as information to the people. We are all agreed that the more information regarding that railway there is disseminated throughout the country, the better will it stand in the opinion of the people. It is desirable that the country should have full information regarding its operations. It is one of our greatest public works and as such should be placed in its true light before the public. I had referred to the financial statement, showing the results of the operation of the railway during the year 1906 as compared with the year 1905. It will be interesting to know that the improvement is based upon such facts and conditions as will immeasurably ensure improvement in the future. The result is not merely a spasmodic one to be followed by a retrograde movement but one which is bound to endure. While I was gratified with the showing of 1906, I have very much more reason to be gratified at the result of the operations of the road during the first six months of the present fiscal year, commencing the 1st of July, 1906, and closing the 31st of December of that year. At the end of the first six months the gross earnings of the railway were $4,425,213.28 and the gross expenditure $4,047,556.43 This shows a net surplus of receipts over expenditure of $377,656.85 in the operations of the railway during the six months. I think, that is the best result that the Intercolonial Railway has demonstrated for many a year. And this result, on its face, is the more gratifying because of the fact that there were certain unusual expenditures made during that period but for which the surplus for the six months would have been still larger. One such expenditure which may be specifically mentioned was the satisfaction of a judgment for $56,000, obtained against the railway for damage resulting from fire. A certain area of timber lands in the province of Quebec was destroyed, as a result, it was alleged, and demonstrated to the satisfaction of the court at least, of sparks from a locomotive of the Intercolonial Railway. A petition of right was sued for and granted, and the result of trial was a judgment in favour of the plaintiff to the amount of about $56,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Who was the plaintiff ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Price, of Price Brothers. This judgment was unfortunate for our financial operations for the six months, for this fire had taken place in 1903, the liability having been thus incurred before I had anything to do with the Intercolonial Railway. Of course, it was claimed on the part of the railway that the fire had not resulted from fire on any property of the Intercolonial Railway, and that there had been no negligence. But the court thought otherwise and so determined.

Mr. MORIN. May I ask the hon. minister a question ? How much loss did the government sustain through the burning of the shops in Moncton last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, that would more properly come in in another place, but I may interrupt my remarks to say that it will cost about $1,000,000 to rebuild the shops at Moncton. Of course, the new shops will be on a much larger scale than the old ones were, and better suited to the requirements of the railway and the trade it is doing. I was going on to say, when interrupted, that the results I have just recited with respect to the first operations of

the railway during the first six months, as well as the result during the preceding year, were very satisfactory indeed; and they were obtained in the face of very large increase over previous years in the cost of material and labour. For many years the employees of the Intercolonial Railway in my judgment, were inadequately paid. There may have been some excuse for keeping down the remuneration paid to the employees. Although we all recognize that the labourer is worthy of his hire, there may have been some slight excuse for the effort that was made to keep down the wages in the fact that the financial condition of the Intercolonial Railway was not satisfactory and that its earning power did not improve. At the very inception of the road, very low freight rates were established and there was never any change in an upward direction. The passenger rates were placed at a minimum and they have never been increased. These rates were established with a view to promoting trade and communication between the sea-board provinces and the inland provinces. At the same time, the increased accommodation and added luxuries of travel added to the cost of operating the road. Thus the burden of annual expenditure was gradually being raised higher and higher, while earning power was not increased to any material extent. The wages of the men were increased 10, 15 or 20 per cent at a time, but no corresponding increases in freight or passenger rates were made. The result was inevitable—there was no improvement in the balance sheet as the years passed by. During the year 1906, we had to make an effort to increase our passenger rates and our freight rates. During the past six years we have practically added $1,000,000 to the yearly wages of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway—that is, to the same number of employees and of the same general classes, we are paying about $1,000,000 more annually than we paid in the year 1900. In every department there has been an increase. I hope I shall not weary the House too much, but I feel it my duty to show in detail wherein these increases occur. And, while the traffic has been growing, we have not been receiving corresponding results, because of the fact that our expenses have been increasing, not only in the cost of wages but in the cost of material as well. For instance, take the matter of ties for the Intercolonial. In 1897 we paid 16 cents for cedar ties; in 1906 we were obliged to pay 20 cents.

Mr. J. D. REID. They were not bought by tender, though?

Mr. EMMERSON. By tender in every instance.

Mr. J. D. REID. No grafting?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, my hon. friend is too suspicious. Notices calling for tenders were posted throughout the country from one end of the railway to the other. I will read a list of items showing the increased prices that the Intercolonial has been obliged to pay in recent years:

COST OF SUPPLIES TO INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

——	1897.	Increase.	1906.
		Per cent.	
Ties—cedar..	16 cts.	87	27–30–32½ cts.
tamarack	17–18 "	50	27 "
hemlock	13–14 "	78	24–25 "
Princess pine	16–17 "	60	27 "
Lumber—spruce deals	$ 7–$ 9 per M.	33⅓	$10.00–$12.00
pine deals	12–15 "	.....	$20.00 to 35.00 to 39.00
pine boards	12 "	25	$15.00
hard pine	20.90 "	33⅓	$22.00–29.00
Posts—cedar	5 cts. ft.	40	7 cts.
Coal	$2.10 per ton.	47	$3.10
Slack	1.10 "	81	$2.00
Car wheels	8.75 to 9.25	46	$13.50
Spikes	1.93 to 2.15 kg	12½	$2.25

Rails have advanced in price about 50 per cent.

There has also been an increase in the matter of nails and all kinds of metal; material of that kind has very largely advanced in price. All labour employed in making sidings, excavations and so forth has increased by about 21 per cent during the three years between 1903 and 1906. I cite these instances out of many to show that in every class of material that is used in repairs, in sidings, in ballasting, there has been a substantial increase. In all building material, and in all work required to improve the road, there has been an increase in price to a marked degree. At the same time, along with these great increases in expenditure, there has not been a corres-

ponding increase in the charges made against the patrons of the railway. Only this last summer was there a slight increase averaging about 10 per cent on the freight receipts of the railway; until that increase, there had not been for years an increase in the charges and revenues of the road.

Mr. HAGGART. Was there any increase on the passenger rates, as well as the freight rate.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was some readjustment in the passenger rates, there was some change for long distances beyond one hundred miles, and with respect to suburban rates.

Mr. HAGGART. You do not know how it affected the total?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was not a very material one. I am bound to say that there was a very marked increase in one direction and that was in respect to suburban rates out of cities like St. John and Halifax. For many years they had been receiving special recognition. They had been receiving rates that were far and away below the rates that were charged by the electric railways at any of the large centres. The Intercolonial Railway was carrying people out of St. John and between that point and Hampton, about 22 miles, for practically nothing and the same is true of Halifax. I see that my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) laughs.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, they are very far from carrying the people for nothing now, I can assure the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are not charging now as much as the Canadian Pacific Railway are charging west from St. John. I am proud to say that the people of the maritime provinces have not made much complaint. Of course, when you have been carrying people for nothing, if you charge ever so little there will naturally be an outcry and that was the case at many points.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand the suburban rates on the Intercolonial Railway are higher than the suburban rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway out of St. John.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to say to my hon. friend that I have it on the authority of the general traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway, who was the special traffic manager in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Tiffin, that even to-day, although we have increased the rates out of St. John and Halifax, we have not reached the standard which has been fixed by the Canadian Pacific Railway out of St. John or by the Grand Trunk Railway out of Montreal and other centres. I am speaking not of what I personally know but of what I have been advised by the general traffic manager. The instructions were to have the rates brought up to the standard of the other railways and to-day there will be found on the table of the House, or in the records of the House a return made to parliament showing the passenger rates of the Intercolonial with the corresponding rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway. Even if we have increased the rates to some extent we have not yet reached the standard. There is not so great a difference as between the freight rates prevailing on these railways and the freight rates prevailing on the Intercolonial Railway, but there is to-day, notwithstanding our slight increase, a wide difference as between the passenger rates of the Intercolonial Railway and the passenger rates of these other railways.

I made the statement some weeks ago in the city of Toronto that the Intercolonial Railway was carrying freight not merely cheaper than any other railway in Canada, not merely cheaper than any railway on the continent of America, but at a lower rate than any railway in the known world and at a later date when some hon. member of this House challenged that statement I did not take up the time of the House in dealing with the question at the moment but I said that I had made the statement and that I would be prepared at a later date to prove the correctness of it. This, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me is an opportunity of which I should avail myself to demonstrate the absolute accuracy of the statement made by me in Toronto and repeated in general terms on the floor of this House at a later date. I have had prepared by the officials of the department a statement showing the charges on the Intercolonial Railway with respect to general merchandise, with respect to special merchandise, such as coal, and with respect to lumber, and I have had them collate information as to the charges made by other railways for similar classes of merchandise. I will read a letter from the deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, who, at my request, had this statement prepared as explanatory of the figures which I will bring to the notice of the House in a few moments and which I will ask to have recorded in 'Hansard,' so that we here may not be the only ones who know it but that the people of the country may realize just what the government system of railways is charging as compared with the charges made by the railway corporations in Canada. Mr. Butler, under date of February 18, writes me as follows:

Herewith I inclose you copy of the Canadian government railway system maximum freight mileage tariff on general merchandise, and also, a copy of the Grand Trunk Railway system standard freight mileage tariff. This Grand Trunk tariff is exactly the same as the Canadian Pacific tariff, from points in the eastern part of the country. The Canadian Pacific tariffs in the west are necessarily somewhat higher.

I have drawn red lines across at points where striking comparisons can be made, and on the face of the mileage opposite it.

I also inclose to you the local comparative rates on coal, in carload lots, on the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. In making the calculations, you will observe that I have stated in the right-hand column, the increase over the Intercolonial, in per cent.

I also inclose another comparative sheet, giving the rates on lumber, in carload lots. The G.B.B. tariff would apply to ordinary rates along the line of the railway, and the export tariffs, of course, to export products. The right hand column again gives the increased per cent rate of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific over the Intercolonial rate.

In the double column of per cents, the left hand figures apply to the G.B.B. rate, and the right applies to the G.B.C. rate.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) M. J. Butler.

I will only cite a few of these instances, not wishing to weary the House, and I shall ask, without reading them that these figures be incorporated in 'Hansard' if no hon. member objects.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a rule of the House which is strictly enforced that the statement cannot be placed on 'Hansard' unless it is read.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I will be very happy to read it.

One is the Canadian government railway system (Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island divisions) maximum freight mileage tariff, to be applied when no special tariff is in effect, subject to the Canadian joint freight classification. There is also the maximum freight mileage tariff attached, and this shows the classes in cents on the 100 pounds and the distance. On distances not exceeding five miles the rates correspond to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway rates, and over five miles and not over ten miles, they also correspond. Over ten miles, in classes in cents per 100 pounds, we have a classification on the Intercolonial Railway of ten to twenty miles, subdividing in ten mile distances.

Mr. HAGGART. This applies to the general traffic ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This applies to the general traffic, and I shall refer to the special items later. Our classification is ten miles and not over twenty miles; twenty miles and not over thirty miles, and so on, classifying in ten mile distances. On the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway they have a classification for five-mile distances; ten-miles and not over fifteen miles; fifteen miles and not over twenty miles; twenty miles and not over twenty-five miles, and so on. Their classification is divided in five-mile distances. Now, as an illustration of the rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway as compared with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, we will take the ten to twenty-mile distances, and where we have 12 cents they have 14 cents; where we have 11 cents they have 12 cents; where we have 9 cents they have 11 cents; where we have 8 cents they have 9 cents; where we have 6 cents they have 7 cents, and so on. Then as the mileage increases the difference between the Intercolonial Railway rates and the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway rates increases.

Mr. HAGGART. To what extent?

Mr. EMMERSON. To any distance you like.

Mr. HAGGART. Compare the rates on the 30 to 40 miles distance.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Intercolonial has 16 cents (first-class) and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway have 20 cents for the same class. The margin of difference is small in the beginning, but it increases gradually, widening out as you increase the mileage. On the 300 mile distance, our rate is 40 cents and theirs is 60 cents; where we charge 35 they charge 53; where we charge 30 they charge 45; where we charge 25 they charge 38; where we charge 20 they charge 30; where we charge 18 they charge 28; where we charge 16 they charge 21; where we charge 16 they charge 24; where we charge 14 cents they charge 20 cents, and so on.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do I understand the minister to say that as the distances increased the Canadian Pacific Railway increases their rates?

Mr. EMMERSON. As the distance increases our rates become proportionately lower than theirs. The margin of difference between the rates increases in a greater ratio as the distance increases until we get to the 700 miles when where we charge 52 cents (first-class) they charge $1.06; where we charge 46 cents they charge 93 cents; where we charge 39 cents they charge 89 cents; where we charge 26 cents they charge 53 cents; where we charge 24 cents they charge 51 cents; where we charge 20 cents they charge 38 cents; where we charge 20 cents they charge 39 cents; where we charge 22 cents they charge 40 cents; where we charge 18 cents they charge 37 cents. In every one of these classifications their rates are higher. It is in the interest of the country that the people should know what freight rates are being charged on the Intercolonial Railway, and I shall read them if necessary, but if the House does not object I will hand them into 'Hansard.'

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAY SYSTEM.

Intercolonial Division.

Prince Edward Island Division.

Maximum Freight Mileage Tariff to be applied where no Special Tariff is in effect. Subject to the Canadian Joint Freight Classification.

Distances.	Classes in Cents per 100 lbs.									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not exceeding 5 miles	8	7	6	5	4	4	4	3	3	3
Over 5 and not over 10 miles	10	8	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	4
" 10 " 20 "	12	11	9	8	6	6	5	5	5	4
" 20 " 30 "	14	12	11	9	7	6	6	6	6	5
" 30 " 40 "	16	14	12	10	8	7	6	7	7	5
" 40 " 50 "	18	16	14	11	9	8	7	8	7	6
" 50 " 60 "	20	18	15	13	10	9	7	8	8	6
" 60 " 70 "	22	19	17	14	11	10	8	9	8	7
" 70 " 80 "	24	21	18	15	12	11	8	9	8	7
" 80 " 90 "	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	11	10	8
" 90 " 100 "	28	25	21	18	14	13	11	12	11	9
" 100 " 110 "	30	26	23	19	15	14	12	12	11	10
" 110 " 120 "	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
" 120 " 130 "	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
" 130 " 140 "	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
" 140 " 150 "	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	13	11
" 150 " 160 "	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	13	11
" 160 " 170 "	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	13	11
" 170 " 180 "	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
" 180 " 190 "	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
" 190 " 200 "	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
" 200 " 220 "	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
" 220 " 240 "	38	33	29	24	19	17	15	15	15	13
" 240 " 260 "	38	33	29	24	19	17	15	15	15	13
" 260 " 280 "	38	33	29	24	19	17	15	15	15	13
" 280 " 300 "	40	35	30	25	20	18	16	16	16	14
" 300 " 320 "	40	35	30	25	20	18	16	16	16	14
" 320 " 340 "	42	37	32	26	21	19	17	17	17	15
" 340 " 360 "	42	37	32	26	21	19	17	17	17	15
" 360 " 380 "	44	39	33	28	22	20	17	18	18	15
" 380 " 400 "	44	39	33	28	22	20	17	18	18	15
" 400 " 420 "	44	39	33	28	22	20	17	18	18	15
" 420 " 440 "	44	39	33	28	22	20	17	18	18	15
" 440 " 460 "	44	39	33	28	22	20	17	18	18	15
" 460 " 480 "	46	40	35	29	23	21	18	19	19	16
" 480 " 500 "	46	40	35	29	23	21	18	19	19	16
" 500 " 520 "	46	40	35	29	23	21	18	19	19	16
" 520 " 540 "	46	40	35	29	23	21	18	19	19	16
" 540 " 560 "	48	42	36	30	24	22	18	19	20	16
" 560 " 580 "	48	42	36	30	24	22	18	19	20	16
" 580 " 600 "	48	42	36	30	24	22	18	19	20	16
" 600 " 625 "	50	44	38	31	25	23	19	20	21	17
" 625 " 650 "	50	44	38	31	25	23	19	20	21	17
" 650 " 675 "	52	46	39	33	26	24	20	20	22	18
" 675 " 700 "	52	46	39	33	26	24	20	20	22	18
" 700 " 725 "	54	47	41	34	27	25	20	21	23	19
" 725 " 750 "	56	49	42	35	28	26	20	21	23	19
" 750 " 775 "	58	51	44	36	29	27	21	22	24	20
" 775 " 800 "	60	53	45	38	30	28	21	22	24	20
" 800 " 825 "	64	56	48	40	32	30	22	23	25	21
" 825 " 850 "	66	58	50	41	33	31	23	24	26	22
" 850 " 875 "	68	60	51	43	34	32	23	24	26	22
" 875 " 900 "	70	61	53	44	35	33	24	25	27	23
" 900 " 925 "	72	63	54	45	36	34	25	26	28	24
" 925 " 950 "	76	67	57	48	38	36	26	27	29	25
" 950 " 975 "	78	69	59	49	39	37	27	28	29	26
" 975 " 1,000 "	80	70	60	50	40	38	28	29	30	27

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY System Standard Freight Mileage Tariff. To be applied in the absence of tariff quoting lower rates governed by the Canadian Freight Classification.

Distances.	Classes in Cents per 100 lbs.									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not exceeding 5 miles	8	7	6	5	4	4	4	3	3	3
Over 5 and not over 10 miles	10	8	7	6	5	5	4	4	4	4
" 10 " 15 "	12	11	9	8	6	6	5	5	5	4
" 15 " 20 "	14	12	11	9	7	6	6	6	6	5
" 20 " 25 "	16	14	12	10	8	7	6	7	7	5
" 25 " 30 "	18	16	14	11	9	8	7	8	7	6
" 30 " 35 "	20	18	15	13	10	9	7	8	8	6
" 35 " 40 "	22	19	17	14	11	10	8	9	8	7
" 40 " 45 "	24	21	18	15	12	11	8	9	8	7
" 45 " 50 "	24	21	18	15	12	11	9	10	9	7
" 50 " 55 "	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	10	10	8
" 55 " 60 "	26	23	20	16	13	12	10	11	10	8
" 60 " 65 "	28	25	21	18	14	13	11	11	11	9
" 65 " 70 "	28	25	21	18	14	13	11	12	11	9
" 70 " 75 "	30	26	23	19	15	14	12	12	11	10
" 75 " 80 "	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
" 80 " 85 "	32	28	24	20	16	14	12	13	12	10
" 85 " 90 "	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	12	11
" 90 " 95 "	34	30	26	21	17	15	13	14	13	11
" 95 " 100 "	36	32	27	23	18	16	13	14	13	11
" 100 " 110 "	36	32	27	23	18	16	14	15	14	12
" 110 " 120 "	38	33	29	24	19	17	14	15	14	12
" 120 " 130 "	38	33	29	24	19	17	15	15	15	13
" 130 " 140 "	40	35	30	25	20	18	15	16	16	13
" 140 " 150 "	40	35	30	25	20	18	16	16	16	14
" 150 " 160 "	42	37	32	26	21	19	16	17	17	14
" 160 " 170 "	42	37	32	26	21	19	17	17	17	15
" 170 " 180 "	44	39	33	28	22	20	17	18	18	15
" 180 " 190 "	46	40	35	29	23	21	17	18	18	15
" 190 " 200 "	46	40	35	29	23	21	18	19	19	16
" 200 " 210 "	48	42	36	30	24	22	18	19	19	16
" 210 " 220 "	48	42	36	30	24	22	18	19	20	16
" 220 " 230 "	50	44	38	31	25	23	19	20	21	17
" 230 " 240 "	50	44	38	31	25	23	19	20	21	17
" 240 " 250 "	52	46	39	33	26	24	20	20	22	18
" 250 " 260 "	54	47	41	34	27	25	20	21	23	18
" 260 " 270 "	54	47	41	34	27	25	20	21	23	19
" 270 " 280 "	56	49	42	35	28	26	20	21	23	19
" 280 " 290 "	58	51	44	36	29	27	21	22	24	20
" 290 " 300 "	60	53	45	38	30	28	21	22	24	20
" 300 " 325 "	64	56	48	40	32	30	22	23	25	21
" 325 " 350 "	66	58	50	41	33	31	23	24	26	22
" 350 " 375 "	68	60	51	43	34	32	23	24	26	22
" 375 " 400 "	70	61	53	44	35	33	24	25	27	23
" 400 " 425 "	72	63	54	45	36	34	25	26	28	24
" 425 " 450 "	76	67	57	48	38	36	26	27	29	25
" 450 " 475 "	78	69	59	49	39	37	27	28	29	26
" 475 " 500 "	80	70	60	50	40	38	28	29	30	27
" 500 " 525 "	82	72	62	51	41	39	29	30	30	28
" 525 " 550 "	84	74	63	53	42	40	30	31	31	29
" 550 " 575 "	86	75	65	54	43	41	31	32	32	30
" 575 " 600 "	90	79	68	56	45	43	33	34	35	32
" 600 " 625 "	94	82	71	59	47	45	34	35	36	33
" 625 " 650 "	98	86	74	61	49	47	36	37	38	35
" 650 " 675 "	102	89	77	64	51	49	37	38	39	36
" 675 " 700 "	106	93	80	66	53	51	38	39	40	37
" 700 " 725 "	108	95	81	67	54	52	39	40	41	38
" 725 " 750 "	112	98	84	70	56	54	41	42	43	40
" 750 " 775 "	116	102	87	73	58	56	42	43	44	41
" 775 " 800 "	120	105	90	75	60	58	44	45	46	43
" 800 " 825 "	124	108	93	78	62	60	45	46	47	44
" 825 " 850 "	128	112	96	80	64	62	46	48	49	45
" 850 " 875 "	132	116	99	83	66	64	47	49	50	46
" 875 " 900 "	136	119	102	85	68	66	49	51	52	48
" 900 " 925 "	140	123	105	88	70	68	50	52	53	49
" 925 " 950 "	142	124	107	89	71	69	51	54	55	50
" 950 " 975 "	146	128	110	91	73	71	52	55	56	51
" 975 " 1000 "	150	131	113	94	75	73	54	56	57	53

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. BLAIN. Are these Intercolonial Railway rates in force at the present time?

Mr. EMMERSON. These are the rates in force. There are special rates for special commodities and special conditions, but these special rates prevail on the other railways as well as on the Intercolonial Railway, and there is a corresponding difference in favour of the Intercolonial Railway so far as the lowness of the rate is concerned.

Mr. HAGGART. Are the Intercolonial Railway special rates, which are so different from the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, not confined to a few articles such as lumber, coal and sugar?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and the like special rates on the Intercolonial Railway are confined to a few articles like coal, lumber and steel billets.

Mr. J. D. REID. And hay?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, we have unusually special rates on hay sometimes.

Mr. HAGGART. What I asked was, if the exceptionally low Intercolonial Railway rates as compared with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway rates are not confined to a few articles?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. The general merchandise rates on these other railways is from 50 per cent to 80 per cent and in many instances 100 per cent higher than the Intercolonial Railway rate. Now, I will show you with respect to special rates what the facts are and the difference is just as glaring having regard to the character of the freight that is carried.

Now, we will take the comparative rates charged on lumber in carload lots on the Intercolonial as compared with the rates charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk, and they show that the rates charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk are higher than either the local rate or the export rate charged on the intercolonial.

COMPARATIVE RATES OF LUMBER, CARLOADS.

Miles.	I. C. R.		C. P. R. and G. T. R.	Increase per cent over I. C. R.
	G. B. B.	G. B. C. (export.)		
				Per cent.
Not over 5 miles	2	2	3	50
Over 5 and not over 10 miles	2	2	3½	75
" 10 " 20 "	2½	2½	4	60
" 20 " 30 "	2¾	2¾	5	81
" 30 " 40 "	3¼	3¼	5½	69
" 40 " 50 "	3¾	3¾	6	60 and 84
" 50 " 60 "	4½	3¾	7	55 " 86
" 60 " 70 "	5	3¾	7½	50 " 100
" 70 " 80 "	5	4½	8	60 " 77
" 80 " 90 "	5¼	4½	8½	54 " 88
" 90 " 100 "	5½	5	9	63 " 80
" 100 " 125 "	6	5½	9½	58 " 72
" 125 " 150 "	7	6	10	42 " 66⅔
" 150 " 175 "	8¼	6½	10	21 " 53
" 175 " 200 "	8¾	7	11	25 " 57
" 200 " 225 "	9¼	7¾	12	29 " 54
" 225 " 250 "	10	8¼	12½	25 " 50
" 250 " 275 "	10½	8¾	13	23 " 48½
" 275 " 300 "	11	9¼	14	12 " 51
" 300 " 325 "	11½	10	15	30 " 50
" 325 " 350 "	12	10½	15½	29 " 47½
" 350 " 375 "	12	11	16	33⅓ " 45½
" 375 " 400 "	12½	11½	17	36 " 44
" 400 " 425 "	13¼	12	18	36 " 50
" 425 " 450 "	13¼	12	18½	39 " 54
" 450 " 475 "	13¾	12½	19	38 " 52
" 475 " 500 "	13¾	12½	20	45 " 60
" 500 " 550 "	14¼	13¼	22	54 " 66
" 550 " 600 "	15½	13¾	24	55 " 74
" 600 " 650 "	16	14¼	25	56 " 75
" 650 " 700 "	16½	14¾	26	57 " 76

That shows what the government railway is doing with respect to the export trade of the country. We talk about increasing our export trade to Great Britain; we as a people are solicitous of encouraging that trade. We are inviting the people of Great Britain to purchase from us; our producers and manufacturers are seeking a market there,

and the very moment they strike the government system of railways they are encouraged in that. But when they have to deal with the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway they are not encouraged certainly, on the contrary, they are taxed and hampered with respect to rates. Either the one or the other is true—either these systems of railway are charging the people too high a freight rate, or the Intercolonial is charging too low a rate. I have shown you this afternoon that the Intercolonial had a surplus for the last fiscal year of $100,000, after charging the rates of freight which I have recited to you, and after charging the passenger rate which I mentioned a few moments ago. If the Intercolonial during the past fiscal year, with the same amount of traffic and the same opportunities for business, had charged the standard rates exacted by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, instead of being able to show a surplus of $100,000 on the operations of the last fiscal year I would have been able to come before parliament and show a surplus of $2,500,000. And yet, the newspaper press of the country will carp and cavil at the results of the financial showing of the Intercolonial Railway; politicians on many platforms will complain with respect to the operation of this railway. Are not these complaints a result of the fact that the people of this country, even the public men and newspaper editors, are not informed as to the true conditions prevailing on that railway? I think it must be apparent, in the face of the rates charged on general merchandise, that the Intercolonial Railway, in promoting an interchange of traffic between the inland provinces and the provinces by the sea, is giving an advantage not merely to those eastern provinces, but to the producers and manufacturers of the inland provinces. I have taken occasion more than once to demonstrate this fact, that if these low rates had not prevailed on the Intercolonial Railway from the time of its inception to the present moment the manufacturers of Ontario and the producers of the inland provinces would not have found the profitable markets in the maritime provinces which they have found, and the advantage of which they have had during all these years. We sometimes hear the complaint made in this House, it has been made since this country has been a confederation, that the Intercolonial was built solely and wholly for the benefit of the people of the maritime provinces—that they were the only people who enjoyed the advantages of that railway and of the low rates of freight which prevailed upon it. Any one who will stop and consider will realize that honours are easy in that respect—will realize that the people of these central provinces are as much advantaged by these low rates as are the people in the sea-board provinces.

I want to call your attention to the rates charged on coal in carload lots on the Intercolonial as compared with the rates charged by the other railways. For a distance not exceeding five miles, the local comparative rates on coal in carloads is the same on the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. For a distance of over five miles and not over ten, the Intercolonial Railway charges forty cents per ton and the other railways fifty cents, or the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway charge 25 per cent more than the Intercolonial Railway. For a distance over ten and not over twenty miles, the excess charge by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway over the Intercolonial Railway is 20 per cent and so on as shown in this tabulated statement:

LOCAL COMPARATIVE RATES ON COAL, CARLOADS.

Miles.	I. C. R. per ton of 2,000 lbs.	C. P. and G. T. Rys. per ton of 2,000 lbs.	Increase over I. C. R.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	Per cent.
Not exceeding 5 miles	40	40	.....
Over 5 and not over 10 miles	40	50	25
" 10 " 20 "	50	60	20
" 20 " 30 "	55 and 60	70	16⅔
" 30 " 40 "	65 and 70	80	23 and 14
" 40 " 50 "	80	90	12½
" 50 " 60 "	90	1.00	11
" 60 " 70 "	90	1.05	16⅔
" 70 " 80 "	90 and 1.00	1.10	22 and 10
" 80 " 90 "	1.00	1.15	15
" 90 " 100 "	1.00	1.20	20
" 100 " 125 "	1.10	1.30	18
" 125 " 150 "	1.20	1.40	16⅔
" 150 " 175 "	1.30	1.50	15½
" 175 " 200 "	1.40	1.70	21
" 200 " 225 "	1.50 and 1.60	1.80	20 and 12½
" 225 " 250 "	1.60 and 1.70	1.90	18⅔ and 12
" 250 " 275 "	1.70 and 1.80	2.00	17⅔ and 11
" 275 " 300 "	1.80 and 1.90	2.10	16⅔ and 10

There is not such a marked discrepancy in the charges on coal, but certainly there is a distinct margin in favour of the Intercolonial Railway, and I would note this fact that the through rate on coal to Lévis and Montreal is one-quarter of a cent per ton per mile or merely the cost of transporting it. There is not a railway in Canada, nay more there is not a railway on this continent, which is giving such favourable rates in the carriage of coal for such a distance as the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there any difference in the rates between summer and winter ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the same rates prevail. Why are these rates made so low? They are made so low for the purpose of giving to the coal mines of Nova Scotia an advantage in competing with the American coal in markets as far west as Montreal and Brockville. I do not think they are able to compete at any point further west, if indeed so far. I think therefore I have demonstrated that the statement made by me in Toronto, namely, that the rates charged by the Intercolonial Railway are lower than those charged by any railway in Canada or in America, or indeed in the world, was an absolutely accurate statement, proved beyond doubt. We hear of the finacial success of the Australian railways which are government operated lines, but I have shown that in all instances the rates charged by the government railway system in Australia are 350 per cent higher than those charged by the Canadian government. If any body will take the trouble to compare the rates charged in Australia with those charged here, they will find that there is a very much wider margin between the Canadian government railway charges in Canada and the charges in Australia than there is between the Canadian government railway charges in Canada and those of the company operated railways in Canada. This is apparent when we look at the statistics. When the Intercolonial Railway, by the expenditure of a dollar, can earn $1.02, the railways in the United States can realize $1.88.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is that a comparison ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, as I demonstrated this afternoon, where, by the expenditure of $1, the Canadian government railway can earn $1.02, the Australian government railway can realize upwards of $1.88, and the company operated Canadian railways can realize upwards of $1.90. Need any one ask why it is the Intercolonial Railway does not have a surplus ? The surprising feature is that the deficits have not been larger. There have been surpluses on the Intercolonial Railway every year since its first inception. From the very moment the wheels of that railway began to turn round in its journeyings from the east to the west down to the present, there has been an annual surplus, but that surplus has not been shown in the public accounts or in the balance sheets of the Intercolonial Railway, nor is it found in the treasury of the country. It has been and is in the pockets of the people.

I have, I know, been the cause of wearying hon. gentlemen of this House in going over these dry details, and I can assure the House that I have not done so without some fatigue to myself. Adversity, I suppose, loves company, and we may both therefore feel that we are even in that respect. If I have wearied the House I have fatigued myself, but I felt it was necessary to bring to the notice of the country information regarding the operations of the Intercolonial Railway, and some of that information is new to hon. gentlemen. I have felt that this information should go on 'Hansard' and be read by the people and in this way be productive of some good.

Let me now turn from the consideration of dry facts and figures to a consideration of the prospects of the Intercolonial Railway. I have discussed its present ; you know its past; let us for a moment talk of its future.

The press of the country and the people of the country are discussing the Intercolonial Railway. The results we have attained are gratifying in contrast with some previous failures ; and I certainly may be pardoned if I speak with some pride of those results. I do not speak with personal pride, of course, for these results could not have been secured by myself, and I claim no particular credit for them. But I want to pay tribute to the army of officials and employees who are engaged on the Intercolonial Railway and each of whom has contributed his share to the successful results of the operations of the last eighteen months. I do claim credit for having had the foresight and judgment, in the first place, to secure as my deputy minister, Mr. Butler, who has no equal—or, at the very least, has no superior —on this continent. But even Mr. Butler with his experience and his knowledge could not have accomplished these results had he not had the faithful and cordial assistance of the other officials of the road. The Intercolonial Railway owes much to Mr. Pottinger, the general manager. The results in the mechanical department show that it owes much to Mr. Joughins, the very competent and efficient head of motive power. And in the person of Mr. Mackenzie, the chief engineer of the railway, the Intercolonial Railway has a faithful official who gives careful and efficient attention to all the duties of his office. Mr. T. C. Burpee's work is clearly evidenced in the figures which I read this afternoon. The reduction in the expenditure on mainten-

ance of way is so marked as to amaze one who knows that these results have been accomplished in the one short year. Mr. Burpee is entitled to receive great credit for his splendid work in his department. I cannot take time to name all those who are deserving of credit, but I would not wish to leave out the name of Mr. Tiffin, the general traffic manager, whose thorough knowledge of the affairs of his department is recognized by railway experts everywhere, nor would I forget the district superintendent, whose efforts have been unsparing and effective. All the way down the line, from the highest official to the newest employees, all have worked unitedly and efficiently with but one aim, and that aim the good of the Intercolonial Railway. The good results have been due also to co-operation of the regular patrons of the road. In many instances we have had to change, to clamp, to repress, to limit, to restrict. Yet, there has been no great complaint; on the contrary there has been a general co-operation on the part of the employees and those who are called upon to patronize the road.

Now, so much for the present. In considering the position of the railway and its prospects for the future, we must deal with conditions as we find them. On former occasions I have dealt with the history of the Intercolonial Railway. I shall not do so this evening. But I ask your attention for a moment to the aims of the road, and, in discussing this point, I must refer briefly to one point in its history. I had the curiosity to read, the other day, the preface written by Sir Sandford Fleming to his report on the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. The name of Sir Sandford Fleming will be inseparably connected with the Intercolonial Railway. He it was who, as chief engineer, located the line, organized the work, superintended the construction and saw the road completed. The preface to his report was written on the 1st of July, 1876, the day the road was declared ready for operation. He said:

> The Intercolonial Railway is national in its objects and character.

And, while he had stated that the expenditures were made, the work completed and the road ready for operation, he goes on:

> Some further expenditure is still necessary but the railway is is a condition to be opened for traffic throughout its entire length.

And, after referring to his retirement from the position he had held, he says this is:

> —because of the completion of the work which realizes the national aspirations of half a century by bringing within a few hours the old fortress of Halifax and the older citadel of Quebec, and which must form an important section of the railway destined, ere long, to extend from east to west throughout the entire Dominion of Canada.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Therein, Sir Sandford Fleming recognized the Intercolonial Railway as a national work and as destined to be part of a great system that was to extend from ocean to ocean. His work was accomplished so far as that section is concerned. He had associated with him Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, C.M.G., who was assistant engineer from the inception of the work to its completion. The names of these two gentlemen must always be associated with the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. And it is most gratifying to know that these men who completed this great national work that realized the hopes and aspirations of our people during half a century although that work was completed over forty years ago, are still with us. I am sure every member of this House will join with me in the hope that they may long be spared to enjoy the honours which they so well merit, and which they have honestly and faithfully earned.

Now I say that the future of the Intercolonial is a matter of concern. Some advocate the giving away of the Intercolonial to another railway system. I have before me an editorial from the Halifax 'Herald' proposing that the Intercolonial be divided between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, the road from St. John to Halifax to be leased to the former and the northern section to Moncton, the Short line, the Pictou branch, the eastern extension and the Cape Breton Railway to go to the Grand Trunk. Now, the Halifax 'Herald' is the organ of the Conservative party in the province of Nova Scotia, and I did not suppose that it was the hope of the leader of the opposition to dispose of the Intercolonial. But if the Halifax 'Herald' truly voices his sentiments, and the sentiments of his party, then we must conclude that that party advocates the transference of that railway to other systems and its annihilation as a government operated system. We often see references in the newspapers to proposals which are being made by at least one of the great railway systems of Canada to secure not merely running rights over the Intercolonial between St. John and Halifax and other eastern points, but secure such a joint user of that railway as will make it a trunk line from Halifax to St. John. We all know that this parliament has pledged itself by solemn agreement and by enactment that at some future time, on the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and when that company has constructed its lines from Winnipeg to Moncton, this country will give, for a consideration, certain running rights not defined over the Intercolonial from Moncton to Halifax and to St. John. What the character of those may be, the future alone must determine. The conditions which then prevail will govern

the character of the rights and privileges that will be accorded them. But there are other systems which are anxious to secure certain privileges in connection with the Intercolonial. Now, giving my own individual opinion on the matter, I say that the Intercolonial Railway should never be parted with; that it should never be allowed to constitute any portion of a trunk line that would be controlled by a private corporation. The very moment one of these railways, whether it was the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Pacific, secure such a use of the Intercolonial as would make it, for either one of them, a trunk line through Nova Scotia, that very moment the character of the Intercolonial must of necessity change, because making a trunk line for a private corporation means that such private corporation would enjoy a participation in its traffic, local and general. It would enable such a company at once to secure, between daylight and dark, every feeder to that Intercolonial, and in securing these feeders that company would absolutely wrest from the Intercolonial the traffic which it enjoys to-day. For every train that would pass upon that line operated as a part of a private corporation, there would be removed from that railway a corresponding train that had theretofore been operated by the Intercolonial. Gathering up the branch lines, securing trunk line rights over the Intercolonial, would enable any company to make of the Intercolonial a thing absolutely worthless as an asset of Canada. I am sure that in any discussion that may arise with regard to this matter, the people of Canada will remain true to this one idea, that no step shall be taken that would end in removing from the Intercolonial its feeders; its control over its sphere of influence—the country adjacent to the line extending through the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

I have felt that while the Intercolonial has had to combat many prejudices, and while there have been many influences against it, yet in view of the good it has done to the country, in view of the trade it has promoted, the day would come when the people of Canada, irrespective of section, would join in the desire to have the Intercolonial extended; would wish it to widen out its influence and absorb its feeders, either by leasehold or by some other means.

In the history of Canada, especially of western Canada, we note this striking fact that when you follow along the line of the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, wherever there are independent branch lines, feeders to their main trunk lines, one by one they are gathered in so that after a time the main trunk lines absorb all these branch lines and they are all run as one system. I assume that that is a business course else these great corporations, governed by keen business men, would not have followed such a course. They would not have acquired these lines but they would have left them to run as independent connections of the main trunk line. I have felt that the government of Canada might some day be impelled by the force of public opinion, by the judgment of the people throughout the country, to secure to the Intercolonial Railway as against all other companies the branch lines which constitute the feeders to the Intercolonial Railway. What are these branch lines but instruments to gather up the traffic in the adjacent country side and hand it over to the trunk line system—the Intercolonial Railway. In so doing these branch lines are favouring and contributing to the advancement of the sections and communities which they are supposed to accommodate; nay, more than that they are contributing materially to the growth and expansion of the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway and therefore I say that I believe the day will come when a demand will go out from the people of Canada in favour of the absorption of these lines. I would, Sir, not be content with that. I would feel that in order to clasp closer together those isolated communities and to draw them closer to the communities of the west it would be desirable that the Intercolonial Railway should penetrate farther west, that it should reach the industrial centres of Canada and especially that it should reach the great industrial centre of central Canada—I refer to the city of Toronto. I look forward, Sir, also to this: There are railways starting out from the extreme west reaching forward eagerly and anxiously to an eastern seaport. Many of them are concentrating their efforts upon reaching the great city of Quebec and there reaching a great ocean port, but a port which is closed for many months of the year and I would anticipate that at some not far distant day these railways, converging at the great city of Quebec, will be reaching still farther east, so that they may find, during the winter months, open water upon which the ships would sail that would take the traffic that our railways would gather up in the west and carry to the east. That day may come, I hope it will come—nay, more, I believe it will come and when it does it will settle all speculation as to the future of the Intercolonial Railway. It will for all time settle the question of the value of the Intercolonial Railway as an asset of the Dominion of Canada, and it will certainly bear out this fact, which, I have at least claimed as a fact, that the Intercolonial Railway is a great national asset, that it is of value to the people of Canada both east and west, that it has served its purpose and its mission in the past and that it still has a purpose and a mission to per-

form and I am sure that when we reach that stage there will be no sectional differences over the matter and that we will all see eye to eye with reference to the manifest destiny of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, Sir, I feel that I have but imperfectly presented the case of the Department of Railways and Canals. I know I have taken up very much of the time of the House in so doing, but I hope the House will pardon me in view of my desire to simply place before the House and the country the information which I thought to be essential to enable the people of the country to form a judgment as to the value of these great public undertakings.

Hon. J. G. HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour at least to be as concise as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) in the remarks which I have to make in answer to the statement which he has presented in reference to his department. In dealing with the subject he has divided it into four heads: First, the canal system, next the Railway Commission, next a description of the National Transcontinental Railway and finally a statement of the position of the Intercolonial Railway. Judging from the detailed remarks of the hon. minister in reference to the Intercolonial Railway what would be the length of the speech that the hon. gentleman would have made this evening if that road had reached from Montreal to the coast and if his aspirations were to be realized what pleasure it would give us to listen to a detailed account of the operations of the railway from Halifax to Vancouver? The hon. gentleman began with the canal system and I will deal with the various subjects in the order in which he took them up. He took us first to the Sault Ste. Marie canal and gave us a description of the work that is being done there. He told us that at the entrance and outlet of the canal there was a little work done that would be completed next season. But, he did not give us an account of the enormous traffic which has been passing through that canal. That fact is in significant contrast to his elaboration of detail in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. From there he took us down to the Welland canal and he stated that the 14-foot navigation was about completed, or was completed, that the works at Port Colborne were in progress and he said that the statement in reference to the expenditure upon the basin had been presented to the House in the report of the Department of Public Works. He told us that the Trent Valley canal would be finished in a couple of years, that the portion from Healey's Falls to the Bay of Quinté would cost in the neighbourhood of $3,000,000, that the portion from Lake Simcoe to the Georgian bay would cost about $1,500,000 and that for an expenditure of $4,500,000 we may expect in a few years to have completed the Trent river system of navigation. He then took us down along the St. Lawrence and stated the expenditure that had been made upon the Galops rapids. Notwithstanding the enormous expenditure on that channel, an expenditure which we on this side of the House denounced year after year, not a boat runs down that channel to-day. But the minister did not tell us that. He told us that on the north shore, immediately in the neighbourhood of the Galops we have a channel of our own which cost us $1,500,000. That was a useless expenditure, and one for which there was no need. For $50,000 you could have removed an island at the head of the canal, and that would have given us ample navigation. But, says the minister the channel we have made is in our own waters. Well, I had an idea that under the treaty of Washington the American side of the river was just as free to us as the Canadian side is to the Americans, and that we have as much right to use their channel as they have to use ours. There we have nearly $1,500,000 thrown away. The hon. gentleman also told us that for a total expenditure of $23,000,000 during the last ten years, we have a complete system of navigation from Lake Superior to Montreal, and, he proceeds to argue that the deficit on the Intercolonial is not quite equal to the $23,000,000 we have spent on the canals. Of course the object of that argument is to endeavour to mitigate the monstrosity of the Intercolonial Railway deficits from year to year. He tells us that there are deficits on the Intercolonial Railway, it went into the pockets of the people of the maritime provinces, who had just as much right to the money as the people of the Dominion had to the expenditure of $23,000,000 on the canals. Well, we all understand that argument.

The hon. gentleman next passed on to the Grand Trunk National Transcontinental Railway which is under his charge. It is a work of transcendant importance to the people of this country, and yet the only information he deigned to give us about it was that there were 1,300 men employed on it, and that taking that number of men together with the number employed on the Intercolonial Railway and on the canals, there were 13,000 employees under his direction. Surely the people of Canada are entitled to some information about the Transcontinental Railway. Surely we should know if it is only going to cost us the $13,000,000 that the Prime Minister said it would cost, or, whether it will cost more. The surveys are now completed, many of the contracts are let, and sufficient information is in the possession of the department to enable the government to tell us what expenditure the country will be liable for. The hon. gentleman should have told us what will be the length of the mountain

section, and whether it will be 500 miles as the government said, or 800 miles as alleged per contra.

Mr. TAYLOR. He was ashamed to tell.

Mr. EMMERSON. I referred you to the report.

Mr. HAGGART. The report does not show whether the cost will be as the Prime Minister said, or whether it will be greater, the report does not show whether the line from Quebec to Moncton is shorter and with easier gradients than the Intercolonial Railway. There is no information in the report which is of any use whatever to the people of Canada.

As my time is limited I must pass on to the Intercolonial, the pet subject of the minister. The time has passed for encomiums upon Sandford Fleming and Mr. Schreiber, and half a dozen other wonderful gentlemen whom the minister has dealt with so fully to-night, that you would think they had departed this life and that he was sounding their praises.

Mr. FOSTER. A funeral oration on them.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was giving credit to whom credit is due.

Mr. HAGGART. Let us get at the bald facts about the Intercolonial. The minister said the capital expenditure on the road in 1896 was $55,000,000, and that to-day it is $82,000,000 or $27,000,000 more. Where has that $27,000,000 gone ? What have we got for it. His predecessor in office stated that it would realize to the Dominion more than the interest charge upon it. Is that true ? The ordinary way of calculating the condition of a railway is to make some allowance for the interest on capital expended. The Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and every other railway provides interest for capital expended which is the first charge upon the road. We can borrow money at 3½ per cent, and 3½ per cent on the $82,000,000 capital account of the Intercolonial means $2,750,000 a year for interest.

First of all, then, before you show a surplus, you should charge up that amount for interest. We have the promise of this government, through its representative in the House, that the difference between $55,000,000 and $82,000,000, which we have expended on capital account on that road, would be returned to us. Then, before we attempt to show profits on the road, we should charge up three and a half per cent on say $20,000,000, or about $700,000 a year. But the hon. gentleman said not a word of this. It is a magnificent asset, he says, and it will be greater still when the road is extended to Vancouver, and when it takes within its grasp all the different feeding railroads in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. What a hint this is to these impecunious railroads in the different provinces, that it may be the policy of this government to buy them up. What a fine election fund the hon. gentleman would be able to provide from a transaction of that kind.

Mr. EMMERSON. Suspicion haunts the guilty mind.

Mr. HAGGART. The Drummond County Railway would not be in it. For building up the eastern provinces of this Dominion and making them content with their lot there would be nothing like purchasing all the feeding lines of the Intercolonial Railway. We have learned how the capital of these railroads is being supplemented in other ways than by a vote of this House. After municipal and other assistance has been granted to them to the fullest extent possible, the government winks at the rolling stock of the government railway being used by them. The Minister of Railways makes the statement boldly and openly that it is with the consent of the government that the whole of the rolling stock of these different lines in the maritime provinces, and I suppose also in the lower part of Quebec, is provided by the Intercolonial, while at the same time over 2,500 of our cars are wandering about the United States, all the way from California up to the Maine boundary. What a state of affairs. What a cause of congratulation to the country upon the management of that road.

Now, let us deal with the hon. gentleman's surplus. The gross earnings of the road in 1905-6 were $7,643,829, an increase over the previous year of $899,690. The gross working expenses were $7,587,914, a decrease of over $1,000,000 ; showing a surplus, as the hon. gentleman says, of $61,915.54. We did not hear a word from him about the capital expenditure ; he never mentioned it. Yet it amounted to $3,765,170, and every dollar of that except $300,000, which was expended for the St. Mary's bridge, ought to be charged to revenue. That would show a deficit upon this road of over $3,400,000. That is exactly the position of the matter. What do the people of this country care about investing their money in capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway ? What they want to know is how the money which is taken out of their pockets is expended. They believe that capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway should cease. Yet there has been a drain on the resources of the country on that account of over $3,000,000 a year since these hon. gentlemen went into power. What possible asset to the people of Canada has been the expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial for the last ten years ? When I was managing the Intercolonial in 1896 and in the years preceding, I insisted that the expenditure on capital account should cease, as a capital expenditure, and that it should be charged to the revenue of the road. For the three or four years prior to 1897, when the control of the road

came into the hands of the predecessor of the hon. gentleman, the largest expenditure on capital account in any year was $150,000. Now it averages over $3,500,000 a year.

The hon. gentleman plumes himself on his management of the Intercolonial Railway. Let us look at the facts of the case. According to his statement, the expenditure per mile on that road, not including the expenditure on capital account, is in the neighbourhood of $5,200 per year. The earnings of the road are just the same, $5,200. Add the $3,500,000 to the expenditure, and you will see that the cost of running that road is in the neighbourhood of $7,500 per mile per year, or nearly double the cost of running the Canadian Pacific Railway, and largely in excess of the cost of running the Grand Trunk Railway. The expenditure per mile of the Canadian Pacific Railway is in the neighbourhood of $4,500 per year, and that of the Grand Trunk Railway in the neighbourhood of $5,000, while the expenditure on this well-managed road is over $7,000. What are the receipts per train mile? For an expenditure on the Intercolonial of $1.02 per train mile, it realizes $1.02. The cost of running trains on the Grand Trunk Railway is about the same, $1.02 per train mile, while it realizes $1.46 per train mile.

It costs the Canadian Pacific Railway per train mile to run their road $1.31 and they realize $2.10. The hon. gentleman states, and states truly, that the average receipts for running a railway in the United States per train mile is in the neighbourhood of $1.85. Well, if we had that from the Intercolonial Railway we would have a handsome surplus. Why is it that we do not receive that? Why is it that the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway is double or perhaps two-thirds more than that on the Grand Trunk Railway. Are the wages dearer? Is the material supplied dearer than what the Grand Trunk Railway pay for it? Is the coal dearer? Here is a road with tracks running into the coal mines, and yet it costs as much per mile to run it as it does to run the Grand Trunk Railway from one end of its system to the other. The amount required to run a locomotive on the Intercolonial Railway is exactly the same per mile, $1.02, as on the Grand Trunk Railway. Oh but, says the hon. gentleman, we give our people cheaper freight than any other railway on the continent of America. True there are some things the Intercolonial Railway carries cheaper. That road carries sugar from Halifax to Moncton, for the benefit of a factory there, and distributes it throughout the country perhaps cheaper than any other railway would charge. It carries the coal from the mines perhaps cheaper than other railways would charge. But for the ordinary freight and passenger fares, the charges are very little different. I took the trouble to look into this, and I found that for all distances up to 60 miles, while there may be a little difference in the first class, as you go down there is very little difference. Then for all local traffic—that is less than 60 miles travel—the Intercolonial Railway gets as fair prices as the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway and on the same classification. The hon. gentleman says that this year the increase in rates has been 10 per cent over preceding years. Well, when I was on the Intercolonial Railway, I looked into the freight system, and I found that the people of the maritime provinces were paying fair prices for the transport of their goods except in a couple of exceptional cases. For instance from St. John to Halifax, the rates were a little less perhaps than on some other roads. But, as a rule, the local charges on passengers who used that road were a fair remuneration. Here is a road which can purchase supplies cheaper than any other railway in the country can. If the system of tendering which was adopted when I was in the office, is still in force on the Intercolonial Railway, they can buy cheaper than any other railway. People like to sell to the Intercolonial Railway. We could get men to work for us without striking, and get them at as low rates as the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway. But we perhaps had not a superabundance of men. We were not driven to the desperate necessity of carrying some counties in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick by having a supply of labour on the road largely in excess of its requirements.

I was amused at the hon. gentleman trying to justify his charging to capital account the property built to replace that destroyed by fire at Moncton. I asked him had he the property insured, and he said no, that the government found it cheaper to insure its own property. But fancy the extraordinary system of charging to capital account instead of the revenue the building put up in the place of those destroyed by fire. After a statement of that kind, we may look for an expenditure next year, chargeable to capital account, caused by the erection of the buildings and machinery to replace those destroyed, of $1,000,000, and that will take a good round sum out of the receipts of the road.

In the minister's statement of the last six months of the fiscal year ending the 31st of March next, he gave a glowing estimate which showed an anticipated excess of receipts over of between $400,000 and $450,000. I did not hear him say whether he included in that the expenditure on account of capital. In fact we do not know what this capital expenditure is. It is very easy, as the late Mr. Alexander Mackenzie said again and again, keeping a capital account, but that simply gives the officers of the Intercolonial Railway a means of covering up their extravagance. If the receipts do not meet the expenditure, then it is the easiest thing in the world to charge

against capital account a locomotive or anything else that is purchased, or any expenditure made for the purpose of lengthening the yards, or for repairs or additions to sheds, or in fact anything at all. But why should there be a capital account in the case of this road which has been running for thirty years ? I can understand that when we purchase a road like the Drummond Railway or the Eastern Railway, the cost of that purchase would be fairly chargeable to capital. But by this system of charging all sorts of expenditure to capital account, you are simply deceiving the people.

The hon. gentleman was very lugubrious in depicting the woeful state of affairs which might result, should an arrangement be made with some railway companies for the purpose of giving them running rights over the Intercolonial Railway. The first thing they would do, he said, would be to gobble up the feeding lines of the Intercolonial Railway. Just fancy a live railway company, with running rights over the Intercolonial Railway, gobbling up those feeding lines, not one of which pays a dividend of 1 per cent in ten years. We had the hon. gentleman's predecessor denouncing the arrangement between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, by which the latter were granted running rights over the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax, as something very iniquitous. He could not understand how any government could be so stupid as to enter into such an arrangement. Well, I have never heard that that arrangement has been terminated. There was a rumour in the newspapers the other day that the Canadian Pacific Railway are insisting upon running rights from St. John to Halifax. It appears that they are compelled, by arrangement with the Dominion government, to have their steamers, after leaving St. John, call at the port of Halifax. They and the Allans company have a contract with the post office department by which each receives one-half of the subsidy given for the mail service between this and the old country. They found it so disadvantageous, on account of arrangements they had made with the imperial government to carry their mail, in a certain fixed time, from Hong Kong and other places on the Chinese coast in which the imperial government are interested to Liverpool, to call in at Halifax, that I understand that they came to this government and said : We shall be forced by necessity even to abandon the subsidy you give and sail entirely from the port of St. John, unless we can make a running arrangement with the Intercolonial Railway under which we shall have the right to see to it that our passengers and freight are promptly shipped to Halifax. I asked the hon. minister if there had been an arrangement made with the Canadian Pacific Railway in reference to that, and what arrangement exists to-day. We have not been furnished with the information. I think the hon. gentleman should have given us the information.

Now, in reference to the benefit accruing to the maritime provinces from the building of the Intercolonial : The hon. gentleman dwelt upon this point and explained it pretty fully and perhaps truly. There is one gratifying result from the building of the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railways. Strange as it may seem in view of the report we sometimes hear, the railway traffic in the maritime provinces has nearly doubled—both passenger and freight—within the last ten years. This is local traffic ; the through traffic has not proportionately increased. We built an elevator in Halifax and another at St. John. We gave exceptionally low rates on the Intercolonial Railway that through grain might reach these places, but they had no effect in diverting grain to the Intercolonial Railway route. By far the greater portion of the increasing receipts of the Intercolonial Railway comes out of the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. It is a fair field for railway enterprise and they are doing a magnificent business there. Now, I believe, to a certain extent, in state ownership of railways. Keep out political and grafting influences, and why should not the state run a railway even more cheaply than a private corporation can do. Yet, we find that the cost per mile upon the Intercolonial Railway is two-thirds more than the cost of running the Canadian Pacific Railway. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) deny it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Unquestionably.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman know the cost of a train mile on the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave the exact figures last year making a comparison of the cost of the Intercolonial Railway with the cost on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and showing that the Intercolonial Railway was run at less cost than either of them.

Mr. HAGGART. I venture to say that the expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway, without taking any account of capital expenditure is $5,286 per mile. The receipts are nearly the same. If you were to add a fair allowance for interest on invested capital and also the sums which are now yearly charged to capital but which should be paid out of current account, the cost of running the road would be over $7,500 a mile, which is two-thirds more than it costs the Canadian Pacific Railway, and a good deal in excess of the Grand Trunk. These figures ought to be furnished by the department. The figures that they do furnish show the operating expenses. Well, the operating expenses on the Grand Trunk

were $1.02 per train mile, and the earnings $1.46. The expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway per train mile, was $1.31, the cost being relatively high, because of the large expenditure on coal for the line north of Lake Superior and other parts at a great distance from coal mines. The receipts on the Canadian Pacific Railway were $2.10 per train mile. The Intercolonial Railway expenditure per train mile, as calculated from figures given in Mr. Butler's own statement was $1.02 and earnings about the same. Now, why should it cost as much to run a locomotive on the Intercolonial Railway as on the Grand Trunk Railway? If you were to add an allowance for capital expenditure, the cost per train mile on the Intercolonial Railway would be $1.52. My contention is that the road is overmanned. The hon. gentleman stated with a good deal of pride—and certainly it is a matter of credit to Mr. Butler, the head of the department—that, with a less train mileage from last year, the road has earned $800,000 more. The same is true of the passenger train mileage. Altogether he shows an increase in gross earnings of $899,000, and a decrease in working expenses of over $1,000,000. Last year I pointed out that there were a lot of useless trains upon the road. What has become of the train that the hon. gentleman said last year was a paying concern?—a train between Halifax and Montreal, starting within fifteen minutes of the Canadian Pacific Railway train and arriving about the same time, competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway for passengers, although the Canadian Pacific Railway train does not stop at nearly so many way stations. Why, of course, the passengers were picked up by the Canadian Pacific Railway. One reason for the decrease in the train mile expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway is the taking off of that train——

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) will have to correct that statement. That train ran last year the same as the preceding year.

Mr. HAGGART. But does it run now?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and it will run this year. It is a splendid train. It is the pride of Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman spoke about the sumptuousness of the trains on the Intercolonial Railway. Well, they ought to be sumptuous. They have cost the people of this country between $25,000,000 and $27,000,000 within the last ten years. The capital spent upon the road ought to provide a line of locomotives covering nearly the distance between Montreal and Halifax. I notice that all the additions made this year—we have not here a statement of the increase in the number of locomotives chargeable to revenue account, but it is very small—all this goes to capital account for the purpose of allowing the minister to make a nice showing, and he continues the trains——

Mr. EMMERSON. The trains are paying well.

Mr. HAGGART. Trains starting within 15 minutes of each other, express trains running from Montreal to Halifax——

Mr. EMMERSON. The trains are crowded.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a nice way to manage a road. Could not you make one of them an annex of the other, and have only one train carrying passengers through? However, I find that I may be getting as lengthy as the hon. gentleman was in his speech. I have not much more to say. But I must say that it was a disappointing statement in reference to the Transcontinental. But it was a long speech, I suppose that, like a kiss, its strength must be measured by its length. If we measure his speech by its length it was a very eloquent one. But seriously, what a laughing stock the parliament of this country must be to the people. On a subject in which there is so much interest taken as the Transcontinental Railway, the minister who is in charge of it has not a word to say. We have no information in reference to it. We have full details of the price that is paid to every fireman on the Intercolonial, the fullest possible information in reference to the prices of supplies, but there is not one word about the most important fact. He did bring out one new thing to-day, he says that the reason the Intercolonial lost on its passenger and freight rates was because it had to pay so much higher wages. To-day we have had for the first time a comparison between the freight rates on the Intercolonial and those of the Grand Trunk, but we had no comparison of the cost per mile and the receipts per mile between the Intercolonial and other railways. We had a comparison with the train earnings per mile on the Australian roads. But the data to enable the people to judge as to whether the railroad is run properly or not, is the expense per train mile and the receipts upon it, and the expense per train mile, as I have already said, is largely in excess of that of any other road I know of upon this continent, and the receipts are comparatively small. I have nothing more to say, Mr. Speaker, I have done my duty in pointing out to the people of this country the immense expenditures that have been made upon the Intercolonial. We do not begrudge an expenditure in the maritime provinces to any extent. We are not local in our feelings in this section of the country. If the expenditure is made for the benefit of the country we are willing to make it. As long as there is a surplus the people are entitled to their fair share,

and the smaller provinces to more than their fair share. But we want to see the expenditure kept within bounds, and that is what the people of this country will demand from us.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I am going to follow the example of my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) who has just taken his seat and make my remarks very brief, for two reasons: First, because the hour is late, and secondly, because the magnificent speech of the Minister of Railways and Canals has exhausted the subject so thoroughly, and so well set forth the conditions existing at the present time, that anything I might attempt to add would be, I am afraid, like trying to paint the lily. I want to congratulate the Minister of Railways and Canals, not only upon his speech, but upon his success in lifting the Intercolonial out of the slough of despond in which it seemed to have fallen. He has not taken perhaps sufficient credit to himself, but he has given credit, and I join with him in giving credit, to his deputy minister and to the heads of departments. But I think credit also should be given to the people of the maritime provinces through which the Intercolonial runs, who have joined in most cases, loyally in assisting the minister in the effort he has made to better the condition of the finances of that road. I know that in the constituency in which I live and through which the Intercolonial passes, the people were desirous of giving the Minister of Railways and Canals a fair chance to put the Intercolonial upon a proper business and financial basis; and I believe they have put up perhaps with some hardship, a hardship which I trust will now be removed, for the purpose of assisting him and his department in an effort to preserve the present status of that road. We realize in the maritime provinces that we are only a small portion of the Dominion of Canada, and if there were to be a continuance of deficits every year, sometimes going up into the millions, it would only be a question of time when the rest of the country would get tired of this kind of work, and would insist that the Intercolonial be transferred to some private corporation. Perhaps in the maritime provinces, Mr. Speaker, we are too sensitive in reference to the Intercolonial. When it was built we regarded it as a bond of confederation, to-day we look upon it in some light as the pet child of those provinces. We desire that the ownership of that road shall be continued in the people of Canada, but we desire that it shall be operated in such a way as not to involve deficits. We do not, however, care to see any huge surpluses on that road, because we believe that it never was intended to be a dividend paying institution, but, as I have just said, a bond between the upper provinces and the lower provinces of Canada. The natural markets for the people of the maritime provinces are the New England States. This road was built to some extent to divert trade into an unnatural channel, to turn it away from the United States and direct it to the upper provinces of Canada.

It is a remarkable tribute to the skill of the Minister of Railways and his staff of officials that a road which, year before last, had a deficit of $1,700,000 and over, at the end of the last fiscal year had a surplus of $50,000 or $60,000. During the first six months of the present fiscal year the surplus has been the largest in the history of the Intercolonial, namely, something over $300,000. I desire to congratulate the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals upon this condition of affairs, but I desire especially to congratulate him upon the fact that after having unfolded the book of this road of having made such a showing that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, the expert of the opposition upon railway matters, upon rising in his place in this House is not able to make one single charge against the management of my hon. friend or to contradict in one particular his statement, but, in fact, contents himself in the course of his speech by making the bald assertion that the expenditure per train mile on the Intercolonial is greater than it is on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, although he had listened here, as the rest of us had listened, last year and this to the Minister of Railways and Canals presenting facts which show conclusively that the expenditure per train mile upon the Intercolonial Railway is not greater than upon either of these roads. I do desire, therefore, to congratulate the Minister of Railways and Canals upon the fact that the conditions are of such a roseate character on the Intercolonial Railway under his management. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals lays down the doctrine that there should not be any further capital expenditure upon the road. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I need to appeal to the people of the maritime provincese, but I might very well appeal to the people of the most remote provinces of the west and they would agree with me in saying that it is necessary in this growing time to make capital expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway as it is necessary to expend hundreds of millions of dollars upon capital account upon other great railways of Canada and the United States. We in the maritime provinces do not desire that there shall be useless expenditures upon capital account, but there are certain improvements that ought to be made to the Intercolonial Railway at the present time. Such expenditure will be in the interest not only of the people of that part of

Canada, but will be in the interest of the people of all Canada, who are the owners of this road. In the first place I think myself that the first capital expenditure which we should undertake is in acquiring the branch lines which will act as feeders to the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has touched upon this question to some extent, but he has not stated it as strongly as I am endeavouring to state it now. I think it is in the interest of the road that we should secure these feeders the same as it seems to be in the interest of railways owned by corporations. Take, for instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway; wherever they acquire a trunk line of railway they immediately seek to secure the feeders of that railway, and such, I submit, should be the policy of the government in reference to the government railway. My hon. friend the ex-minister has spoken of the branch roads as not paying one per cent in ten years. There are branch roads that I am acquainted with that are paying handsome dividends every year and have been for years past. These roads should be controlled by the Intercolonial Railway which would derive greater benefit from their operation than by merely taking the traffic from them, as is done at the present time.

I would like to extend an invitation to my good and genial friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to come down over the Intercolonial Railway. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals to provide him with an observation car. Let him sit in the rear of that car and come down over the road and see it, and if he does he will never make such a speech again as he has made here to-night. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals does not apparently know what he is talking about. There is a tradition down there that upon one occasion when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Railways and Canals he went over the road on a tour of inspection, and it is said travelled in a train at the record speed of any train that had ever gone over that system. I wish he would come back, look around and see the road, which, when he was operating it, was almost grass-grown but which to-day is a great avenue of activity. I wish he could come down and see the road which has almost doubled its rolling stock and which has undergone many changes for the better since it was operated by my hon. friend, and operated, I am afraid, largely in the interest not of the Intercolonial Railway, but of the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friend has referred to the arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. As a matter of fact, under his administration, the best business in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was being taken from the Intercolonial Railway and handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway under the arrangement which he made with that company. Imagine trying to operate that road with every agent having directions in his hands that said to him: You shall not try to get business for the Intercolonial Railway in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway; you must allow shippers to send their goods as they please. The Canadian Pacific Railway had their agents in every hamlet coaxing the people to send their goods by the Canadian Pacific Railway, while the agents of the Intercolonial Railway were shackled and tied, unable to canvass for their own road. With such a condition of affairs existing is it any wonder that stagnation existed until 1896 when that arrangement was done away with?

Mr. HAGGART. Was not the arrangement that they should not discriminate between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway with respect to goods when they passed beyond the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. LOGAN. I am referring to the direction which was given to the agents of the Intercolonial Railway and we know that they were not allowed to canvass for west-bound trade for their own road. There is no question about it. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway are asking for running rights over the Intercolonial Railway. Personally I believe that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be given running rights over the Intercolonial Railway. I believe that they should be able to get their trains into the city of Halifax and to that magnificent harbour, but I do not believe that they should be given the whole of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not believe that we should make such an arrangement as would allow them not only to send their trains to Halifax, but to take the whole cream of the trade of the provinces away from the government railway. The proposition, as I understand it, and I am not going to discuss it, because I promised not to speak at any great length, is that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall have the right to do station to station business in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia on what is the fat portion of the Intecolonial Railway, while the government would have to take the lean part from Moncton away up north and do the best it could with that part of the road. In other words, we would be handing over to the Canadian Pacific Railway the best of our business and trying to operate the most expensive part of our line. I do not think that unless we receive a very large remuneration it is in the interest of the people of Canada that such an arrangement

should be made with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I do believe it is in the interest of Nova Scotia that we should make some arrangement with that railway by which they shall have running rights for their train into the city of Halifax. It is a matter of detail. On general principles I believe we should give them running rights, but that we should not hand over the best of the business of the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway or to any other railway. I was very glad to hear my hon. friend making the argument that we in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are not beggars before the treasury of Canada, or, in other words, that we do not have such exceedingly low freight rates. My hon. friend has made the statement that with a few exceptions we pay as high freight rates in the maritime provinces as the people do anywhere in Canada. The only exceptions which he made were the rates in regard to the carriage of sugar to a refinery at Moncton which he said were made lower. Once more, did my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) put his foot in it, because there is no sugar refinery in the city of Moncton, and therefore there could not be any special rates to the sugar refinery there. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) has evidently been asleep since 1896; he has not taken measure of the progress of the country since then. Let him, I repeat, come down to the maritime provinces and see the conditions as they are to-day, and then he will not make such ridiculous statements as he has contributed to the debate to-night.

Now, my hon. friend (the ex-Minister of Railways) has made a very important statement and that is that the Intercolonial purchases its supplies as cheaply, if not more cheaply, than do company-owned railways. That is an excellent recommendation for the Minister of Railways and the administration of his department. But, the ex-Minister (Mr. Haggart) said that on the intercolonial he could get labour as cheap, if not cheaper, than could be obtained on any other railroad. I was sorry to hear that he held such a poor opinion of the workingmen in the maritime provinces, and I am thankful to say that the present Minister of Railways is not looking to get cheaper labour than can be obtained by another railroad; his policy is to give a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, and so he has increased the wages of the Intercolonial employees all along the line.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I want to make one or two criticisms of the Intercolonial and my first criticism will be that the road has not enough rolling stock. To-day, the business of the maritime provinces is almost stagnant for want of railway transportation facilities. I know that condition prevails throughout Canada to some extent, but I think it is to be found in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in a more aggravated form than elsewhere. Our people have not cars to move their hay and other produce; coal cannot be forwarded, and stored; in the sheds all along the line are all kinds of freight waiting for transportation. Surely, in view of the encouraging financial condition of the road, as shown by the minister to-night, we ought now be able to secure sufficient rolling stock to alleviate to some reasonable extent the existing condition. We need more motive power on the road, to handle the trains; we need more passenger cars and we need more frequent trains for the accommodation of the passenger traffic. The people of the maritime provinces, have as I have said, joined in helping the Minister of Railways to better the finances of the Intercolonial; and they deserve some consideration in return. Certain trains were taken off the schedule some few years ago, which I think the road can well afford to run to-day. We had formerly, between Moncton and Halifax, two local trains, known as No. 1 and No. 2, which were cancelled in the interests of economy. Since then the service has been defective. The people have been patient, they have had to use through trains for local accommodation, and of course during the winter months these through trains often do not run on schedule time. I admit, that when the through trains are very late, specials are put on, but nevertheless a great deal of inconvenience has been caused to the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and I hope the Minister of Railways will now see his way clear to restore that local service. I trust also, that the government will come to my view, and that they will secure the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial as feeders for that system. I trust that the government will equip the Intercolonial with the very best rolling stock that money can buy, that engines of the most modern type will be secured, and that the people of the maritime provinces will be provided with the passenger service to which they are entitled. Mr. Speaker, I am following one good example of the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) in being brief, and therefore I conclude with again congratulating the Minister of Railways on the very satisfactory statement he has been able to present to the House, and I express the fervent hope that he may be enabled to go on and still further improve the Intercolonial system and the service upon it.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I shall not trouble the House with any lengthened remarks in reply to the statement of the Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman divided his department into four branches, but I shall confine my remarks largely to his statement with regard to the canals. He stated that from 1896 to the present we had expended

$24,000,000 on canals capital account, and amongst this was an expenditure of $1,265,000 on the Cornwall canal. But the hon. gentleman did not tell us how much had been mis-spent on that canal; he did not tell us that mistakes were made in reference to its construction which cost the country thousands and thousands of dollars, and he did not tell us that included in that expenditure was a large sum for the construction of the foundations of the St. Lawrence Power Company plant, the benefit of which is now enjoyed by a private company. He told us that on the Iroquois and Cardinal canal, $4,000,000 had been expended, but he did not tell us that on account of mistakes and changes made, about $1,000,000 of that had been wasted. In addition a location was selected for that canal, which cost the country a great deal more money for construction, than if the location were selected without any reference to party considerations. Then, as to the construction of the north channel of the Galops which cost $1,500,000, that expenditure has also been worthless because that channel cannot be safely used by the large vessels that to-day ply on the river. For some reason or other the pier at the west end of that channel is so built that the entrance is very dangerous to vessels, and already several have been sunk there. As was said by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) for the expenditure of $50,000, a shoal of no great area, on which there is only 10 feet of water, could have been removed and a much better and safer channel provided than that which has cost the country $1,500,000.

It was the old channel, which had been used for the last 50 years. But the excuse that was given for the construction of this north channel was that vessels should run entirely through Canadian waters. There is no doubt that in going down through this north channel they have that advantage. But a vessel leaving the Welland canal for Montreal cannot go down the St. Lawrence to Prescott without passing through a portion of the American channel, as there is no Canadian channel direct between Brockville and Gananoque. If therefore it is right to use the American channel west of Brockville, why was it not to be used east of Brockville as well, saying to the people of this country $1,500,000? In every canal that has been built there has been the same difficulty, and for that reason a great deal of the expenditure that has been made by the Minister of Railways and Canals, if it has been actually necessary, has been made in the most extravagant way. The hon. minister, when he was stating the expenditures, did not make any comparisons between the cost of maintaining and operating these canals at the present time and the cost previous to 1896. The only difference in them is that they are now a little deeper. They have the same number of locks, and should not require any more men to operate them, while it should cost less to maintain them for the reason that they are all new. Let me give a comparison of the cost of operating and maintaining these canals in 1896 and in 1906 respectively:

Name of canal.	Cost in 1896.	Cost in 1906.
Welland..	$137,336 21	$186,637 89
Williamsburg	16,690 46	33,438 08
Sault Ste. Marie..	3,432 73	35,964 26
Rideau..	53,314 40	96,315 40
Lachine..	81,110 24	144,773 62
Cornwall..	28,168 10	103,139 90
Beauharnois..	32,651 49	27,932 62

The total cost of running the canals in 1896 was $252,716, while in 1906 it was $886,023.97, showing that $633,307.97 more is paid out annually by this government to operate and maintain these canals than was paid in 1896.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Was the traffic of both years the same?

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think as many vessels passed through the canals last year as in 1896, but there was more freight, because the vessels are now much larger. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) did not state to-night whether it was the intention of the government to deepen the Welland canal. The premier informed a deputation which waited on the government a short time ago that they were considering the matter. The government has spent $1,330,405.41 at Port Colborne, largely towards building an elevator. If the Welland canal were deepened, this elevator would be useful, but I mention it now to show how the government is spending money unnecessarily.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals spoke of the Railway Commission as a separate department. That commission has done good work. When it insisted on a reduction of passenger rates a few days ago, it performed a good act, for which I am sure the people of this country are grateful; and if that commission continues its good work, the people of this country will appreciate it very much. But that is the work of the Railway Commission and not of the Department of Railways and Canals. I would like the minister to ask the Railway Commission why it is that in some parts of Ontario there are two different rates on the railways. For instance, between Montreal and Toronto, and between Toronto and Hamilton, there is a rate of 3 cents per mile for first-class passengers and about 2½ cents or 2¼ cents per mile for second-class passengers. Many railways in Ontario have only a first-class rate, while they supply only second-class cars. These railways should be compelled to furnish first-class cars for people to whom they charge a first-class rate. I believe that the work of the Railway Commission is not proceeding fast enough in the interests of the people. I do not wish to be understood as blaming for

a moment the members of the commission. In my opinion there is not a sufficient number of them to do the work that requires to be done. They should be either given more assistance or more members should be appointed on that commission so that the work, instead of being delayed for months and years, might be pushed to a conclusion at the earliest possible moment.

The next thing I wish to mention is the Transcontinental Railway department. Every one knows that when the Transcontinental Railway Bill was submitted to this House, there was almost a stampede on the other side. Many of these hon. gentlemen were bound that the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill would not go through until this road from Winnipeg to Moncton was tacked on to it. But hon. gentlemen on the other side, who were threatening to defeat the government, were in a short time—influenced by the newspapers in their different constituencies I suppose—brought to believe that they must support this road. I notice, in the list of accounts unpaid by this Grand Trunk Pacific, that newspapers from Moncton to Vancouver were subsidized to advertise this railway; and to the surprise of us all, we found that it cost those people $162,000 to get a foundation laid for the passage of the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill through this House. Could any one imagine that a charter, which was backed up by the right hon. the First Minister himself and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson), should require such an amount to be expended in order to have it become law and enable the company to proceed with the work ? However, the Bill got through, and those who are managing this Transcontinental Railway department have spent some $2,000,000, and we have not had any explanation from the minister. But we had a little sample, not long ago in the Public Accounts Committee, of the way some of these expenditures are made ; and if the expenditures on this road are carried on in any way like what came up at that committee, there is no doubt that thousands of dollars were paid more than should have been for the work done in this department That being the case, what will be the amount which the people of this country will lose through expenditures on such a system ?

Now I shall pass on to the railway department, concerning which I propose to say a few words. The hon. minister said that in 1896 we had 16,387 miles of railways and we had paid in subsidies towards those railways $90,395,692. Since that time the increase has been 5,131 miles, on which subsidies to the extent of $15,338,509 have been paid. The minister takes credit for the building of all these 5,000 miles of railway. I want to say that men like Mackenzie and Mann, the Canadian Pacific Railway and others are the ones that promoted and pushed these railways through.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought I was very modest about it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, my hon. friend tried to make out that the department was responsible for pushing through these 5,131 miles of railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. You must have misunderstood the object of my remarks.

Mr. J. D. REID. That was the way that I understood it. So far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, I wish to say that I in common with every one on this side, wish to see it do well and give the greatest convenience possible to the people of the lower provinces ; and I do not believe there is one man who would object to any expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway for the purpose of making it more advantageous to the people of the lower provinces. And in so far as the ownership of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, I am of the opinion that it should remain under the control of this government. But I was just making a comparison. I see that in 1896 there were 1,155 miles of railway owned and operated by the Intercolonial Railway and that in that year the gross receipts were $2,866,028 or an average of $2,500 per mile. Last year there were 1,739 miles owned and operated by the Intercolonial Railway and the receipts were $7,643,829 or an average of $4,400 per mile.

Mr. EMMERSON. You have included the Prince Edward Island Railway in that.

Mr. J. D. REID. In the first one as well. I take them all together because they are all part of the Intercolonial Railway system. Last year we had 1,739 miles and the receipts were $7,643,829 or an average of $4,400 per mile. That shows an increase of $1,900 per mile last year as compared with 1896. What strikes me as very strange at the moment is that if there is such an enormous increase over the whole system, why are there not more profits ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In 1896 there were more than 1,149 miles.

Mr. J. D. REID. I took it out of the book.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was confined to the Intercolonial Railway, but if you combine the mileage of the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railways, it would be more than 1,149. You divide by 1,149 in 1896 and now you put it at 1,700 adding in the Prince Edward Island Railway. You should make your division by the actual mileage of the Intercolonial Railway in 1906 as you did with the actual mileage of the Intercolonial in 1896. Your results are very faulty indeed.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the minister mean that there were more than 1,155 in 1896 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Combining the two, yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister can see that he would add more to the 1,155 miles, instead of its showing $2.500, it would show a difference much wider than I have indicated. You can understand that I divided 1,155 into $2,866,000. So, if I make it 1,300 or 1,400 miles, it will only tell the more strongly against the argument of the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. My arithmetic does not agree with that of the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid).

Mr. J. D. REID. I have taken the figures out of the hon. gentleman's own accounts, and certainly I have no intention of misrepresenting them.

Mr. EMMERSON. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. J. D. REID. Speaking of the cost of operation, the minister states that the wages bill has gone up. There is no doubt about that. But I do not see that other things have gone up as much as the minister says they have. One reason for the high prices—and the minister knows it—is that, in purchasing these supplies, he does not purchase them direct from the manufacturers.

Mr. EMMERSON. We purchase by tender in every instance.

Mr. J. D. REID. Take the case of ties—the hon minister purchased these from a lawyer, Mr. B. F. Pierson

Mr. EMMERSON. But by tender.

Mr. J. D. REID. On a letter simply—there is no public advertisement

Mr. EMMERSON. Excuse me—

Mr. J. D. REID. Oh, this year,—

Mr. EMMERSON And last year, and every year. Notices are posted up in every station in the maritime provinces, and the lowest tender is accepted. And the price paid to that lowest tenderer is the price we pay to everybody—we do not buy a single tie above the price fixed by the lowest tender. That was the case with Mr. Pierson—he was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the lowest tenderer always get the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. His tender is accepted in every instance.

Mr. J. D. REID. As to ties, they have been advertised for the last year or so—

Mr. EMMERSON. And every year.

Mr. J. D. REID. If my memory serves me right, they were purchased by letter formerly.

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has in mind something that was done previous to 1896. But I can tell him that as far as ties and lumber are concerned, even before 1896 they asked for tenders.

Mr. BERGERON. In 1900, how many were bought without tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not a tie.

Mr. BERGERON. Why, they bought enough for five years in advance.

Mr. EMMERSON. But all on the basis of the lowest tender. There was a complaint then that too many were bought; last year they made the complaint that I did not buy enough.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. minister knows that cases were brought out this year and last year in the Public Accounts Committee showing that expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway were not fair and just. Now, I want to say a word or two about the rates. The minister told us that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway are much lower than those on the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway. The hon. gentleman knows that the rates from any part of Ontario to any point in the maritime provinces are exactly the same whether the shipment goes over the Intercolonial Railway or over an opposition road. The arrangement is with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway on one side and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the other. The government has men going through the province of Ontario soliciting freight for the Intercolonial Railway, but the rates are identical.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman is speaking of through rates.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am speaking of rates from any point in Ontario to any point in the maritime provinces.

Mr. EMMERSON. And, if the hon. gentleman will pardon me—these rates are very low, due to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was first in the field and established its freight rates, and the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have had to conform to them. And it is due to the existence of the Intercolonial Railway that we have to-day, over all the lines to points in the maritime provinces, such low freight rates.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the rate from Toronto to Halifax on the Intercolonial Railway is as high on any other route.

Mr. EMMERSON. Put it the other way—the rates charged by the others are as low as those on the Intercolonial Railway, and these low rates were established at the inception of the government road.

Mr. J. D. REID. What I am pointing out is that on traffic from points in Ontario to points in the maritime provinces, the rates on the Intercolonial Railway are not lower than by other lines which simply means that the government went into an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way on through freight. So far as local rates are concerned, the minister states that they are all the way from 25 per cent to 50 per cent less than on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Take for instance the case of lumber, 50 per cent higher on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Does not the hon. minister think that if he can make a surplus managing the railway as he has been doing with the present freight rates, it is about time that he should see the Railway Commission and make them reduce the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway to those of the Intercolonial in the matter of lumber? I believe the parties who are producing the lumber do not get the advantage of that difference in the low rate. It is the speculator or manufacturer that is getting the advantage of the low rate instead of the producer of lumber. The same thing I believe applies to all produce along the Intercolonial. I do not believe that the farmers are getting advantage of the low rates. Then the first thing the minister did was to advance the freight rates, and in doing so he took the money out of the farmers. The passenger rates I understand are the lowest on any railway, therefore it would have been more to the advantage of the people in the lower provinces to advance the passenger rates than to advance the freight rates and take them out of the people who are producing the stuff.

I wish to say in conclusion that I cannot agree with the minister in his statement that the expenses on the canal system and on the railway have been made as economically as they should have been. I cannot agree with him that the operating charges are down at the lowest point consistent with safety. I hope and trust that some changes will be made by which they will be put on a different basis. However, I am glad to see that the Intercolonial is being operated by the government. When the minister spoke about the future of the Intercolonial I supposed he would have some announcement to make on behalf of the government, but there was only an expression of his own opinion. Nevertheless, I hope the Intercolonial Railway will remain an asset of the Dominion government and under its control; and if the present minister does not do better than he has been doing in its management, when we get into power we will put it on a proper basis.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John city). Coming as I do from one of the maritime provinces, I take, in common with all the inhabitants of that part of Canada, a great interest in the Intercolonial. I do not rise for the purpose of criticising the statement which the minister has made but rather as a friend of the railway, and with the expectation and hope that the government will maintain it as it was at the beginning, the great bond of union between the maritime provinces and the rest of Canada. I think we have a right to demand that in the future. The future of the Intercolonial is a question that is giving the people of this country, and especially of the maritime provinces. a good deal of thought. In a few years it is expected that the Grand Trunk Pacific will reach Moncton and then have running rights over the Intercolonial. It has been stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway have made an application for equal rights of user on the Intercolonial between St. John and Halifax, and possibly between St. John and Sydney. I think parliament has a right to a statement from the government in regard to that matter. They have had this application before them long enough now to know what their mind is about it. I think parliament is entitled this evening to a statement as to the intention of the government with regard to this application of the Canadian Pacific Railway for free and equal rights of user on the Intercolonial between St. John and Halifax. It was a disappointment to me, and I think it will be a disappointment especially to the people of the maritime provinces, to find that the Minister of Railways, after taking so many hours over his budget speech, has given no intimation whatever of his own views or the views of the government with regard to that important matter. So it would appear that the Intercolonial, so far as we can see at present, is likely to fall upon evil times. When the Grand Trunk Pacific gets to Moncton and runs over the Intercolonial, then the only part that would remain would be that part between Moncton and Montreal, and that would become apparently a local railway. We can only guess at what would be the result to the Intercolonial if the Canadian Pacific Railway were granted full running rights, equal rights, on the Intercolonial between St. John and Halifax or between St. John and Sydney. Where then will be any justification for the idea of the government that they will be able to make the Intercolonial a paying affair, or make it show even half the results that it does at present? The thing is absolutely impossible. If the Canadian Pacific Railway are going to come in and do business over the principal part of the Intercolonial on the same terms as the Intercolonial, at one stroke will go at least one half the business of the Intercolonial, that is one half the returns. To allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to run a passenger and mail train through to Halifax or Sydney is one thing, but to grant free and full equal rights of user with the Intercolonial itself, is a thing that, it appears to me, ought not to be done in the interest of the Intercolonial itself.

Mr. FIELDING. Is there a proposal that it should be granted free and equal rights? The hon. gentleman has used the word 'free' twice.

Mr. DANIEL. I did not use the word 'free' in the way of getting it for nothing,

of course. Instead of 'free' I should have said perhaps full and equal rights of user on the Intercolonial between St. John and Halifax or Sydney. I think that only one result could follow a course of that kind, namely, that the Intercolonial could never become a paying concern, or even begin to pay its way, There was another subject that the minister omitted to make reference to that I think we ought to hear something about, and that is the result of the suit which the Department of Railways and Canals brought against the Grand Trunk Railway for non-performance of contract. That is a suit that was up some time ago and I have not seen any result as yet. I do not know what the result of it is but I think parliament has a right to know the outcome of that suit or arbitration and yet the minister has made no reference to it at all. I fully agree with the remarks that the minister has made in regard to the principal official of the railway. In regard to Mr. Butler I believe that the minister has only stated the simple truth when he spoke of Mr. Butler's capacity as a railway man as he did, also in regard to the other principal officials of the railway. I noticed, however, in a paper published in the city of Ottawa, the 'Evening Journal,' I think it was, last month a statement with reference to an inquest that was held at Beaver Brook as the result of an accident on the Intercolonial Railway. I allude to it because of the peculiar verdict which the jury gave. They say that :

> The trainmen were not to blame and that the primary and actual cause of the collision was the loose system practised by the management of the Intercolonial Railway for the protection of working trains and ambiguous style of order sometimes issued to such trains.

There is the statement made by the jury that was called upon to hold an inquest over a man who was killed in that accident and they make a charge of mismanagement against the railway. I think the minister should take a matter of that kind into his consideration, and it may be that perhaps he has, but he has made no statement in regard to the effect of accidents of that kind or whether such accidents would be rendered impossible in the future in so far as they have been the result of the want of good management on the part of the Intercolonial Railway authorities.

In regard to the financial statement which the minister has made I hope that the railway has got the $93,000 of a surplus. I know that there is a great deal in regard to matters of surpluses in the bookkeeping that is done. It is very difficult, indeed, I suppose almost impossible, for any one who is not thoroughly familiar with the actual accounts of the Intercolonial Railway to say just exactly how much of a surplus there is or how much is just a balance due to bookkeeping. There is good ground for the criticism of my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) when he says that this surplus of $93,000 is more apparent than real.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend knows that it was upwards of $377,000 for six months.

Mr. DANIEL. Then, I took the hon. ministers figures down wrong.

Mr. EMMERSON. He was speaking of the previous year. I gave a statement showing that during the first six months the surplus was $377,000 and upwards.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that taking into consideration capital account ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We do not figure up capital account.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because no other railway in Canada does. We do just as the other railways do. Capital is one account and revenue and expenditure is another.

Mr. DANIEL. I must have got the figures down wrong. There were so many figures given that I might perhaps be excused for doing that. There was a large amount of money spent on capital account.

Mr. EMMERSON. That should not affect the surplus as between revenue and expenditure.

Mr. DANIEL. It does not affect the bookkeeping surplus but it does affect the statement which is being laid before the people of the country as to whether the Intercolonial Railway really had the surplus or not, when they know that while there is an apparent surplus claimed there was also a charge against the country of over $3,000,000 during the past year. While it does not make any difference, as some speakers say, in so far as the matter of bookkeeping is concerned, it does make a great deal of difference as to the ideas which the people of the country will have when they know that while there is an apparent surplus of $93,000 there is also a capital expenditure of over $3,000,000 during the same year.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does not my hon. friend know that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway make capital expenditures, and that if they paid these expenditures out of their receipts they would never have dividends ? They borrow the money. They get authority from this parliament to do that and they expend it in the same way as we do when we get money here and expend it on capital account.

Mr. DANIEL. I am quite aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk and all these other railways have capital accounts.

Mr. EMMERSON. Your idea is that we should not have one. They can have it but we cannot ?

Mr. DANIEL. That was the argument advanced by one of the speakers this evening. I have not advanced that argument myself yet, but the statement I was going to make is that while it is true that these large corporations have capital accounts there is some difference of opinion as to the expenditures that should be put to capital account as between the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railways.

Mr. EMMERSON. On the authority of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy we do just as the Canadian Pacific Railway do, and I produced the letter of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy to that effect.

Mr. DANIEL. I have heard the minister make that statement before, but as far as I followed him and followed the expenditures he gave as being made on the Intercolonial Railway and charged to capital account it would not bear out his statement in so far as the letter of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy is concerned.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is none so blind as those who will not see.

Mr. DANIEL. Then I would like the minister to apply that to himself because I think it would fit very well indeed. That is the only difference that I would point out between the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway and that of these other railways. There were other matters mentioned by some of the speakers which I will not go into. I will only refer to the prices at which the Intercolonial Railway purchase various articles which they require. I am quite aware that the Intercolonial Railway buy many things as cheaply and as good as any one else does but in some instances we are told that is not the case. The purchase of land at Moncton from Mr. Matthew Lodge is an instance of where the Intercolonial Railway and consequently the people of this country have paid more for land than they ought to have paid. I would like to call the minister's attention to—I was going to say the excuse—but I will not say that—I will say the reply which he made to the criticism upon that purchase. The minister then stated that this was not as bad as what the Conservatives had done, because they bought land at about $2,000 an acre. He used that argument in reply to the charge from this side of the House, that $8,000 was too large a profit for Mr. Lodge on that small quantity of land. I quote from 'Hansard' of 1906, the statement of the minister:

> In 1884, the Intercolonial Railway purchased right adjacent to this property, half an acre from Mr. Milner, and how much did the Intercolonial Railway pay for that? $1,000 for half an acre.

Again he said in the same speech:

> We were able to purchase this land at $1,000, when in 1884, at a time when my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) would have every confidence in the then administration, the Intercolonial Railway bought 55-100 of an acre and paid $1,000.

Further on in the same speech Mr. Emmerson said:

> Judged by the procedure in 1884, when half an acre was purchased by the Intercolonial Railway for $1,000, we in 1904 made a good bargain when we bought at the rate of $1,000 an acre, and not at the rate of $1,000 for half an acre.

The Minister of Finance made the same argument, but no doubt he took his cue from the Minister of Railways and he evidently thought the statement was true. Now, the Minister of Railways should give the country an explanation of this statement of his.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was laid before the committee and the House an abstract of title showing details of this purchase in 1884, and it said that in this transfer of land from Milner to the Intercolonial Railway, there was half an acre purchased by the government for $1,000. Based on that evidence I made the statement on the floor of this House, as cited by my hon. friend. I did not know that the question would come up in this discussion, but I will be prepared to deal with it at a later stage.

Mr. DANIEL. I shall not pursue the matter further now except to state that the land bought in 1884 for $1,000 was six and a half acres and not half an acre.

Mr. EMMERSON. That may be. I only know that the evidence before the committee was that the quantity of land then purchased for $1,000 was a little over half an acre.

Mr. DANIEL. Where did the minister see that statement?

Mr. EMMERSON. When the matter comes up I will be able I think to show it.

Mr. DANIEL. I suppose some one is responsible for leaving out the six acres.

Mr. EMMERSON. My information was obtained from the papers on file in the department, and which were there long before the question came up in committee.

Mr. DANIEL. As the matter will come up again, I shall leave it for the present, but I think it demands an explanation from the minister who let it go forth to the country that the Conservative government bought land in 1884 for $2,000 an acre, while the present government were able to buy it for about half of that amount. Of course that statement is not right, and the minister should set it straight. Now one reason for the better financial showing of the Intercolonial Railway for this year was the absence of the expenditure for the removal of snow which the previous year amounted to $600,000, and which of course

had it been incurred this year would have wiped out the surplus.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was in 1905 when there was a deficit of $1,700,000 and part of that was due to the expenditure of $600,000 for snow removal. In the year 1906 in which there was a surplus of $100,000 there was no unusual expenditure for snow removal. In the current year, in which there is a surplus for the first six months of over $377,000 the snow question is not a factor.

Mr. DANIEL. Until recently this has been an exceptionally favourable winter for the Intercolonial Railway in the matter of snow blockades. I do not know what orders the management of the Intercolonial Railway give as to the removal of snow, but I do know that quite recently the Halifax train was ten hours late, and so far as I know there was no attempt made to keep the track clear with snow ploughs between St. John and Moncton, or Salisbury. Although that storm was very severe, and was about central over the city of St. John and extended away off to the westward as well as to the eastward, the Canadian Pacific Railway train which left St. John reached Montreal on regular schedule time. It showed a difference in the management of the two railways in regard to looking after the snow on the tracks which was not favourable to the Intercolonial. The freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway have been raised; but I have noticed, by a return that has been brought down, that they are apparently raised everywhere except between Levis and Montreal, where at nearly half the stations they are lowered. That struck me as being very peculiar.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can very easily explain it. When the Drummond County road was taken over, it was subject to certain rates, which were higher than the rates on other portions of the Intercolonial; and in the readjustment they were made uniform.

Mr. DANIEL. Of course, I accept the minister's statement. Not having the knowledge which I presume he has in regard to that matter, I could only take the rates as given in this return, where I found this anomaly, that while the rates were being raised everywhere in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, they were being lowered on that part of the line between Levis and Montreal. As the various interests connected with the Intercolonial will come up again, I will not detain the House at any greater length at this time; but I would like to impress on the minister that in dealing with the Intercolonial he is dealing with an interest which is very warm in the hearts of the people of the maritime provinces, and that I do not think they will forgive him or any government that does anything to destroy the influence, the power, and the strength of the Intercolonial. I would have been glad to have heard statements from the minister with regard to the immediate future of the Intercolonial; which I have no doubt he could make if he wished to do so; but he has not done so, and we must remain content without them for the present.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, we have very often heard statements with regard to the Intercolonial Railway similar to what the hon. minister has given us to-day; but we have never yet heard from him an answer to the criticism from this side of the House with regard to his method of keeping the books, or with regard to the question of capital account and ordinary expenditure. My hon. friend to-night, in answer to an interruption of mine, repeated that that should not be taken into consideration. I do not understand why, if you spend $25,000,000 in ten years on capital account, you should not take that into consideration when making a statement of the difference between the receipts and the expenditures of the road. I was more than astonished at the statement of the minister that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company keep their books in the same way. I differ with him as to that, because I feel sure that these railway companies keep their books in a businesslike way. When the hon. minister next speaks on the subject, I hope he will answer that criticism in a thorough way. My impression is that the Intercolonial has for a long time been run too much on political lines. Some time ago we heard of ties that were bought without tender in such quantities that they would last for five or six years. With such a useless expenditure as that, it is no wonder that the Intercolonial has deficits in the proper sense of the word. But I want to call my hon. friend's attention to something with which I am more familiar. Why should we have spent last year on our canals $600,000 more than we did in 1896? The Beauharnois canal in 1896 cost $32,651.49, while last year it cost $27,932.62, a difference of less than $5,000, although in 1896 there were five men at every lock on that canal, while last year there were only two, a total of 45 men in the one case and 18 in the other.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will tell my hon. friend from memory that the average annual cost of the maintenance of the Beauharnois canal is $20,000.

Mr. BERGERON. We will not discuss that. The figures I have stated were given by the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) who said he had taken them from the blue-books. I know that there has been no work of any extent on that canal for three or four years, and the hon. minister does not give any reason why the expenditure has not been more reduced.

Mr. EMMERSON. We increased the wages.

Mr. BERGERON. Not enough for that. Some time ago I asked a question in the House about an investigation which had taken place there. Last summer, a man employed as foreman on the canal was using on his farm during the week the men who were paid by the government to work on the canal. I do not suppose my hon. friend will sanction anything like that. There was an investigation into the matter, because one of the employees who thought that was wrong said so, and threatened to report the foreman to the department. The foreman was a good Liberal, and the other man was also; but the matter became public. The superintendent of the canal suspended the man who had threatened to report the foreman, and it took the whole summer to find out who was guilty and who was not. A commission was appointed to hold an investigation, and of course will be paid. There were also criminal proceedings taken. The men called each other liars and other sweet things, and the matter came before the Criminal Court sitting at Valleyfield about three weeks ago. There were four cases before the court and three Crown prosecutors, and the proceedings lasted about a month. When the case of the man I refer to came on there was a nolle prosequi entered, and the case was dropped. I intend to speak of this matter later on. In the meantime, I would like the minister to show why the expenses of that canal, which was used by only two or three boats last year, are not more than $5,000 less to-day than they were in 1896, when it was largely used for purposes of navigation.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are nearly $15,000 less.

Mr. BERGERON. This is only an instance but there are many others. However I do not want to detain the House longer. But this sum of $600,000 more this year spent on our canals is entirely out of proportion and should be looked into. I am confident my hon. friend wants to do for the best and is really a good trustee of the public money, and I call his attention to this so that when he next makes an eloquent speech like the one we have heard to-night, he may be in a position to reply to those remarks.

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

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. The resolution respecting subsidies to the provinces is to come up on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 25, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ST. MARY'S BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. MACPHERSON moved: That Bill (No. 131) respecting the St. Mary's River Bridge Company be placed on the order paper for second reading at the next sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 137) to amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—Mr. Macpherson.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES.

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 139) respecting a Department of Mines. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of creating a Department of Mines to be administered by a member of the government to be named by an order in council. It is intended to include in the department the mines branch now in the Department of the Interior, and the geological survey at present administered by the Minister of Inland Revenue. The duties to be assigned to the new department will include all questions affecting the mining industry of Canada over which this parliament has jurisdiction.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORT OF THE INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The Senate has passed an address calling for certain papers, being part of the exhibits in connection with the Insurance Report. As these papers are in the custody of the House of Commons, they can only be sent to the Senate by consent of this House. I therefore move:

That papers referred to as exhibits Nos. 682, 686, 688, 737, 738, 740 and 741, in sessional papers be transferred to the Senate.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would ask my hon. friend whether it would not be wise to have copies made of them and sent to the Senate; or if the originals are to be sent to the Senate by courtesy, that copies be left with the records branch of our own House—because they are of such a nature that we may require them at any time.

Mr. FIELDING. The clerk of the House will keep a copy of them for the conve-

nience of this House, while the originals are transferred to the Senate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is in his place. He gave notice some time ago that he proposed to-morrow to bring up a certain matter, which has already been discussed. In so far as I could learn, he did not intimate in what way it was to be brought up. Would it be too much to ask the hon. gentleman if he proposes to bring it up by way of privilege or by way of resolution, and if the latter, what would be the nature of his resolution ? I simply ask this for the information of the House.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). As I stated when I gave notice, I had an understanding with the Prime Minister and with the leader of the opposition that I would bring up the matter on Tuesday next ; and I think I stated, however, I state now, that I will bring it up before going into supply, on the expectation that there will be a motion to go into supply immediately after the Orders of the Day. I may say that I have not yet worded the motion that I intend to present, so I could not give to my hon. friend the exact terms of the motion. But I may say that as the Prime Minister stated the last time this question was up that he did not see that the commission had made a charge against any member of the House, I intend quoting from the Report of the Insurance Commission that portion which refers to the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on account of the attacks that have been made repeatedly against him by the press of the country, and the references that have been made in this House, in order that the question may be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman cannot yet inform the House as to the nature of his resolution ?

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I really could not, because I have not yet decided its final terms.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid it is a leap in the dark.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I have indicated my intention clearly. My motion will tend to ask the House to decide upon the necessity of clearing up the insinuations that have been made, either against the hon. gentleman himself, or against the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Fowler), or the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), or the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Lefurgey), as well as the retort by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler).

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would not a motion of this kind, even if it were brought up in connection with the question of going into supply be a motion of privilege at any period in the debate?

COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether or not there is any foundation for the rumour that he does not propose to attend the conference between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Prime Ministers of the different colonies?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, in view of the slow progress which has been made by the House, I certainly have contemplated the possibility of my being forced to cancel my trip. I would not like to do so, but I must say that the matter is under consideration now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In that case I would ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the importance of Canada being represented at that conference. I think it is a subject that ought to engage the attention of the House at once. I therefore beg leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the following matter :

The urgent public importance that Canada shall be represented by the Prime Minister at the approaching conference between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the prime ministers of the self-governing colonies.

Mr. SPEAKER. Has the hon. member the leave of the House?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The resolution of the conference of 1902 in regard to future conferences is very plain as to their scope and as to the persons who are to compose them. It is as follows:

That it would be of advantage to the empire if conferences were held as far as practicable, at intervals not exceeding four years, at which questions of common interest affecting the relation of the mother country and His Majesty's Dominions over the seas, could be discussed and considered as between the Secretary of State for the colonies and the prime ministers of the self-governing colonies. The Secretary of State for the Colonies is requested to arrange for such conferences after communication with the prime ministers of the respective colonies in case of any emergency arising upon which a special conference shall have been deemed necessary, the next ordinary conference to be held not sooner than three years thereafter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The members of the House will pardon me if I do not raise my voice unnecessarily as I should not have attempted to speak to-day except that I regard this matter as of the most urgent

possible moment. Canada must either be represented by her Prime Minister at that conference or she cannot be represented at all. That is made perfectly clear by the terms of the resolution which I have just read. That resolution was passed unanimously. The Prime Minister of Canada representing Canada in that behalf was a party to that resolution. There is, therefore, no doubt that this country has been thoroughly committed to the position that these conferences should be held every four years, and that each self-governing Dominion of His Majesty should be represented at these conferences of the Prime Ministers.

The return which has been brought down emphasizes that necessity. I do not intend to comment at the present time, because we have arranged that for Wednesday next, upon any matter of policy or any subject of discussion which might be brought up at that conference. The only point which I propose to touch is the importance that Canada should not be unrepresented on the 15th of April, when that conference opens. This government, on July 20, 1906, passed an order in council, and they passed another order in council on October 17 of the same year in regard to the approaching conference. The only subject which has been brought to the attention of the home government by the government of Canada has been in relation to the constitution of the conference because we have all observed that although Australia, New Zealand, Cape Colony and Natal, I think, have proposed subjects for discussion, no subject has been suggested by this country. However, that will be a matter for comment later on. In the order in council of July 20, 1906, we find the following:

The right Honourable the Prime Minister observes, with, reference to the said despatch, that April 15 usually falls within the session of the Canadian parliament. A change has just been made in the Canadian fiscal year, the effect of which upon the disposal of parliamentary business has yet to be ascertained. It is contemplated that parliament shall meet in November, and that an adjournment for some time shall take place before Christmas. Very important business will engage the attention of parliament at the coming session, and it is not unlikely that the session will continue up to and beyond April 15.

And further on:

The Prime Minister further observes that the attention of the right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies should be called to the form of invitation hitherto extended to the several colonial governments which have been invited to participate in these conferences. Such invitation has been extended to the prime ministers only.

It could not be extended to any other minister in view of the resolution passed unanimously at the Colonial Conference of 1902. Then it continues:

Experience has shown that, having regard to the wide range of subjects which are considered at the conference, the prime ministers of the larger colonies are unwilling to assume the responsibility of dealing with such questions without the assistance of some of their colleagues. Practically, therefore, the conference becomes not one of prime ministers, but one of ministers representing the various colonial governments. If it be deemed expedient, for the reasons above stated, that ministers, other than the prime ministers of any colony should be present, it seems to be desirable that their position in the conference should be recognized, and that they should be included in the invitation extended by His Majesty's government. The Prime Minister, therefore, suggests that the object of His Majesty's government in calling the conference would be better attained if the conference were declared to be a conference of ministers and the invitation expressed in such form as would admit of the attendance of any ministers who might be accredited by any of the governments concerned.

To that the Secretary of State for the Colonies (Lord Elgin) made answer on August 11, 1906:

As regards the second point——

That is the point to which I have just alluded.

—I think that in the case of the larger colonies there is a distinct advantage in securing the attendance on special occasions of other ministers in addition to the Prime Minister, notably the Minister of Defence or the minister in charge of commercial affairs. This arrangement was in fact made at the conference of 1902, and on the same principle other ministers of the Imperial Government beside the Secretary of State for the Colonies have been present at meetings of past conferences, when matters affecting their departments were under consideration.

It does not, however, appear to be necessary to make any alteration in the general constitution of the conference. Any minister whose attendance seems desirable to the prime ministers of the larger colonies could, as before, accompany them and could attend the conference when subjects with which they are specially concerned are to be discussed. In such cases ministers would, of course, be the guests of His Majesty's government.

This government was not satisfied with that answer, and they passed a further order in council on October 17, 1906, the important part of which is as follows:

As to the conditions under which colonial ministers, other than prime ministers, may attend the conference the committee are of opinion that further representations should be made to His Majesty's government. The intimation that such ministers may 'attend the conference when the subjects with which they are specially concerned are to be discussed,' does not, in the opinion of the committee, meet the point raised by the Canadian government in the minute of July 20.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies refers to the arrangements respecting the attendance of such ministers at the conference of 1902, and assumes that they were unobjection-

able. The committee have to remark that although it was not deemed necessary at the time to place on record any formal protest against them, the arrangements in question were far from satisfactory. The colonial ministers other than the prime ministers were received only by the courtesy of the conference, and not without objection having been taken to what was regarded by some as a departure from the basis on which the conference had been organized. It seems desirable, therefore, that for the avoidance of misunderstanding hereafter the position of such ministers should be properly defined in advance.

Further on :

If the objects of the conference will be advanced by the presence of such ministers they should only be expected to attend with a recognized status which will be consistent with their position as responsible ministers in their respective colonies.

The committee therefore suggest that furthe representations be made to His Majesty's government expressing the hope that the conference may be treated as one of colonial ministers, the government of each colony being free to send such of their members as they may be pleased to select to represent the colony at the conference, and such representatives to be deemed members of the conference in the fullest sense, with the understanding, however, that in any matters which may be determined by vote each colony shall have one vote only.

It would almost seem from the persistence with which this attitude was put forward by the Canadian government in face of the unanimous decision of the conference, that even so far back as that time the Prime Minister had in contemplation that he would not attend this conference and desired to have some minister appointed to attend in his place. However that may be, the government have already answered themselves, as I will point out, because when Mr. Lyttelton in a previous despatch, in the year 1905, had suggested that the name of the conference should be changed from 'The Colonial Conference' to 'The Imperial Council,' the Canadian government answered him, and properly answered him, that that was a matter with which the conference must itself deal, and that it would not be proper, except at that conference, to make any such change. Well, that is practically the answer that Lord Elgin gave on the 27th of November, and which is to be found at page 19 of the return to which I have alluded. It is a despatch from Lord Elgin, the Secretary for the Colonies, to Lord Grey, the Governor General of Canada, and the important part of the communication is as follows :

I have given the views of your ministers my full consideration, but I regret to say that I do not see my way to concur in their proposal. That proposal appears to me to raise difficulties which can only be satisfactorily settled by discussion at the conference itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN

The essential factor in the consideration of this matter seems to me to be, that the proposal of your ministers would involve a change in the constitution of the conference. The conference of 1897 was composed of Prime Ministers, and the resolution of the conference of 1902, in terms of which the present conference has been convened, states : That it would be to the advantage of the empire if the conference were held, as far as practicable, at intervals not exceeding four years, at which questions of common interest affecting the relations of the mother country and His Majesty's dominions over the seas could be discussed and considered as between the Secretary of State and the Prime Ministers of the self-governing colonies. The Secretary of State for the Colonies is requested to arrange for such conferences after communication with the Prime Ministers of the respective colonies. The effect of this resolution, which was passed unanimously, is to reaffirm the principle that the Prime Ministers of the colonies alone are members of the conference. In dealing with the other suggested alterations in the constitution of the conference His Majesty's government have held that the conference itself must consider and determine whether changes are to be made, and it would not be possible, without inconsistency, to depart from that principle in the present instance.

I need hardly say that nothing derogatory to the position of colonial ministers (other than Prime Ministers) was implied at the last conference, or would be implied at any future one, by the fact that they only participate in discussions on subjects with which they are especially concerned. The representatives of the Indian Office and of other departments of His Majesty's government attend on a similar footing. But the arrangement was one which the conference treated as essentially a matter which it was competent to decide, and the Secretary of State as chairman ruled that an alteration could not be made unless there was a unanimous feeling in its favour. It does not seem practicable under these circumstances to adjust by correspondence alterations in procedure even if time now permitted. The proposal of your ministers might well raise questions on such important points as the effect on the duration of the debates, or of the sittings of the conference by a material increase in its members—and the relative advantage to be derived by colonies within easy reach of this country and those which are more distant.

Now, I have already alluded to the fact that Canada has not suggested any subjects for discussion, and it would seem to me a most deplorable outcome that this country, the premier over-seas dominion of the empire, and within easy reach of the mother country, should not be represented at that conference, while distant dominions such as the Commonwealth of Australia, New Zealand and Cape Colony should be represented, although the journey from these countries occupies twice or in some cases thrice as long as does the journey from Canada to London. I would regret it as a most deplorable incident if Canada were not represented. It would in fact re-

sult in practically nullifying the work of the conference and in absolutely diminishing its usefulness to the vanishing point.

I have said that the opposition were and are willing to facilitate the attendance of the Prime Minister at that conference; I think they have shown it; I am willing to discuss that if it should be necessary. But I now say to the Prime Minister that if he cannot so regulate his domestic affairs amongst his friends opposite as to enable him to leave the remaining business of the House in charge of one of his responsible colleagues, we are willing on this side of the House to adjourn from Wednesday next for such length of time as may be necessary to enable the Prime Minister to attend that conference so that Canada may be represented there. No doubt that would cause a great many of us inconvenience, but it seems to me the inconvenience should not weigh as any thing in comparison with the paramount necessity that this great Dominion of the empire should be represented by its Prime Minister at the conference. I am prepared to go that far, or I am prepared to make any other reasonable arrangement with the Prime Minister and with the government in that connection. Having said this much, I think I have said all that is necessary for the present, and I therefore conclude by moving that the House do now adjourn.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would not have had a word of criticism to offer on the remarks of my hon. friend had they all been couched in the same language as those in the latter part of his address. But the insinuations which my hon. friend, for reasons which are unknown to me, chose to make when he said that his opinion was, that even when I was sitting in that conference in 1902 in London, I had in contemplation not to attend this present conference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It would appear to me that the hon. gentleman said something very like it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said that the orders in council of the 20th July and the 17th October seemed to me to afford some evidence that the Prime Minister expected, or hoped, that Canada should be represented at this conference by some person other than himself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Even that much, Sir, there was no justification for such an insinuation. The observations which the hon. gentleman has founded on these despatches have simply shown this, that as it is my lot at this moment to be Prime Minister of Canada, I am prepared to take my share of the work, whether it be in Ottawa or in London; but whether my work be in Ottawa or in London, I am anxious to have the co-operation of the colleagues who assist me in this work. The despatches which my hon. friend has just quoted do not go any further than to show that my anxiety was not to go to London alone, but to have the assistance of my colleagues in the work to be done there. There are important questions to be discussed at that conference. The agenda which has been published shows what they are. Amongst others, there is the trade question, in which we take a deep and vital interest; and whenever it is my duty to discuss this and connected questions, I would like to have the assistance of my colleagues who have done so much to make the tariff of Canada what it is at the present time, and to bring the trade question up to the standard which it has reached in this country and in the British Empire at large. My hon. friend ought not to be surprised at my anxiety between the duties which call me to London and the duties which detain me at Ottawa at the same moment. I may say that during the last few days I have been under great anxiety on this question, not knowing whether my duties would keep me here or call me away. Up to the present time I may say I have not made up my mind. I have thought that it might be possible for me to postpone for a time my departure from Ottawa. The conference is called and must take place; but everybody knows that the first sittings will not be as important as the later sittings. There are always in such cases certain formalities before the actual business begins. It takes some time to organize and prepare for the work of the conference, so that my attendance on the 15th would not be as important as it would be later on. But I would be only too glad to welcome a proposal to facilitate the business of the House in order to afford me the opportunity to fulfil the duty appertaining to the position which I am entrusted with; and if hon. gentlemen opposite will carry out the suggestion, I do not think there will be any necessity of adjourning the sittings of the House. If hon. gentlemen opposite will put a reasonable restraint upon their flow of eloquence, so that we can confine ourselves to a discussion of the questions before the House, I think it will be possible for me to sail on the 5th of next month, leaving some of my colleagues here till the business of the House is completed. At the same time, I would impress on my hon. friend that it is most important that I should be accompanied on this mission with which the Canadian people have entrusted me, with those of my colleagues who are to work out with me the problems we may have to discuss at the conference; and therefore, since my hon. friend has been good enough to say that the opposition will facilitate the business of the session, I conclude that he will do so with reference not only to my own de-

parture, but the departure of the friends and colleagues whose attendance with me is of the utmost importance to Canadian interests.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my mite of persuasion to the Prime Minister to altogether reconsider his half-formed if not wholly formed determination, of which he advised us in his answer to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and to see whether or not, by the kindly co-operation of gentlemen on this side of the House, and maybe the enforced diligence of members of his own side, and maybe a little mild curbing of the floods of eloquence which occasionally burst forth in tremendous torrents from his own supporters, we might, by all these efforts combined, be able to facilitate the departure of the First Minister on the 5th of next month. It is all very well to say that it is not absolutely important that the Prime Minister representing Canada should be present at the opening of the conference, because the opening period is a period of organization. That is the strength of our position and the weakness of the position first taken by my right hon. friend. It is absolutely impossible that the question of defence or the question of preferential trade, for instance, two very important questions which may be brought up, the latter particularly, shall become burning questions for discussion during the first few days of the conference. But there are other important questions to be brought up by the other members of the conference, the agenda which has been referred to being a very long and very important one. And it is very important for two reasons—first, that if you take out of the opening and organizing period the presence of the representative of the premier colony, in that conference of the colonies, you take out a great deal of the enthusiasm, the incitement, and the strong good feeling which ought to exist. My right hon. friend will thoroughly agree with me in that. The absence of an important or predominating partner in a conference of that kind at the early and organizing period has a very injurious effect upon the spirit and the operation of the conference itself. So that I think my right hon. friend will find that if there is any period when it is necessary for him especially to be there, it is at the opening. Afterwards his ministers can one by one find their way over. Here are their officers, and all the information which it is possible to get, and which can be gotten nowhere better than in Ottawa, can be in process of preparation, as it has been probably before this, and can be completed and got ready for them when they find it possible to leave. Really, what is it that keeps the Prime Minister here? The important policy business, if there has been any policy business this session, is almost or altogether completed. We have gone through the tariff, and we shall discuss and probably dispose of two important subjects this week. The legislation which was promised by the government has been brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) looks very lazy as he contemplates me now, satisfied no doubt that his pièce de resistance has been got rid of. The only big thing which remains, and for which no tears will be shed by some members on the other side as well as members on this, if it does not get through all its stages this year, is the huge Bill, involving altogether new and strange principles, introduced by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). In my parliamentary experience I have seen case after case of Bills just as big introduced just as late in the session, quietly laid on the shelf to dry and mature and possibly become improved in the process of maturing; and I am quite sure it is not impossible that this ponderous piece of legislation may be left to simmer during the recess, to be taken up again at the opening of next session. With all these things in his favour, with all these vexed questions out of the way, with a council which is in the closest harmony—each member of it with the other and all with himself—with a party absolutely undivided when it comes to certain questions, whatever divisions there may be on others, with a majority of eighty at his back—what is there to prevent my right hon. friend from going to the other side on the 5th of April and taking his proper place in the conference which is to be held there? There is nothing of sufficiently vital importance in the present stage of legislative work or the questions before us, that appears on the surface, to prevent him from going; and if it will do him any good I promise that for my part—and probably some others might promise on this side for their part—if the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) cuts up too rusty in the rear of the government benches, we will bring as much gentle persuasion as possible on that hon. gentleman to induce him to stay his hand until the summer holidays are passed and a new session begins in November, when he can, with renewed vigour, resume the roll he plays so well. Therefore I add my persuasion to that of my hon. friend in the hope that our joint efforts together with all the other circumstances, will induce my right hon. friend to by no means throw the coming conference into confusion, and possibly contribute to its ultimate disintegration, by his absence from it as the representative of Canada. I think I would be perfectly warranted in saying that this conference is to take place, as defined in the invitation, largely because Canada, under the leadership of her governments and the government of my right hon. friend, has made it possible for the idea of an imperial conference to develop step by step until it assumes the form it has taken to-day. My right hon. friend cannot say, and the people of this country will not admit, that there are not

common interests between Canada and the sister colonies, and between these colonies and Great Britain herself so important and far reaching as to make it a matter of indifference that one of the premier colonies should be absent from a conference convened, by their own consent and under their own direction, for discussing their common interests. I earnestly hope therefore that the 5th April will see my right hon. friend sailing with favourable breezes and sunny atmosphere out of one of our good Canadian ports, in one of our good Canadian steamers, bound for the old world, to take his part in a conference of the colonies of the empire, consulting together in order that the common interests of this great aggregation of people may be strengthened and improved.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). I could hardly resist the most tender appeal made to me by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). But with all due respect to his patriotic views and his affectionate desire that the first minister should leave his country and parliament be prorogued as soon as possible, I cannot altogether agree with him on the necessity of closing this House in order to enable the right hon. gentleman to leave the week after Easter. It is all very well to say that Canada should be represented in any conference which may be organized in London for the purpose of bringing together the representatives of the various parts of the empire. With that idea I have always agreed most heartily. Of course I did not agree, and still disagree, with the idea propounded by the late Colonial Minister (Mr. Lyttelton) in his letter of invitation addressed to the Canadian as well as the other colonial governments. But fortunately for Canada and the empire at large, there has been a change in England. The common sense of the people has gained control, and no doubt the present conference will be held on the sound basis of good old British policy which has heretofore existed. But just because of that change, I fail to see that there is such imperative necessity for our Prime Minister to be there on the 15th of April, if at all. In 1902 the right hon. gentleman very properly opposed the idea of putting these conferences on a basis of perpetuity or on a regular basis, giving them the form of a regular institution within the empire. What he agreed to—and in that I think he has the support of the large majority of the people of Canada—is that whenever the occasion should arise for the representatives of the various colonies in the empire to meet in London or elsewhere, such conferences should be held.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A period of four years was fixed by the resolution.

Mr. BOURASSA. Quite so, but it is easy to see by the context of the discussion that although a date was adopted at the time, the idea of putting it on a regular basis was not approved of. When Canada accepted the invitation of Her Majesty's government in 1902, her representatives said positively that the only question which, in their opinion, could be discussed with advantage by the representatives of the various colonies, was the question of reciprocal trade within the empire. In reply to the invitation sent them this year, the government of Canada stated that they had no suggestion to make and no programme to bring before the conference. Therefore I taken it for granted that the position taken by the Canadian government in 1902 is still the position now held and which will be held during the coming conference. Therefore the only question then on which the Canadian government have given notice, both to the British government and to the Canadian people, that they were ready to meet the other colonies in conference is the question of trade. I take it for granted that the Canadian representatives have no mandate to agree upon any change in the constitution of the empire or the relations between Canada and the empire regarding either imperial defence or the imperial council itself. There is nothing to warrant the First Minister or any of his colleagues in taking any other position, as far as imperial defence and imperial council is concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be regarded as a matter of some importance that the Prime Minister should be present to consider any matters submitted from Australia or New Zealand or any other colonies ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, but to what end ? And on this point I want to make myself clear. So far as defence is concerned, so far as the constitution of an imperial council is concerned, both in the official correspondence and in the attitude taken by the Canadian government during the conference in 1902, the Canadian people have received the assurance that the Canadian representatives would not consent to any change in the political status of the empire or to any change in the military organization of the empire.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) kindly point out what authority the Canadian ministers would have for making any such change—adopting any such resolution ?

Mr. BOURASSA. That is what I say—they have no authority to make any change.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Are they seeking such——

Mr. BOURASSA. No, that is not what I am saying. What I say is that they have no right to go there, and presume the enactment of parliament and contrary to what appears in the correspondence, to take a contrary attitude to that which they took in 1902. With regard to trade matters, the Canadian representatives defined their

position quite clearly, at the last conference in a memorandum, which, was, if I am not mistaken, prepared by the Minister of Finance with the concurrence of his colleagues. He stated then that the Canadian government were prepared to act on the line of reciprocal arrangements somewhat further by increasing the preference granted to British goods, if the British people and government were prepared to give a preference to Canada ; otherwise, said perhaps not in these terms—but in effect—the Canadian government and parliament will hold themselves free to reconsider their position with regard to the preference.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has spoken of the necessity of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) being there at the opening of the conference in order to take advantage of the enthusiasm that may exist. I think we may count upon the wise action of the present British government to prevent any enthusiasm which might carry the representatives of the various colonies beyond the lines of sound policy which should govern the relation of Great Britain and the other parts of the empire. I think we can safely rely upon the representatives of the Campbell-Bannerman government in that conference to prevent that kind of enthusiasm, and therefore, I think it is not exactly necessary that the Prime Minister should be there to take advantage of such enthusiasm.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He should be there to restrain it, should he not ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not think there would be any necessity for that either. I think that the British Liberals will settle it this time, and that no colonial, either a Liberal or a Conservative, will find himself urgently called upon to play the role of a jingo-imperialist at that conference.

Now, there is something more. If you read carefully the correspondence which has been laid before parliament, you will find, first, as I have stated, that the Canadian government have replied that they have no suggestion to make, no programme to offer, nor any subject to propose for discussion ; second that they ask for permission to give a certain standing in the conference to other ministers besides the premier. Upon the latter point, they were given the cold shoulder. Later they stated that the Canadian parliament would be likely to be in session in April and asked if the date of the conference could not be changed to a later time. On that also they were given the cold shoulder. I am not stating this as a reproach to the British government, but as showing that the British government—very sensibly—are not anxious to have such great changes made in the constitution of the empire, nor anxious that all the prime ministers of the colonies should be there in order to adopt momentous resolutions with regard to the policy of the empire. My deep conviction is that the present government in England have continued the invitation issued by the late government because it was issued, and because they did not want—and again very sensibly—to be accused of discourtesy towards the colonies. But the work that the colonial ministers will have to do during that conference is not of such importance that the Prime Minister of Canada should be forced to leave his duties as Prime Minister of Canada, forced to abandon the leadership of the Canadian parliament ; for, the first duty of the Prime Minister is to the parliament of Canada and the first duty of the parliament of Canada is to look after the interests of the people of Canada, to make wise laws for Canada and take good care of the money of the Canadian people. And all this shows very clearly one of the inconveniences of the system which has been propounded, and justifies the attitude, the rather reluctant attitude, taken by the representatives of Canada at the last conference with regard to such colonial conferences as have been proposed. The idea of a colonial conference, I agree, is an excellent one—that the representatives of the the colonies should meet in London once in a while, when need arises, in order to discuss in the most friendly way among themselves and with the representatives of the British government all questions of common interest. This, I say, is an excellent idea. But to give this conference in any way the status of a parliament, to give it priority over the parliaments of the several self-governing parts of the empire, is an idea, against which I, for one, protest. And when the Canadian parliament is sitting, unless the session is about to close, when it is a mere question of a few days, and there is nothing of importance to be dealt with, in fact, unless the Prime Minister can abandon parliament to go to the conference as he would abandon it to go off on any important business in Canada, I claim that the duty of the Prime Minister of Canada, as the duty of the Prime Minister of Australia or any other colony, would be to reply to the British ministry that the first claim upon him is that of the parliament of which he is the head, and not of the empire at large. I agree with the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) when he says : 'Canada first, and the empire after.' The Prime Minister has no right to abandon this parliament at a stage when the security of the institutions of Canada might be at stake.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that there are no other important matters to come before the House. It may be that there are no other matters of importance in the opinion of the hon. gentleman. But in the opinion of the great majority of the

people of Canada, there is one thing of the deepest importance to be settled, and that is the question of the honour of the parliament of Canada itself. There are many members of parliament to-day whose honour is under suspicion. I am not going to enter now upon that subject, because it is the one that I am to discuss tomorrow. But it is far more important than the voting of money or the passing of laws, and parliament should not progrogue before the honour of every member of this House has been vindicated. The Prime Minister has no right to go to London while members of this parliament, including ministers and ex-ministers stand under suspicion of having violated the independence of parliament or of being unworthy to be representatives of the people of Canada. These are the accusations that have been made broadcast in the press of this country. Echoes of these accusations have found their way into this parliament; and I say that this parliament cannot prorogue, and the Prime Minister cannot leave, until the honour of parliament and the honour of the people whom it represents has been redeemed.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I heartily concur in the statement made by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that the first duty of the Prime Minister of this parliament is to this parliament and to this Dominion. But one may make that statement, I am sure, without in any way departing from a sense of the obligation which Canada assumes as a part of the great empire to which we are all proud to belong. So, while I concur with my hon. friend that the Prime Minister must give his first thought and consideration to the duties that rest upon him as Prime Minister, it is nevertheless most desirable—and on this point I differ from my hon. friend from Labelle—and it is not only desirable, but most important, that the Prime Minister should be present at a very early stage of the great conference, and if possible at the very opening stage of it.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to do me justice. He is not differing with me on that point; I agree that it is most desirable that the Prime Minister should be there, if his duty does not keep him here.

Mr. FIELDING. There are duties to Canada which can best be performed in Canada, and chiefly in the parliament of Canada; but there are also duties to Canada which can be performed in other parts of the world, and notably in the capital of the empire. So, I am glad to know that my hon. friend from Labelle does not differ with me in that respect, but agrees that it is very desirable that the Prime Minister should be present at this conference, and present, if possible, at its opening session. I regard this as important, not because Canada has any great proposal of her own to present, not because Canada has any grievance of her own to present. We are in the happy position of being contented with our lot as part of the British empire. We have practically no grievance, and therefore we have not even asked the conference to place on its paper any special subject as to which we desire to make representations. Some of our sister colonies have presented subjects, subjects which interest them, and subjects which are of interest to every portion of the British empire. But whether we are able or not to agree with our brethren from the sisters colonies as to the merits of these proposals, we can all agree surely that if these subjects are to be discussed in a colonial conference, in a conference which is gradually growing in importance, even though we do not ourselves present any subjects for discussion, it is desirable that representatives of Canada, and above all that the Prime Minister of Canada, should be present in order that he may confer with his brethren from the other colonies, and assist them with his judgment and with his wisdom, and at all events, that he should be able to place on record the views which Canada may entertain as respects these various subjects. In this view I regard it as very desirable and very important that the Prime Minister should be present.

So far as the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite are made with the purpose of facilitating his departure, I join in welcoming those statements very sincerely. I do not think there is any reason to complain as to the progress of what I may call the business proper of the House; I do not think there is any ground for complaint that there has been what sometimes is called, in parliamentary practice, obstruction. We have had several discussions which some of us think perhaps were unnecessary, and what I might for convenience call the side-shows of politics. But on the ordinary business of the House, as regards the various measures presented, as regards the consideration of the estimates, as regards all the routine business of the House, I frankly say that we have no reason to complain of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. The business of the House has been reasonably facilitated, and I have no reason to doubt it will continue to be facilitated.

We must, however, point out that if perchance Canada should not be represented at the conference—and I trust there is no particular need of that 'if'—but if it should turn out that she were unrepresented, it would only be realizing what we had some ground to fear at the beginning. The colonial conference of 1902 met, I think, in the month of June, which is a convenient period for Canada to be represented. When

it was proposed that the conference of 1907 should meet in April, we pointed out at once that there was a doubt as to whether Canada could conveniently be represented. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has read from the despatch; permit me to read from it again in order to emphasize it. In the minute of the Privy Council of the 20th of June, 1906, it is stated :

The Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister observes, with reference to the said despatch, that the 15th of April usually falls within the session of the Canadian parliament. A change has just been made in the Canada fiscal year, the effect of which upon the disposal of parliamentary business has yet to be ascertained. It is contemplated that parliament should meet in November, and that an adjournment for some time shall take place before Christmas. Very important business will engage the attention of parliament at the coming session, and it is not unlikely that the session will continue up to and beyond April 15. For these reasons the Prime Minister observes that the postponement of the conference for a month would be convenient to the Canadian government, and would probably ensure the attendance upon the conference of Canadian representatives who would be unable to attend if parliament were still in session.

That view was presented to the imperial government, and they replied that the 15th of April, which was chosen, would be convenient to the ministers from the other colonies, and they hoped that Canada would not press for a change. Thereupon Canada recognized the difficulties of the situation and in another despatch containing the minute of council passed in October 17, it is stated :

The Committee of the Privy Council, to whom said despatch was referred, submit that with regard to the date fixed for the conference the committee appreciate the reasons against any change and they can only express a hope that the business of the session of the Canadian parliament may be concluded at a early date enough to permit Canadian representatives to attend the conference.

Now if it were found that the business of the Canadian parliament could not reasonably be concluded in time to permit the representatives of Canada to attend the conference, I do not know that anybody would have any ground to complain. There would be a just cause for regret, every member of this parliament, I am sure, would regret the circumstances which prevented Canada being adequately represented upon that occasion. But it so happens that the date for this colonial conference is fixed at a very inconvenient time, and when we pointed out the inconvenience, and we were told that the convenience of the other colonies would be best suited by taking this date, of course, we had to make the best of the matter, and endeavour to comply with the requirements of the imperial government.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This was put forward something more than a month ago.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it was originally proposed earlier. But my hon. friend will see at once that in anticipating that possibly parliament might still be in session on the 15th of April, we were only anticipating what was reasonable, and what any gentleman familiar with parliamentary practice might have foreseen.

Now with regard to the point as to the status of ministers other than the Prime Minister, I think hon. gentlemen will agree that if these ministers are to be present, it is very desirable their status should be properly defined at the beginning, that there should not be room for any misunderstanding. That was the idea presented by the Canadian government in the several despatches which have been read by the leader of the opposition. The position taken by the British government is, not that we are wrong, but that on the whole it is better that that point should be determined by the conference itself. We thought that perhaps by consultation with the representatives of the various colonial governments the change might have been made by common consent, but the imperial authorities having raised the question that it was one which could be best considered by the conference itself, we have nothing further to say upon it. I can only say in conclusion that I heartily sympathize with every word that has been said in the House as to the desirability of Canada being represented at the conference, and represented by the Prime Minister, not because we have any subject matter to bring forward, not because we have any grievance to present, but because, if these conferences are to be held from time to time, surely it is proper that Canada, the first colony of the empire, should be represented, that she should be represented adequately, and represented above all by the Prime Minister. I trust therefore that on both sides what has been said to-day will help facilitate the transaction of business, not because I think there has been any delay or any obstruction. I hope that we will agree to facilitate business in order that Canada may be represented at the opening of the conference by the right hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). With what the Minister of Finance says I am sure the House will cordially agree. There did seem to be a tinge of disappointment in his feeling owing to the fact that the conference was not appointed at a time to suit the convenience of the Canadian parliament, which it seems to me would have been better left out. We must remember that people cannot always get their own way, but it does not necessarily follow that their own way must be wrong. When the majority of the other colonial dependencies have so much at stake, and their represen-

tatives would have so much further to come than those of Canada, surely Canada ought to be prepared to concede something, and to make an extra effort to meet the convenience of the other colonies. But I rose more particularly to say a word with regard to the observations of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). He seemed to say, as between himself and the Minister of Finance, that there was not much difference. I took down his words as I think correctly, and I understood the member for Labelle to say that he was opposed to any conference except it was of the most formal character, one that might last for a day or two.

Mr. BOURASSA. On the contrary, I said I was in favour of the idea, but I was opposed to the idea of making them permanent institutions.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, if the hon. member is in favour of the idea, how can he be opposed to making them permanent, to holding them periodically ? There seems to be a strange inconsistency in his position. If he is in favour of the principle of holding consultations between the colonies and the empire, how can he be opposed to holding them periodically ? I can only tell the hon. gentleman that if he had been in England at one time in the history of the British empire, and not so very long ago, I am afraid he would have been dubbed as a little Englander.

Mr. BOURASSA. Oh, that is dead.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be dead. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman would like it to be dead.

Mr. BOURASSA. In England I would be regarded as a good British Liberal the same as I am here.

Mr. SPROULE. The whole trend of the hon. gentleman's observations fails to show much to that affect. He says that the first duty of the Prime Minister is here, that his first duty is in the Canadian parliament. He saw no reason why we should have that conference at all or why the Prime Minister should abandon his duty here to take part in it. If the hon. gentleman says there is no reason why the Prime Minister should take part in the conference he is opposed to it. He does not see that the time of the colonial Prime Ministers could be advantageously employed at a consultation in regard to questions which may be of value or interest to the empire and the colonies. Therefore I say that in the most natural sense of the term he would be regarded in many parts of the world as a very small Little Englander. In regard to the importance of that conference the hon. member for Labelle says that no obligation rests upon the Prime Minister to be present. The Prime Minister has been there before. He has expressed a desire with other of his ministers to be present at that conference for the purpose of taking part in discussions in regard to questions with which they might be more intimately acquainted than he is. He has taken part in these conferences before. He has also expressed his willingness to take part in them again. He has expressed his opinion that they are valuable both to the empire and to the colonies, and yet if that be so how is it that the hon. member for Labelle can see no reason why the Prime Minister should be present at that conference or why there is any obligation resting upon him to attend. Governments and nations are built up by evolution and that evolution goes on constantly and perpetually. New questions arise as conditions change that become proper subjects for consultation and advice from time to time, and I do not know of any gathering of representatives of the colonies and the mother country that would be more important for that purpose or more desirable than periodical conferences. They have started well. They have been carried on for a number of years; the principle has been accepted and established not only by the colonial premiers themselves but by the mother country as well, and will it be said, after they have been carried on so long, that the premier colony of the British empire shall abandon these conferences and allow them to die from inanition ? That would be practically what it would mean if the first colony of the empire were unrepresented. It is true that the present government have submitted no question for consideration at that conference, but even though they have not there will be a number of important questions discussed there in which the Dominion government is interested, in which the British empire is interested and in which the representatives of Canada might very well give valuable advice. If that be the case then it becomes important that the Premier of Canada be present and others of his ministers as well for that purpose. Even though no question may be proposed by Canada, even though Canada may be satisfied with her relationship with the mother country at the present time, is it not important that her advice which has been sought by the mother country should be given by the Premier of Canada representing the premier colony of the British empire? I think it is most important and most desirable. I think this is one of the most valuable conferences that has been started and kept up for the last half century in the British empire. It is a move in the right direction and to abandon it to-day would be practically to give it its death blow. If that be the case I can understand how desirable it would be that the Prime Minister should be present and be present at the early stage of the con-

ference as well, because it is at the early stage that the trend will be given to the events which transpire afterwards. Whatever may be the trend of events it will be such as will be initiated from the first and if advice is not given at the first in regard to the nature of the conference it will be very difficult to control it in many respects after the work has gone on for a length of time. For these reasons, in my judgment it is very important, in the interest of the British empire, in the interest of the colonies and in the interest of the continuance of the cordial relations between the sister colonies themselves and between the colonies and the empire, that the premier colony of the British empire should be represented. We have shown not only our desire but our willingness, our inclination and our disposition to help in every possible way that we can to facilitate the aim of the Prime Minister to attend that conference, and I think that the government should bring their best efforts to bear upon the work of the House so that they may also facilitate that aim and so that the premier may be able to carry it out at the proper time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House and the country will be under a debt of gratitude to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) for the proposal which he has made to facilitate the attendance of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at the colonial conference. An interesting episode in connection with this matter is that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has dictated to the Prime Minister what his attitude is to be in the conference, how far he is to proceed along certain lines and how far he is not to proceed along other lines. He waxes very eloquent over the possibility of this conference arrogating to itself the control of the empire at large and undertaking to give to its deliberations the force of law. Now, Sir, let me give the right hon. First Minister a suggestion. Some years ago when the young gentleman, the hon. member for Labelle, was commencing to kick over the traces the First Minister whipped him into line for the time being by appointing him secretary of the commission appointed to deal with questions affecting the relations of Canada and the United States. That nursed the young gentleman along for a certain time, but he has become obstreperous of late. Let me give the right hon. Prime Minister another suggestion. I would suggest that he take him over to England to carry the carpet bag if for no other purpose, or if not to act as secretary; take him over to carry the bundles, and I will give you my word that the young gentleman will be quiet for another couple of sessions or so in the House. Another suggestion that I would make to the right hon. First Minister is this: The House is about to ajourn on Wednesday evening next for some holiday business. I might suggest to the right hon. First Minister that he cancel the motion of which he has given notice and allow the House to sit Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Monday and thus facilitate the business in place of allowing those members from distant provinces to go back to their homes. If that suggestion is adopted the public will be convinced that we are trying to do some business instead of being eager to take holidays. If the Prime Minister has to leave so as to be in England in time for the opening of the conference he can leave behind him some of his colleagues to look after the House. He might leave the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) to give the young men sitting behind him an opportunity of falling in line under that hon. gentleman as the coming leader. Or, in case the Finance Minister has to go, there might be an opportunity for the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) or the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to show his skill as leader. Or we might have a chance to see how the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) would shine in that capacity, or how the ambitious Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) or his right hand man would bear the responsibility of the leadership. I offer the suggestion to the right hon. First Minister that he create some post for the hon. member for Labelle and take him away with him, and in the second place I suggest that he cancel the motion and let the House sit on Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Monday. There are four good days during which the members of this House might be conducting the business of this country and not dawdling around the country and taking holidays like a set of school children.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I make no reproach to my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), that he has a different idea as to the importance of this conference, from that which I entertain. But, I desire to say to him that he evidently has not comprehended the resolution which was passed in 1902. He has spoken as if that resolution provided for the calling of a conference only on special occasions, whereas, it is expressly provided that the conferences shall take place at intervals not exceeding four years. I cannot find anything in the context, to which my hon. friend has referred me, which takes away the force of that statement. Resolutions of previous conferences are recited, and then the following is the only context which is of any importance:

It was the general opinion that it was desirable to take a step in advance of that resolution, and while leaving due latitude for any political exigencies which might render it diffi-

cult for the Prime Ministers to leave their colonies at a date fixed in advance; at the same time to indicate that the conferences should not wait for some special object, but should take place as a rule at fixed periods unless there is some reason to the contrary.

This, declares that the conference shall be held at fixed periods, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) will admit I was right in my concepton of the resolution of 1902. My hon. friend from Labelle, in the warmth of debate, went perhaps a little further than he intended to.

Mr. BOURASSA. So far as this is concerned?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, but when he stated it was not important that the Prime Minister should be at the conference on the 15th of April, or on any day——

Mr. BOURASSA. I did not say it was not important that the Prime Minister should be present at any conference, but I did say that in view of the position of this government and of the present British government towards the present conference, I did not see any necessity that the Prime Minister of Canada should be at the conference this year at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend is fully entitled to his own judgment about that, and I have no doubt he gives it in all sincerity. I differ from this view. For instance, some of the subjects suggested for discussion at the conference are not controversial, such as the question of naturalization, and the question of preferential trade proposed by this very government—for the resolution of 1902 was passed on the motion of the Canadian government.

Mr. BOURASSA. Does my hon. friend imagine that the present British government would favour anything like the preferential trade policy which was propounded by the Canadian government in 1902?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not imagining anything. but I say that this government put forward in 1902 a policy from which as a government they have not receded—unless we are to judge by some more or less casual expressions of opinion by the Minister of Agriculture and which he says were not given by him as a member of the government, but as a farmer. Apart from that, I do not know that there has been any retractation by this government of the policy they put forward to the imperial government in 1902, and it contained, as my hon. friend from Labelle knows, a pretty distinct intimation to the British government that unless they are prepared to give to Canadian products a preference in the British markets, they might expect to have the preference granted to British products in our market withdrawn whenever it pleased the Canadian government to withdraw it. I would think that these two subjects—not considering at all some of the others which may be regarded as more or less controversial—are of some interest to Canada and the empire, and it would, therefore, be important that the Prime Minister should be on hand on April 15.

My hon. friend from Labelle has referred to matters of some importance which he proposes to bring to the attention of the House to-morrow. If these matters should prove to be of the importance he mentions, and undoubtedly they are important. I would be prepared to insist with him, that the session should not conclude until these matters had received due inquiry and investigation. It was in that view that I suggested to the Prime Minister, that we should not prorogue, but should adjourn for the purpose of enabling him to discharge the duty which he owes to Canada and to the empire of attending that colonial conference.

I would avail myself of this opportunity to refer to the statement made in some newspapers in this country—notwithstanding my declaration in this House on a previous occasion—that there is some arrangement between the two parties with regard to what my hon. friend from Labelle proposes to bring forward to-morrow, and I repeat my statement that there is no such arrangement and that there never has been the semblance or the suggestion of such an arrangement. I want to say, that any statement to the contrary is as false a statement as ever proceeded from the pen or from the lips of any man in this House or elsewhere. I desire to make myself perfectly plain, and clear. and explicit, on that point. There never was a statement more absolutely unwarranted, more absolutely false, than that statement which has been made with regard to myself, and also with regard to hon. gentlemen on the other side, if I am supposed to be included in it. I have had no communication with the government, or any member of the government, or any gentleman on the other side of the House, with regard to what my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) proposes to bring forward. I did have a short conference with my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) on the subject, and he is perfectly at liberty to stand up and proclaim from the house tops what that conversation was about.

Mr. BOURASSA. Does my hon. friend say that I made any statement to the effect that he had entered into an arrangement with the government?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not at all. My hon. friend absolutely misunderstands me. I say that I did ask my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) a question as to what he would propose, and that my hon. friend from Labelle is perfectly at liberty to say what took place between us. He knows it did not

contain anything in the nature of an arrangement, and my hon. friend from Labelle will do me the justice of saying that.

Mr. BOURASSA. Quite so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) knows that I did not suggest to him in any way, that he should withdraw, or minimize any matter he had to bring forward against any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. I know he will do me the justice to confirm my statement as to that.

Mr. BOURASSA. I confirm that entirely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And further, the interview which I had with my hon. friend from Labelle took place after these statements appeared in the public press, so that there was not even that foundation for them at the time they were made. I shall have something further to say, perhaps, when this matter is debated to-morrow upon whatever resolution my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) may bring forward.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has stated his position with regard to this conference, very much according to my own view of what is the proper position for us to take. But, I would hardly be inclined to think that the Prime Minister of Canada should not go to that conference, or, that Canada should be unrepresented at that conference merely by reason of the fact that we have no grievance. Perhaps the Minister of Finance did not mean to imply that. Even if we have no grievance, there are important subjects proposed for consideration, and it is only proper that Canada should be represented by its Prime Minister who is the only person that can represent her under the constitution of the conference. It is true that the conference is fixed at a not very convenient time for Canada, but the Minister of Finance will realize that in view of the change in the date for calling the sessions of the Canadian parliament, the month of April would correspond to the month of June under the former system. June he describes as a convenient month. We have frequently sat here in June, in July, and even in August. April will now be very much what June was to us before; and we have to recollect that this empire, of which we are proud to form a part, is so enormous in area that winter to us is summer to those on the other side of the world, who also hold their sessions in the winter season. Therefore it was necessary for the imperial government, in fixing a date convenient for all, to fix it not later than April 15. In doing so they conceded something to Canada, because we know that in the first instance it was proposed on behalf of Australasia and New Zealand that the conference should begin in March. I do not think I have anything further to add except to express the very sincere hope that the Prime Minister will be able, notwithstandng the urgency of any public business in parliament to which of course he owes a very firm duty, to be in attendance at the opening of the Colonial Conference on April 15.

Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjourn, negatived.

INJURIOUS POST CARDS.

Mr. R. N. WALSH (Huntingdon). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he is aware that there are going through the mails post cards coated wholly or in part with isinglass, which is extremely injurious to the mail clerks ? The Postmaster General of the United States has prohibited these post cards from being sent through the mails, and I wish to ask the Postmaster General if he intends to take any action in the matter ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I am aware that complaints have been made to the department with regard to such post cards. I think there is already a regulation against their admission. At all events, I will inquire into the matter.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). In view of the approach of the close of the fiscal year, or the fiscal period, as it is quite evident that we shall not have our Supply Bill completed at the opening of the new fiscal year, I wish to announce that I intend to-day or to-morrow to take the first steps towards asking for an appropriation equal to one-fifth of so much of the estimates as may not have already been passed through committee. If that be approved, we shall then introduce a Supply Bill covering all the appropriations which the House has already voted upon and one-fifth of the remainder, leaving the discussion of these to a later stage. I shall be very glad to have the co-operation of hon. gentlemen opposite in promoting that measure when it comes forward to-day or to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that there will be no opposition to that proposal from this side of the House.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the British America Assurance Company.—Mr. McCarthy (Simcoe.)

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate the Travellers' Indemnity Company of Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Eastern Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Calvert.

TRADERS' FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 110) respecting the Traders' Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Johnston.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to move that this Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce. There seems to be some misunderstanding as to section 16 which was amended to increase the amount of paid-up capital stock required.

Mr. FIELDING. I will assent to the motion, but in doing so I would not like to be understood as agreeing to any change. I think the object of the Bill as it stands is consistent with the general policy of parliament, but I have no objection to it being referred back for further consideration.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I think that the Bill in its present shape is not the Bill as it passed the committee. There has been a mistake either on the part of the department or the members of the committee, and it is very desirable it should be referred back.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objections but I would not like to accept the implication that there is anything to correct. After the Bill was reported by the committee, several members of the committee said they had not understood the effect of a motion which was carried. I did not think there ought to have been any misunderstanding, but inasmuch as some members said they did not understand when they voted, I see no reason why they should not be given an opportunity of going over the Bill again.

Progress reported.

Mr. MILLER moved that the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 132) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 133) respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

QUESTIONS.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES AND BOUNDARIES.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What additions to subsidies or allowances have been made to each of the different provinces since confederation, when, and on what account ?

2. What additions in territory or enlargement of boundaries have been made with respect to each of the provinces since confederation, and when ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The first part of the hon. gentleman's question can hardly be answered briefly, but the information is contained in a memorandum which I will send to him and which will serve the purpose. In reply to the second question the only province the boundaries of which have been enlarged by any act of parliament of Canada, is the province of Manitoba, the enlargement having taken place under the Act of 1881. As respects any other province, there have been definitions of boundaries but no enlargements.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the title of the first paper ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a memorandum prepared by the Deputy Minister of Finance at the time the provincial subsidies were discussed in connection with Saskatchewan and Alberta. I do not remember whether it was included in the parliamentary papers or not. Perhaps I had better lay it on the table and have it included at a later stage.

NEW ZEALAND FLAX.

Mr. ELSON asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to the matter of trying, as an experiment, at the Experimental Farm, the growing of a certain plant known as New Zealand flax, which is favourably spoken of by Mr. J. S. Larke, Canadian commercial agent in Australasia, in Weekly Report No. 155, January, 1907, as being a plant likely to furnish a strong and cheap fibre for the manufacture of binder twine ; and which plant he thinks would grow to perfection in the low-lying or wet lands of certain portions of the Dominion of Canada ; and that the growing of such plant in the Dominion as fibre for twine might result in the manufacture of as good twine as the farmers now get, and at lower prices ?

2. If the government has not already commenced the trial of such experiment, is it their intention to do so ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The New Zealand flax (Phormium tenax), mentioned by Mr. J. S. Larke in Weekly Report No. 155 of the Department of Trade and Commerce, January 14, 1907, is a sub-tropical plant which has been experimented with in the greenhouse at the Central Experimental Farm, along with other tender fibre plants such as jute, ramie and cotton, for the instruction of visitors. Some six or seven years ago there were several thrifty plants of the New Zealand flax growing in the greenhouse at the Central Farm and early in the summer they were planted out in a suitable bed to test their

hardiness. They were well established before winter, but the first severe frost killed them.

The New Zealand flax is a native of New Zealand, where it is cultivated for its fibre, It is also grown in some parts of Australia, in the south of France, in Algiers, California, and other sub-tropical regions; but it is not hardy enough to endure the frosts of northern climates.

2. The government has no intention of attempting to grow this sub-tropical plant as a crop in this country.

HUDSON BAY COMPANY.

Mr. BOURASSA asked:

1. Is the Department of the Interior, or any department of the government, in possession of the original or of a copy of, Colony Register A of the Hudson Bay Company?

2. If a copy only is in the possession of the government, where is the original to be found?

3. If there is no such copy or original, was either one or the other ever in the possession of the government?

4. If there was, when and how did it disappear?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (for the Minister of the Interior):

1. No.

2. What purported to be a copy of Register A was obtained in 1900, through the agent of Dominion lands at Winnipeg. It is understood that the original is in the Hudson Bay Company's office in London.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. It is not known how the copy, referred to in answer to question No. 2 disappeared.

Mr. FISHER. We have looked through the archives and can find no trace of these papers.

LORD SELKIRK'S ESTATE.

Mr. BOURASSA asked:

1. Is the Department of the Interior, or any other department of the government, in possession of the original, or of a copy of the land registers of Lord Selkirk's estate in the Northwest, for the period extending from 1812 to 1835?

2. If a copy only is in possession of the government, where is the original to be found?

3. If there is no such copy or original, was either one or the other ever in the possession of the government?

4. If there was, when and how did it disappear?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (for the Minister of the Interior):

1. No.

2. It is not known where the original is to be found.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked:

1. Is the Minister of Justice aware that the text of the Revised Statutes, at present in force, contains several errors in the text?

2. Will the Minister of Justice take steps to prevent such errors from being repeated in the French version, which is now being prepared?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. There are several typographical errors, and these are noted in a page of errata to be published with the fourth volume.

2. The gentlemen preparing the French version have instructions to avoid these errors.

MR. MAGLOIRE GRANGER.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. Is Magloire Granger, notary, of St. Jacques de l'Achigan, an excise officer or any other kind of civil servant?

2. What is his salary?

3. When was he appointed?

4. To replace whom was he appointed?

5. At whose request was he appointed?

6. Did he pass the qualifying examinations?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. Mr. Magloire Granger is a temporary excise officer in the Inland Revenue division of Joliette.

2. His salary is at the rate of $500 per annum.

3. He was appointed April 3, 1906.

4. Said appointment was to replace Mr. M. Légaré.

5. There is nothing on record showing on whose recommendation Mr. Granger was appointed.

6. The department has no advice to the effect that he has passed the qualifying examination.

SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVINCES.

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

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:

Most Gracious Sovereign.

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty for the purpose of representing that it is expedient to amend the scale of payments authorized under section 118 of the Act of parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, commonly called the British North America Act, 1867, to be made by Canada to the several provinces of the Dominion for the support of their governments and legislatures by providing that—

A. Instead of the amounts now paid, the sums hereafter payable yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures, to be according to population, and as follows:

(a) Where the population of the province is under 150,000.. .. .. $100,000

(b) Where the population of the province is 150,000, but does not exceed 200,000.. 150,000

(c) Where the population of the province is 200,000 but does not exceed 400,000.. .. .. $180,000
(d) Where the population of the province is 400,000, but does not exceed 800,000.. 190,000
(e) Where the population of the province is 800,000, but does not exceed 1,500,000.. 220,000
(f) Where the population of the province exceeds 1,500,000.. 240,000

B. Instead of an annual grant per head to the population now allowed, the annual payment hereafter to be at the same rate of eighty cents per head, but on the population of each province, as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census, until such population exceeds 2,500,000, and at the rate of sixty cents per head for so much of said population as may exceed 2,500,000.

C. An additional allowance to the extent of one hundred thousand dollars annually for ten years to the province of British Columbia.

We pray that Your Majesty may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be laid before the imperial parliament at its present session, repealing the provisions of section 118 of the British North America Act, 1867, aforesaid, and substituting therefor the scale of payments above set forth, which shall be a final and unalterable settlement of the amounts to be paid yearly to the several provinces of the Dominion for their local purposes and the support of their governments and legislatures.

Such grants shall be paid half-yearly in advance, to each province ; but the government of Canada shall deduct from such grants, as against any province, all sums chargeable as interest on the public debt of that province in excess of the several amounts stipulated in the said Act.

All of which we humbly pray Your Majesty to take into your favourable and gracious consideration.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the terms of this address, in the form of a notice of motion, has been before the House for some days. I ask, by your leave and that of the House to make the amendment of which I have given notice and which is to be found in the Votes and Proceedings of last Friday. This proposed amendment is to add to the address the following paragraph, immediately after paragraph c :

D. Nothing herein contained shall in any way supersede or affect the terms special to any particular province upon which such province became part of the Dominon of Canada or the right of any province to payment of any special grant heretofore made by the parliament of Canada to any province for any special purpose in such grant expressed.

The object of this petition, which I ask parliament to approve, is to obtain an amendment of the particular disposition of our constitution which provides for and regulates the financial terms existing between the Dominion and the provinces. It is now more than forty years since the various conferences took place which laid the foundation of the Canadian confederation. And it is now exactly forty years, this year, since the imperial parliament giving effect to the resolutions which were adopted by the Quebec conference, passed the British North America Act which brought confederation into existence and which, within its four corners, contains the charter of the Dominion's rights, privileges and liberties. It is undoubtedly a right of legitimate gratification and pardonable pride for us Canadians, that nearly half a century has elapsed before any necessity has arisen for substantial alterations in the enactments of the original instrument. And this is undoubtedly, also, an evidence that the work which was undertaken and carried out by the men who arranged this confederation was well done. In this respect we may claim that we have been more fortunate than our neighbours ; for the ink was scarcely dry upon the Act of Union before new articles were added to it, and almost simultaneously with the Act of Union, ten amendments had been added to the original instrument. Two more were added soon afterwards, and there were also the three additional amendments added at a subsequent period as a result of the awful arbitrament of war, that great civil conflict which took place some eighty years after the original contract was made. Yet, though we may be proud of the manner in which our constitution has stood the test of time, it must be admitted that there are certain features as to the sufficiency of which reasonable doubts were entertained from the first, and as to which strong objections were taken. This applies most particularly to the subject which is now before us, the financial terms of the confederation as established under the British North America Act. Section 64 of the Quebec resolutions contained the following enactments :

In consideration of the transfer to the general parliament of the powers of taxation an annual grant in aid of each province shall be made, equal to eighty cents per head of the population, as established by the census of 1861 ; the population of Newfoundland being estimated at 130,000. Such aid shall be in full settlement of all future demands upon the general government for local purposes, and shall be paid half-yearly in advance to each province.

Sir, it is a matter of history that this particular enactment which I have just read was the subject, in the conference, of very warm and even passionate discussion. It is a matter of history that the very idea which is embodied in the enactment was objected to and resisted by some of the ablest men there assembled, the ground taken being that both sound constitutional principle and sound economic principle united to declare that upon the same shoulders should rest the duty and the responsibility of both raising and applying the public revenue. And it is clear that, as a mere abs-

tract proposition, there is great force in this contention. But it is also a matter of history that if the resolutions were passed in a certain form, if the allowance to the provinces were arranged in a certain way, the reason, the paramount reason, was that without such an enactment and such an allowances the provinces would not have consented to enter confederation. This point was made absolutely clear by Mr. Brown in the speech which he delivered in support of the resolution of the Quebec conference before the legislature of Canada, in 1865. Mr. Brown, speaking first upon the division of legislative power between the Dominion and the provinces, went on as follows :

But, Sir, I am told that though true it is that local matters are to be separated and the burden of local expenditure placed upon local shoulders, we have made an exception from that principle in providing that a subsidy of eighty cents per head shall be taken from the federal chest and granted to the local governments for local purposes. Undoubtedly this is the fact—and I do not hesitate to admit that it would have been better if this had been otherwise. I trust I commit no breach of discretion in stating that in conference I was one of the strongest advocates for defraying the whole of the local expenditures of the local governments by means of direct taxation, and that there were liberal men in all sections of the provinces who would gladly have had it so arranged. But, Mr. Speaker, there was one difficulty in the way—a difficulty which has often before been encountered in this world—and that difficulty was simply this, it could not be done. We could neither have carried it in conference, nor yet in any one of the existing provincial legislatures. Our friends in Lower Canada, I am afraid, have a constitutional disinclination to direct taxation, and it was obvious that if the confederation scheme had had attached to it a provision for the imposition of such a system of taxation, my honourable friends opposite would have had a much better chance of success in blowing the bellows of agitation than they now have. The objection, moreover, was not confined to Lower Canada—all the lower provinces stood in exactly the same position. They have not a municipal system such as we have, discharging many of the functions of government, but their general government performs all the duties which in Upper Canada devolve upon our municipal councils, as well as upon parliament. If then the lower provinces had been asked to maintain their customs duties for federal purposes, and to impose on themselves by the same Act direct taxation for all their local purposes, the chances of carrying the scheme of union would have been greatly lessened.

The objection moreover was not confined to Lower Canada. The lower provinces stood in exactly the same position. They have not a municipal system such as we have, discharging many of the functions of government ; but their general government performs all the duties which in Upper Canada devolved upon our municipal councils as well as upon parliament. If then the lower provinces had asked to maintain their customs duties for other purposes and to impose on themselves by the same fact direct taxation for all their local purposes, the chances of carrying the scheme of union would have been greatly lessened.

This testimony is conclusive. Lower Canada would not have entered confederation if, as a consequence, she had been obliged to resort to direct taxation to levy the revenues necessary to carry on her domestic affairs. What was true of Lower Canada was equally true of the maritime provinces. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, would not have agreed to enter confederation if, as a consequence, direct taxation had to be resorted to. That was not, however, Mr. Brown's idea. Notwithstanding all the authority which attaches to the name of Mr. Brown, and the reverence which for my part I profess for his memory, I am quite sure that upon this occasion he was not accurate in his estimate. Nothing that has taken place in Quebec since confederation has shown that in that respect they were any different from the people of the other provinces. It is quite true that there was in Ontario as well as in Quebec a system of municipal taxation which had somewhat familiarized the people of those provinces with the idea of direct taxation. But I have not seen that the people of Ontario, in addition to the burden which they had to carry to maintain their municipal institutions, would have been willing to tax themselves to carry on the burden of their legislature. Ever since the British provinces of North America have been granted representative government, the only mode, so far as my information goes, by which they carry on their domestic affairs, their municipal government and their legislatures, has been by means of customs excise duties. Therefore it is not to be wondered at that when the provinces represented at that conference agreed to surrender to the central government the exclusive power of taxation by way of customs and excise, they should at the same time have stipulated as a condition precedent that a certain portion of the revenue thus collected should be returned to them, and a portion sufficient to permit them, without having recourse to direct taxation, to carry on their provincial affairs. This is the reason of the enactment which we have before us in the 64th resolution of the Quebec conference to which I have just called the attention of the House ; it was one of the many compromises which had to be made in order to render confederation possible, and without which probably confederation would have remained but a dream.

Here again we have another evidence of the paramount influence which was exercised by Mr. Brown in the events of that epoch. Sir John Macdonald, although a very effective worker in bringing about confederation, still only entered the field at the eleventh hour. Mr. Brown had been in the field from the dawn of the day, and it was his agitation which brought on the crisis of

1864. When that crisis promised to realize the idea for which he had so long struggled, he allowed no obstacle to stand in the way, he did not hesitate to make the sacrifice of some of his long cherished convictions when he found that such sacrifice was necessary in order to obtain the adhesion and concurrence of all classes of men whose adhesion and concurrence were essential. For instance in the matter of education, though he had been all his life a consistent opponent of separate schools, he did not hesitate to accept separate schools in the new constitution in order thereby to secure the concurrence of the minority in Quebec and the minority in Ontario. In the matter which now concerns us he resolutely set aside his own views and adopted views in which he had but little confidence. The union of the provinces was the supreme end he had in view, and that end was attained.

Upon this point we have not only the testimony of Mr. Brown, but we have also the testimony of another member of the conference of 1864. Col. John Hamilton Grey was a member of the conference as a delegate from the province of New Brunswick. In the year 1872 he published a book in which is to be found a narration of the events which took place at the conference. There is in the book an especially important chapter concerning the contest between the two sides, between those who favoured such an allowance as is now embodied in the Confederation Act, and those who opposed it, and he gives a very interesting narration of the almost superhuman difficulties that stood in the way of a reconciliation of the opposing views on this subject. Speaking first of the method of taxation which then prevailed in the maritime provinces, and to which I have alluded, he goes on in this way :

It was absurd, therefore, to suppose that the delegates from those provinces could consent to any propositions for union that did not make adequate provisions for meeting the existing wants and contributions to which their people had been accustomed. It was equally hard to make the representatives of the people of Upper Canada understand that that was right. In vain was argument used. It amounted to nothing. Unless some compromise could be effected the discussion about union might as well cease. Subsidies were proposed, the expenses of each local government in calculation, reduced to the smallest figure—the general government assumed the burden of every expenses that could possibly be considered of a general character—but still as the distribution was to be by population the provinces of Upper Canada would receive what it did not want, while the others did not get what they did want. Agreement seemed hopeless, and on or about the tenth morning after the convention met, the conviction was general that it must break up without coming to any conclusion. The terms of mutual concession and demand had been drawn to their extremist tension and silence was all around. At last a proposition was made that the convention should adjourn for the day, and that in the meantime the Finance Ministers of the several provinces should meet, discuss the matter among themselves, and see if they could not agree upon something. Accordingly, Messrs. Brown and Galt on behalf of Canada, Dr. Tupper and Mr. Archibald of Nova Scotia, Mr. Tilley of New Brunswick, Mr. Pope of Prince Edward Island, and Mr. Shea of Newfoundland, withdrew for that purpose.

On the following morning they reported the conclusions at which they had arrived. These with some modifications, after some discussion, were ultimately adopted by the convention, reduced the resolutions, and the 'financial crisis' passed away.

This is a graphic description. We can almost see with our eyes these strong and able men, sitting at the council board speechless in face of a deadlock which would have ended in an ignominous rupture of the conference had not some mode of conciliation been found. At last however these men rose to the occasion and discovered a way out of the deadlock by mutual concession. And here again we have presented to us a fact which we must always keep in mind. It is well to recollect, especially in a country composed of so many diverse elements as we have in this confederation, that no great reform can be achieved except at the sacrifice of some opinion, even by those who are the most ardently in favour of it. The true reformer is not he who always adheres stubbornly to his own ideas, but the true reformer is he who, after having earnestly combatted for his opinions, then yields in order to attain some greater end, and to facilitate the change from the old to the new order of things.

These resolutions which I have quoted to the House, and the comments passed upon them by Mr. Brown and also by Colonel Grey, were brought to the attention of the legislative assembly of Canada and there they were the cause of discussion almost as hot and as passionate as had taken place in the conference. The ground of dispute there was very different from the ground of dispute in the conference. The ground of dispute in the legislature was not the question whether or not there should be an allowance to the provinces but the ground of dispute in the legislature was the question whether or not the allowance provided by the resolutions adopted at the conference of eighty cents per head of the population according to the census of 1861 would be sufficient to enable the provinces to properly carry on their own demostic affairs and to provide for their needs and requirements. I do not propose to review the debate that took place upon that occasion. That debate consisted of a series of contradictory and conjectural statements and allegations as to how much would be required by the legislature to properly discharge the duties with which they were entrusted. It is to some purpose to observe that as the discussion went on there arose a strong

and consistent opinion to the effect that as the population of the different provinces would increase the principle of the allowance should be changed, that it should not be fixed, but, on the contrary, that it should be flexible and should move on with the increase of population. This opinion was not expressed by the party leaders for the one obvious reason that the party leaders were committed to the resolutions of the conference just as they were brought down to the House but these views were to be found in the expressions of the rank and file of the two parties which had coalesced for the purpose of carrying out confederation. I will not quote many opinions. I will content myself with two, one taken in the ranks of the Reform party, the other taken in the ranks of the Conservative party and both taken from the province of Ontario. One of the most prominent members at that time of the legislative council was Mr. Currie, member for Niagara division. He did not occupy an official position but he was well known as a man of superior abilities and, speaking on this very subject, he expressed himself in this way :

> Notwithstanding the admitted talent of the delegates he contended that a manifest injustice had been done to Canada and especially to Upper Canada, in the distribution of the subsidies to the local governments. Hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that the subsidies change not with population, but remain fixed.

Mr. Alexander, a Conservative member of the legislative assembly expressed himself in almost identically the same language :

> We know that our delegates contended, as we now contend, that it only would have been fair and just that the future subsidy to be paid to each province, of eighty cents per head, should be based upon the census returns to be made every ten years.

This strong opinion coming from the rank and file of the two parties who had bent their energies on framing this new constitution created an impression. That impression however did not find expression in any legislative enactment and for an obvious reason. Shortly after the beginning of the debate upon that question the government had moved the previous question so as to prevent any possible amendment to the resolutions which had been adopted at the conference. These resolutions had to be adopted entirely or rejected entirely. They were adopted in their entirety but the delegates who went to England to supervise the legislation before the imperial parliament of the then existing governments, that is to say of Canada, of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, introduced into the Bill which was submitted to the imperial parliament several important additions in furtherance of the view of those who thought that the provision made in the Quebec resolutions was insufficient. The 64th resolution of the conference became the 118th section of the British North America Act. I have just quoted to the House what was the tenor of the 64th resolution of the conference. Let me now quote to the House the tenor and language of the 118th section of the British North America Act.

Mr. BERGERON. Before my right hon. friend proceeds with that, was it not understood in the discussion that took place at the time that the provinces would have to resort to direct taxation and that this would be just a beginning for them ? Of course there were those who were opposed to that view but was it not generally understood that the provinces would have to adopt direct taxation ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I do not know that there was any such policy. That view was expressed and forcibly expressed by many members of the legislature, but it was resisted by as many others. It was said that confederation would be endangered if in consequence of insufficient means being provided for by the Quebec conference the provinces had to resort to direct taxation to carry on their domestic affairs. The 118th section of the British North America Act is in these words :

Ontario..	$80,000
Quebec..	70,000
Nova Scotia..	60,000
New Brunswick..	50,000

> Two hundred and sixty thousand ; and an annual grant in aid of each province shall be made, equal to eighty cents per head of the population, as ascertained by the census of one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and in the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, by each subsequent decennial census until the population of each of these two provinces amounts to four hundred thousand souls, at which rate such grant shall thereafter remain. Such grants shall be in full settlement of all future demands on Canada, and shall be paid half-yearly in advance to each province ; but the government of Canada shall deduct from such grants, as against any province, all sums chargeable as interest on the public debt of that province in excess of the several amounts stipulated in this Act.

The House will see that in this article in the Confederation Act there are two important additions to the provision which had been made in the resolution of the Quebec conference. The first is that apart from the allowance of eighty cents which was provided in the Quebec resolution a fixed allowance, a specific amount, was provided for—$80,000 for Ontario, $70,000 for Quebec, $60,000 for Nova Scotia, and $50,000 for New Brunswick, and that instead of an allowance of eighty cents per head, which, according to the resolution of the Quebec conference, was to remain fixed by the figures of the census of 1861 is was provided that in the case of New Brunswick

and Nova Scotia this allowance would increase from time to time after each decennial census until the population of these two provinces had reached the figure of 400,000 souls. Well, Sir, these are the provisions under which the confederation was commenced and has been carried on ever since. Now, I have to observe to the House that even with this addition which was made to the original text of the Quebec resolution time has shown that, if the principle be admitted of a contribution being made from the Dominion treasury to the provinces, the provision made by the British North America Act has proved to be absolutely insufficient and inadequate. The experience of forty years has brought this fact again and again to the attention of the parliament and the people of Canada. If I needed any evidence in support of that assertion, I might remind the House, that not once, nor twice, nor thrice, but periodically and systematically parliament has been asked, at almost regular intervals, to vote in favour of now one province and now another province, appropriations far in excess of anything that had been stipulated in the British North America Act; and, every province which has since joined confederation has entered upon terms in excess of the terms provided for in that Act.

Confederation had only been accomplished two years, when, in 1869 better terms were provided for Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia was given for ten years a yearly allowance of $18,698, and Nova Scotia was also given an additional allowance of $1,186,000 upon the debt which she was entitled to charge against confederation. The door which was then opened never has been closed to the present day. In 1873, parliament was asked to vote to New Brunswick an allowance of $150,000 a year in compensation for revenue derived from the export duty on lumber.

Mr. FOSTER. That was on a little different principle from the other.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Whatever may have been the pretext the financial arrangements made at confederation have been continually changed for one reason or another. In 1873, the adjustment of the public debt chargeable against the Dominion was remodelled, and as a consequence every province of the Dominion was given a new allowance. In 1876, a special grant was made to Manitoba of $26,000 for five years. In 1878, a further special grant of $10,000 a year for three years, in support of education, was made to Manitoba. In 1879, another special grant of $15,000 a year for three years was made to Manitoba. In 1882, the financial terms with Manitoba were completely recast and the new terms were: Fixed subsidy, $50,000; per capita allowance of 80 cents a head based not upon the actual population, but on an assumed population of 150,000; indemnity in lieu of public lands $45,000 a year. In 1884, a new adjustment of the public debt between the provinces was made by which all the provinces were given an increased allowance. In that same year the province of Quebec was given a special grant in compensation for expenditure on the building of the railway from Quebec to Ottawa which is now a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1885, Manitoba was given another grant. In 1887, a further grant of $20,000 a year was given to Prince Edward Island. In 1898, Manitoba was granted $200,000 in release of money advanced for the construction of a court house. In 1901, Prince Edward Island was given a further sum of $30,000 a year. It will therefore be seen that from the earliest date after confederation up to the present, there has been again and again an extra grant appropriated to one province or another. What is remarkable in this portion of our history is, that all these grants have been made by parliament without any plan, without any guiding principle, but simply as the expediency of the moment suggested, or rather as the financial difficulties of one province or the other were more or less urgent. Such a course may have been found satisfactory for the time being by the province thus benefited, but it undoubtedly must be obvious, that the Dominion as a whole could not be benefited by such a course. I have only to appeal to the experience of the older members of this House who will remember that again and again upon the floor of parliament, the advisability, nay the necessity was urged of dealing with such questions upon a general basis, and recasting the financial terms of confederation so as to have a uniform rule apply to all the provinces. But, though the suggestion was made more than once, it did not take shape until the matter was taken in hand by the provinces themselves. In 1887, a conference took place in the old city of Quebec, the cradle of confederation, and that conference was attended by representatives of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and Quebec. At this conference some of the ablest men of that day were present. I will spare the modesty of some of those who are living and who are now in the House; I will speak only of the dead. Ontario was represented at that conference by Sir Oliver Mowat, whose ability and experience made him conspicuous throughout the Dominion, and he was accompanied by Mr. Hardy and Mr. Fraser, also men of great ability. Quebec was represented by Mr. Mercier, a man whose ability was undoubted. New Brunswick was represented by Mr. Blair, whose name it is sufficient to mention here. Manitoba was represented by Mr. John Norquay, whose rugged ability was acknowledged by all. There were no party divisions at that

conference; men of all shades of politics attended it, and the resolutions referring to the financial questions passed at that conference were :

That this conference is of opinion that the basis for the final and unalterable settlement of the amounts to be yearly paid by the Dominion to the several provinces for local purposes and the support of their governments and legislatures, may be found in the proposals following :

A. Instead of the amounts now paid, the sums hereafter payable yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures, to be according to population, and as follows :

(a) Where the population of the province is under 150,000.. .. ..$100,000
(b) Where the population of the province is 150,000, but does not exceed 200,000.. 150,000
(c) Where the population of the province is 200,000, but does not exceed 400,000.. 180,000
(d) Where the population of the province is 400,000, but does not exceed 800,000.. 190,000
(e) Where the population of the province is 800,000, but does not exceed 1,500,000.. 220,000
(f) Where the population of the province exceeds 1,500,000.. 240,000

B. Instead of an annual grant per head of population now allowed, the annual payment hereafter to be at the same rate of eighty cents per head, but on the population of each province, as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census, until such population exceeds 2,500,000, and at the rate of sixty cents per head for so much of said population as may exceed 2,500,000.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman has followed in the resolution which he now proposes, the resolution of the Quebec conference word for word.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have, as I will show presently, adopted exactly the resolutions of 1887. I may say that these resolutions were ratified by the legislatures of all the provinces interested. Nothing, however, took place in the direction of carrying them into effect.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman one question ? The subsidies are to be based on 'the population of each province, as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census.' How will that work in with the provision with regard to Saskatchewan and Alberta, where the census is to be taken every two and a half years ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, every five years. I will explain that in a few minutes. I may say that these resolutions, though approved by the legislatures of all the provinces interested, were not acted on at the time, for several reasons. They were never brought up in this House. The death of Sir John Macdonald, which occurredd a few years afterwards, was one reason. Others were : the agitation over the Manitoba school question, which lasted six years, from 1890 to 1896 ; the change of government, and the agitation over the South African war. But in 1902 another conference took place, also in Quebec. At that conference the provinces represented were Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba. Ontario and British Columbia were not represented, not because they were not in sympathy with the objects of the conference, but for other reasons. The province of Ontario signified its adherence to the resolutions immediately afterwards, and British Columbia also gave its assent to them, though claiming special treatment for itself. The resolutions adopted by that conference were identical with those which had been adopted at the conference in 1887, with one exception only, that a further allowance was claimed with respect to criminal justice. The resolution on this subject adopted by the conference of 1902 was as follows :

Resolved, that in addition to the foregoing resolution, the Dominion government be requested to consider the matter of the cost of administration of criminal justice conjointly with the other matters submitted, and in addition to the amounts that may be allowed to the provinces under the claims above set forth, to award to each an amount for that purpose commensurate with the expense necessary to be made in that regard.

The resolutions adopted at the conference of 1902 were submitted to us, but we considered it advisable not to take any action upon them, but to invite the provinces to a conference at Ottawa with the Dominion government, where we could hear the reasons which might be advanced in support of the resolutions and the views which might be presented against them. This conference took place in October last.

Mr. FOSTER. Why the delay of four or five years ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know any reason except that our attention was occupied with other matters. At that conference all the provinces were represented, including the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. After debating the matter with the conference, we came to the conclusion that it would be advisable to recommend parliament to act not on the resolutions of 1902, but on those of 1887, as affording a basis for the permanent settlement of a question which had been open ever since the first days of confederation. Such is the history of this particular disposition of our constitution. Such is the situation as it now exists, and such is the prayer now made unanimously by the provinces. The question is, what is to be done ; what is the duty of parliament, and what answer have we to make to this unanimous petition of all the provinces ? Stern constitutionalists have told us to heed not that prayer, as the

principle of it is false, and not to extend our aid beyond its present dimensions. Stern economists have advised the same course. I have to observe that the objection urged against this prayer of the provinces is exactly the same as was pressed, but without any success, on the men assembled at Quebec in 1864, to carry out the task of forming confederation. It failed to convince those men, and I do not think it can convince this House, at the present time entrusted with the duty of carrying on confederation. After an experience of forty years, we are in a better position to judge of the value of that objection than those who heard it first. All the force of the objection which was made against the principle embodied in the resolutions of the Quebec conference, and afterwards in the Act of confederation, is the statement made that as the provinces would incur no responsibility in levying the revenue which had to be meted out to them from the federal treasury, the inevitable consequence would be imprudence if not extravagance in the disposition of the same. Now, there is no denying that as an abstract argument there is force in this contention; but there is no denying either that actual experience has not justified this sinister prediction. Of course, it can be shown that in certain provinces serious departures have been taken from prudent administration and wise expenditure; but all the experience of these forty years has shown that wherever such departures have taken place, the people of the province themselves have not been slow to punish the offenders and to insist that the funds provided out of the federal treasury should be expended in a prudent, careful and honest manner, the people themselves realizing that no matter by whom the moneys were levied or by whom they were expended, they came out of their own pockets.

Mr. BERGERON. If it were by direct taxation, they would see it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Though we do not raise our revenue by direct taxation, we give a part of it to the provinces; and the provinces during the past forty years have applied it with judgment and honesty. I do not think the objection has all the force it was at one time supposed to have. Again I come to the question, what is to be done? Sir, we claim that parliament should now do what should have been done long ago. Parliament long ago, instead of leaving province after province to knock at the door of this Chamber and ask for better terms, would have acted more wisely in at once revising the subsidies in a more liberal spirit and in making a general and uniform law to apply to all the provinces. The first case considered would undoubtedly have been that of Nova Scotia. I need not remind the House that Nova Scotia was dragged into confederation by violent measures and that that proud province was for some years estranged from a union, which, if it had been properly approached it would have gladly accepted. The government of Sir John Macdonald, I am bound to say, made an effort to correct this error by providing better terms for Nova Scotia; but, although the object was an eminently wise one, the manner in which it was carried out was open to grave suspicion. When the resolution in favour of giving better terms to Nova Scotia was introduced in this House, Mr. Blake, who was then a young member of the House but who had already attained a remarkable position, moved the following resolution:

That the British North America Act, 1867, has fixed and settled the mutual liabilities of Canada and of each province in respect of the public debt, and the amount payable by Canada to each province for the support of its government and legislature;

That the said Act does not empower the parliament of Canada to change the basis of union thereby fixed and settled;

That the unauthorized assumption of such power by the parliament of Canada would imperil the interests of the several provinces, weaken the bond of union, and shake the stability of the constitution;

That the proposed resolutions on the subject of Nova Scotia involve the assumption of such power;

And that therefore this House while ready to give its best consideration to any proposals to procure in a constitutional way and needed changes in the basis of union, deems it inexpedient to go into committee on said proposed resolutions.

These views, presented by Mr. Blake, were not admitted at the time, but everyone must recognize that there was statemanship in them and that it would have been far better in the early days of confederation not to have allowed the claims of Nova Scotia to be adjudicated upon exclusively, but to have found some method in the basis of union for discussing and adjusting all the claims of the provinces in common. This policy, advocated by Mr. Blake, was, however, not adopted at that time. The same principle was again affirmed in a motion moved by Mr. Holton. The motion was in these word:

That in the opinion of this House any disturbance of the financial arrangements respecting the several provinces provided for in the British North America Act, unless assented to by all the provinces, would be subversive of the system of government under which this Dominion was constituted, and if effected, as proposed by this Bill in favour of one province, without at the same time providing for a general revision and re-adjustment of those arrangements, would be manifestly unjust to the other provinces.

The views again presented there were eminently wise and everybody must regret that they were not adopted in 1869. They, however, became the policy of the Liberal

party. They were affirmed more than once on the floor of this House and affirmed with great vigour on another occasion in 1884 by Mr. Blake. That occasion was the aid which was voted to the province of Quebec as compensation for the construction of a railway which is now part of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The province of Quebec was then in rather straightened financial circumstances. It came for help to this House. Mr. Blake did not oppose the resolution moved at the time, but presented again the view that it was not fair to the other provinces to give assistance to one and not to the rest. Any assistance needed—and it was possible the province of Quebec did need assistance—should be given upon a liberal and uniform scale which would apply to all the provinces. Let me call attention to the language which Mr. Blake used on that occasion:

I think that the position of the province of Quebec has demanded for some time past, and is now demanding, the attention of parliament, and, for my part, I have always been prepared to deal fairly by that or by any other of the provinces, but on the condition of equal and fair justice to all. I repeat that it is only fair and reasonable, when a new policy of this kind is being proposed, to consider what its real basis is, to consider what the real condition of the other provinces is, relative to that basis and otherwise, and to see whether what is being proposed as it stands, and without applying proper remedies for the application generally of the new principle you propose, can be called just.

In the same debate, at a later stage, Mr. Blake supplemented the views he thus presented. He said:

I should desire that we should address ourselves very early and very earnestly to the solution of the whole problem by the adoption of some plan whereby, once for all, the question of the provincial subsidies shall be placed on a permanent and lasting basis. I believe it to be destructive of the independence and autonomy of the provinces that they should be looking to Ottawa for favours, that they should be dependent on the central government for carrying on their affairs. I believe it to be destructive to confederation itself that a system should continue under which it may be said: 'Oh, we will go on; we will expend more, we will go into debt, and when we get to a pass that we cannot carry on any longer, the Ottawa parliament must relieve us.' Any sentiment of that kind, any notion on the part of the provincial ministers or politicians or citizens or electors of the provinces, of that kind, must be destructive, in the first place, of good economcal government, in the provinces. and, in the second place, in its influence, moral and financial, on the confederation, destructive ultimately of the confederation itself. Therefore I think it is a pressing and incumbent duty upon us to endeavour, if we can, to devise a plan which will set these matters permanently upon a basis different from that upon which they unhappily stand.

I commend these words of Mr. Blake to the attention of the House, especially the concluding sentence:

Therefore I think it is a pressing and incumbent duty upon us to endeavour, if we can, to devise a plan which will set these matters permanently upon a basis different from that upon which they unhappily stand.

This was the idea we had in view when we met the provinces in conference last autumn. Our object was to find a plan which would permanently set these matters at rest and place them on a basis different from that on which they had stood in the past. Since confederation the plan followed has been to allow one province after another to come to Ottawa and ask for relief, basing its claims on one consideration or another, and then obtaining that relief without regard to the other provinces. The plan we proposed was that we should revise the subsidies given the provinces, with the clear intimation to them that this was to be a final settlement, that no further claim would recognize, that each province must carry on its affairs with the means at its command and must not have recourse to this parliament. We thought we could not do better than have a friendly conference with the provinces, and ascertain what was the most they deemed requisite in order to prevent their coming again to Ottawa and knocking at the door of this parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. Will they not come again?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know, but if they come again we assume that my hon. friend will not listen to them, and if he will not, I certainly shall not, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. BERGERON. My right hon. friend was not always of the opinion he expresses to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For my part I rather agree with the views held by Mr. Brown. I do not believe in the principle, but, like Mr. Brown, I admit that if confederation is to exist, it must exist on these lines. I have to differ from my hon. friend. I am a reformer and do not always believe my views are the best, but I approve of the course taken by the man who was the most instrumental in carrying confederation and who, in order to do this, surrendered to a certain extent his own views. My hon. friend, if he wants confederation to continue, must surrender his views as he has done in the past more than once. No man can hope to have confederation perpetuated on a basis which may be according to his ideas of what is right, but not according to those of the majority. It is my belief that in 1864 it would not have been possible to weld the provinces into one great confederation if Mr. Brown had said: No, we

shall not give an allowance to the provinces. On the same principle my hon. friend may not approve of a certain policy, and though I may not approve of it, it may be essential to the carrying on of confederation. Though my views and those of my hon. friend may be different, they are not those generally entertained, and for the sake of peace and harmony and good government it is essential that we should adopt the views presented to us by the different provinces. Now, what are the views propounded by the provinces ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friends will permit me, I can finish in ten minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) can hardly do that ; I want to ask him a question or two.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I mean I can finish my own speech.

Mr. FOSTER. But I would suggest——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend will give me just a few minutes I will finish. I have only to deal with that part of the conference which has settled the financial terms which are to be given to the provinces. After having looked over the resolution of 1902 and the resolution of 1887, we discarded the resolution of 1902 so far as it related to a claim on the part of the provinces for an allowance on account of the administration of criminal justice. But we adopted the resolutions as framed by the conference of 1887. I have read those resolutions. They provided reasonable increases on what is now paid. The sums paid to the several provinces under the terms of article 118 of the British North America Act make a total of $3,990,000 in round numbers. The sums to be paid under the new arrangement will be $6,336,000, making an increase of about $3,346,000. This will be the added cost to the government of the Dominion.

Now, I come to the question asked of me a few moments ago by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). He asked me what is to become of the provision under the Act for Saskatchewan and Alberta. I may say that the question involved is a much wider one than the hon. gentleman put. We have to consider not only the peculiar terms which had been given to Alberta and Saskatchewan but also the terms which had been given to all the other provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. That is with regard to the special arrangements ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, special arrangements have been made at the time of the entry into confederation of each province, that has entered since the Dominion was established, and also special terms have been given to the different provinces at different times during the time confederation has lasted. By special Acts of this parliament every province was granted more than was granted it by the original terms of confederation. We do not propose to repeal what was done in the past. I do not approve the provisions made ; but what has been done has been done. We propose to provide what seems necessary for the future and to leave the past as it is. Therefore, all the different allotments which have been made to the provinces and which are now in force, will remain as they are. What we propose is that, in the future, these provinces shall be paid what is here contemplated in substitution of what is paid under article 118 of the British North America Act. For instance, the province of New Brunswick receives a special allowance for its timber dues—we do not propose to alter that. The province of Prince Edward Island receives a special grant in respect of its population, it being provided that its allowance for population shall not decrease. It will not matter very much, and I believe the other provinces will not object to the payment of Prince Edward Island on this score, and so we do not propose to alter that. So, conditions as they exist in the Dominion will remain as they are, except that the allotment under article 118 will be replaced by the allotment under this resolution.

Now, I come to the question of British Columbia. British Columbia is entitled to special treatment. I think we all agree as to this. British Columbia is, in some respects, our most remarkable province. Its territory is the largest of any ; and the day is not far distant when it may occupy the first position among the provinces in many respects. British Columbia is especially endowed in many different ways. Its climate is not, perhaps, as bracing as the climate of the eastern provinces, but is a most genial climate. Its resources in fisheries are, perhaps, not surpassed by the far-famed fisheries of the maritime provinces. Its resources in timber equal those of Ontario and Quebec. Its resources in minerals are simply beyond calculation. Its resources in agriculture are never talked of, but my humble opinion is that British Columbia's resources in agriculture will some day astonish the world ; the valleys of British Columbia, I believe, in the not far distant future, will equal in productiveness as they equal in fertility the valleys of Switzerland. But the conditions of development in British Columbia are different from those in every other province. We must consider the mountainous character of its territory ; the sparseness of its population scattered over such an immense area ; the difficulty of access from the eastern markets—all these things make the development of British Columbia more difficult and expensive than the development of any of the provinces of the east. Under these circumstances,

everybody will agree that British Columbia is entitled to special treatment. Now, what should be that special treatment of British Columbia? It is clearly a matter upon which it is difficult to form an opinion. The claims set forth by British Columbia were very wide of what was given to the other provinces. But we decided not to pass any final judgment upon them. We thought we could not do better than refer the claims of the province of British Columbia to the premiers assembled at the conference last year. We asked this conference to advise us what would be the fair thing to do by British Columbia; we asked them that, prepared in advance to accept their arbitrament and abide by their decision. They advised us that British Columbia would be fairly treated if she were given an extra allowance of $100,000 a year for ten years; and we asked parliament to ratify this and to embody the recommendation in the Address to His Majesty, the King.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Prime Minister expect the physical conditions to change in ten years?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. But, in ten years British Columbia will have another transcontinental railway, and many other railways also; she will be brought into close contact with the markets of the east. I believe, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will agree with me that in ten years the conditions in British Columbia should have materially changed. British Columbia may become, in my judgment, the first province of the Dominion; with its climate and resources, it must become one of the most important. But at present we realize that British Columbia is entitled to exceptional treatment and that, in the opinions of the premiers assembled here last autumn, was, that for ten years she should have an extra allowance.

Mr. FOSTER. I wanted to ask my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—and that is why I suggested that he should break off his address at six o'clock, and resume after recess—to deal with two points, which he seems to have missed: First, as to the basis on which these amounts have been apportioned—how have the government come to the conclusion that these should be the amounts apportioned to the several provinces—and, second, what are the guards by which the right hon. gentleman proposes to make this a lasting and permanent settlement? I wish he would treat these two points before he finishes his speech.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As to the first the answer is easy and obvious. In matters of this kind it is difficult to lay down any basis. Why was the basis fixed in 1864 for the allotment of 80 cents? I have searched for the reason, and the only one I can find is this, that a calculation was made by the Minister of Finance of the various provinces according to the statement by Colonel Grey, by Mr. Brown, by Dr. Tupper, by Sir Leonard Tilley, by Mr. Shea and others, and they came to the conclusion that this would be a fair basis upon which to meet the wants of the provinces. That was their judgment, and in 1906 we took as a basis of judgment of the ministers of the several provinces assembled with us, and told us that, according to their experience, this was the amount they needed in order to carry on their public affairs, they had no other basis than that. My hon. friend asked what guarantee we had of finality. My hon. friend knows as well as I do that there is no other guarantee but the determination of parliament itself. Under the American constitution no amendment can be made unless it has been voted and ratified by three-fourths of the states. We have no such provision in our constitution, the only guarantee we have is the security of the imperial parliament, and it will always be difficult for us to go to England and get an amendment to our constitution. Forty years have now elapsed since our constitutional charter was amended. It is true that we have been doing like the Romans who though they had the law of the twelve tables which could not be altered, still they managed to circumvent that law by enacting other laws. We might do the same thing. But the only guarantee we have is this, that my hon. friend representing one party, and myself representing another party, and the members of parliament generally, will agree that this is to be final. Parliament will not defeat its own intentions, and parliament can always do as it pleases, and the hon. gentleman knows that there is no other finality in all these matters but the will of the people, the will of parliament itself.

Mr. SPROULE. That is something like a remark of Mr. Blake, when he said that the decision was to be finally final.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was finally final because it was embodied in an imperial Act. When the provinces came to us and asked for better terms, we might have done as our predecessors did, and have them voted by this parliament. But we thought that we should insist upon having the sanction of the British parliament, we desired to be assured that they were embodied in an imperial Act. That is the policy we now propose to this parliament, and it is, I believe, calculated to promote the harmony which is absolutely essential if we are to work out, as we expect to work out, our destiny as a united people. Therefore, I move this resolution, of which I have given notice.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all lis-

tened this afternoon with interest to the historical summary to which the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) invited our attention; as to the beginning of the terms which were afterwards passed from resolutions into an Act, the changes that took place in the process, the discussions which attended the advent of the resolutions and which afterwards took place in the legislature when these, in their ultimate form, were produced. Of that part of his speech, which, I am bound to say, was the main part, I do not think I have very much criticism to make. One looks back with interest to the struggles, twenty, thirty or forty years ago, as men, twenty-thirty or forty years from this time, will look back to the questions which are being agitated here now. As there were principles that were strongly held to in those olden times I hope, when the succeeding generations come to look back to the debates and conclusions therefrom to-day, they will find that there are also principles involved. As compromises had to be made in the olden times, compromises, to some extent, have to be made at the present time, and with a complex system of government and a country of wide extent and varied resources and requirements probably something of a compromise will come into all great questions, especially those which relate to the development of the provinces of this country, and will soften somewhat and determine to a certain extent the ruggedness of the principles that contending parties may hold.

It is something to be proud of that the Act of confederation under which the four provinces at first united and under which the remaining provinces have practically come in has been subject to as little change and has worked as satisfactorily as it has. The right hon. Prime Minister expressed himself as being proud of the fact, taken in comparison with our neighbours on the other side of the line, and commented upon the few changes in vital respects in our own constitution as compared with the more frequent changes in equally or more vital respects in the constitution of the United States. I am not going to say that what man has made man may not change even though what he has made has all the solemnity of a constitution or a pact under which different provinces agreed to unite themselves together. It is quite too much, I think, to ask that the product of the best judgment and best intelligence at a certain period of time, under certain conditions, good though it may be, may never have to be changed on account of the changing conditions and a gradual evolution from the less to the greater which brings up different sets of requirements and which appeals to different treatment. I do not think the ground is well taken that because the constitution is once formed it must be like steel and iron and never changed. At the same time I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and I think I am in agreement with the majority of the members of this House when I say that the constitution under which different peoples agree at a certain time to bind themselves to live their national lives together under a federal compact ought to be very respectfully treated and that there ought to be more than a common reason for disturbing that constitution. There may even be difficulties, evils and weaknesses developed, but on the other hand it sometimes is a question of pretty even balance whether it is not better to endure those evils and to make head against the difficulties rather than to lead towards frequent change, and thereby to gradually take away from the sacredness and the inviolability of the constitution or the compact and make it a mere matter of agreement that is liable to be changed from the stress of party or political or financial or other exigencies.

I think there is a strong sentiment against interfering with the constitution and against amending it from time to time, unless the reasons for doing so are very strong indeed. There was a great difficulty in the olden time on the financial side of the question and I am not disposed to disagree with the First Minister in his conclusion, that unless compromise had been resorted to and the smaller provinces provided for so as to relieve them from the necessity of facing immediate and even approximate, taxation, we would be to-day a string of disunited provinces without confederation. It is also fair to say, that in 1864 (with the older provinces practically undeveloped, and with almost a total lack of knowledge of the uninhabited territories), it was impossible for any human foresight to accurately gauge what would be the requirements of the country forty or fifty years afterwards. Again, that is an argument that under changing conditions it is not always wrong to change. The Prime Minister criticised the way in which these changes had been made in the past, in the first place because they were piece-meal, in respect to one province at one time and to another province at another time; and in the second place, that they were not made on any uniform and well ascertained basis. The criticism may be proper, but I do not quite see the pertinency of it as applied to the legislation now brought down by the right hon. gentleman. It was all very well to treat us to these inspiring quotations from Edward Blake and other statesmen of the period, but the fact came out immediately afterwards that although the friends and the partners of Edward Blake applauded his fine sentiments, they straight away in practice shattered them to pieces and left their remains lying around this House of Commons to be resuscitated to-day. Piecemeal legislation in the betterment of terms

had been passed by Mr. Mackenzie's administration, just as by Sir John Macdonald's administration—it was not done so often because they were not so long in power, but had the Mackenzie administration been seventeen years in power and the Liberal Conservative administration only four years I venture to say you would have seen the situation reversed. The right hon. gentleman criticised the basis and called it special class legislation to this province and special class legislation to the other province. But, in 1907, with all the accumulated wisdom of the forty years of confederation; when he has an opportunity to remedy all these cases of class legislation, and when, were he standing on Edward Blake's platform he could have applied the fund of experience and information gained, and taken up this subject from the very first and rearranged and put upon a uniform basis all these examples of class legislation, and made one final and ample and thorough, and well based arrangement; the Prime Minister, fluent in criticism, fails in practice. He criticises what has been done in the past as wrong, but, when he is making a permanent and final revision, as he claims, in 1907 he does not try to remedy one of these things he criticised. One by one they came to the government and got each province what it wanted, and that the Prime Minister says is wrong. But when they come altogether and get what they want, the right hon. gentleman thinks it is right. That is the only difference between these isolated pieces of legislation and this wholesale legislation of to-day. To my mind it probably is a development which may be suspiciously looked at, that now it has come to be, that the provinces, especially the needy provinces, have learned the force of combination, and how strong a front, if they unite, they may present to the government and force it to do their will.

Mr. BERGERON. They will do it again.

Mr. FOSTER. In comparing the present legislation with the legislation of the past, I do not know that we have gained much. The main part of the Prime Minister's speech was easy to make; it was an historical summary well put together and interesting, but when the minister of a government comes to this Dominion parliament to ask for $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 of an increase, with the possibility of an annual and gradual increase for all the years that are to come, until when we come to the 20,000,000 or 30,000,000 or 100,000,000 people it will amount to a great deal of money; it does seem to me it is incumbent upon that minister to do something more than present certain historical reminiscences to the House. It seems to me that minister should give us reasons why he and his government have come to the conclusion; he should state that the plan he proposes has been examined by the government, and that the legislation will act justly by all of the provinces and be accepted because of its very justness as a permanent and lasting financial arrangement. I appeal to this House as to whether the Prime Minister gave us one single iota of evidence to show that he and his government had examined this matter, and that he could state to the House how they arrived at these sums, and whether they did it by examining the necessities, the geographical position, the different wants of each one of the provinces, and satisfied themselves by that examination, expert and otherwise, that they had arrived at a just and adequate basis.

This is what the Prime Minister has not done, and I venture to say this is what the government did not attempt to do. I venture to say that the government has not expended five minutes of hard consecutive thought and examination on these financial terms, but that they have simply given the provinces what they put forward as their demands. The speech of the Prime Minister shows that. In 1887, certain premiers of the provinces met together and formulated their demands. In 1902, a similar meeting was held, and the old demands were formulated plus one other for an adjustment as to the enforcement of criminal law. That is the only difference between the programme now and the programme of 1887, except that some new provinces have been made, and consequently the exceptions have to be enlarged so as to take in those provinces. We come to the conference of 1906. How many days does it occupy? The prime ministers of the provinces come together. They meet on one day and are welcomed by the Prime Minister; but there is no discussion and no examination. The provincial ministers then go into conclave for the second day, and after they have had their discussion and come to their conclusions they again meet the Prime Minister and his colleagues and tell them what they have done. And so it goes on until the third day, when, if I mistake not, the British Columbia position is taken up and discussed. The British Columbia claim is for special treatment. It is addressed to the Dominion government. The Dominion government, careful of not being overworked, careful of leaving everything that is to be done to the provincial premiers, do not even take the responsibility nor the care to look into the special circumstances of the province of British Columbia and come to their own conclusions as to what British Columbia ought to have and what they would be willing to give; but with easy grace they say to the province of British Columbia: We have not time to look into this; it would be burdensome if we had to take it up and make our examination; we will hand you over to the other provinces; go before the premiers of

the other provinces, make out your case before them, and if possible agree, and let us hear what the provincial premiers say with regard to your claim. British Columbia, a province of this Dominion, comes to the Dominion government and asks certain treatment from that government, who alone can accord it, and the Dominion government, instead of treating with British Columbia, simply form a tribunal made out of the sister provinces, and ask that tribunal to give its views with reference to what British Columbia should have. The premiers of the other provinces meet, and the premier of British Columbia puts his case before them, and the next day they meet in general conclave. The premier of the Dominion asks them what they have done, and they say: We have decided that British Columbia, owing to its special position, should have $100,000 a year for ten years. They also had to say that Mr. McBride, the premier of British Columbia, had refused to abide by that decision, had made his claim, and had retired from the conference. There you have the whole thing. Instead of there being any expert examination, any careful looking into the matter by the Dominion government through their financial department, and with the aid of their expert accountants and financiers, it simply amounts to this, that the provincial premiers claimed so much, and the Dominion government came to the conclusion that the easiest way was, as they were in practical agreement, to give them exactly what they asked for, and so get rid of the business as quickly as possible. A four days conference was quite sufficient to clear up this whole matter and lay the burdens on this Dominion for all succeeding years, and it ended in virtually giving to each province what the provincial premiers demanded, and giving to British Columbia, against British Columbia's protest, not what the Dominion government decided should be given, but what the provincial premiers decided would be a fair allowance to British Columbia. In all the history of the rearrangement of financial conditions this is about the easiest on record. Certain claimants want something. They come to the Dominion government with their wants; the Dominion government says, Put them on paper; and then the formality is gone through of putting them into the shape of law and making them operative. From the little detail that has been given us by the Prime Minister, it seems to me that that was just about the course of the operation as it took place. But the Prime Minister asked, what was to be done? Granted that the provincial premiers came to the conclusion that their income was insufficient for their needs, and that they brought that demand to this government and pressed it upon the government, the premier says, what was this government to do? Evidently it did not very long trouble them. What they thought was to be done was to give these provinces just exactly what they asked, with the simple exception of 20 cents per head that was asked for the carrying out of the criminal law in the different provinces. Well, as I have stated before, I think something more was to be done. I think it was the duty of this Dominion government to have made a very thorough examination of the expenditures of those provinces for the last ten or twelve or fifteen years.

In order to see whether, in the first place, there was by these governments a duplication of the expenditures that were made within the province of the Dominion government, and in the second place whether the provinces were extravagant in their expenditures. The Prime Minister might say that we have not the right to inquire into that matter, but when the provinces come to us and plead that their income is not sufficient for their needs and that they must have more, then it becomes the duty of the Dominion government to make a careful and thorough inquiry into their administration. That evidently was not done, but the word of each was taken and the demand of each complied with although there must have been various degrees of efficiency or the reverse in the administration of each provincial government and although the necessities and extravagances of each must have varied considerably. Every province is quite willing to get an extra slice from the Dominion treasury if the Dominion is willing to grant it, but when the provinces come together as a whole and make demands on the Dominion treasury, then the Dominion should see to what extent these demands are due to extravagances of the worst kind and a failure on the part of the provinces to make the most of their own financial resources. If, however, whenever a province gets into deep water financially, we are going to come to its relief, we are putting a premium on provincial extravagance and mismanagement. Instances can be cited from some of the provinces—it is not a pleasant task for one of us to criticise provincial expenditure—in which the most extravagant use of public money has been made and in which they have launched out into schemes for party and patronage purposes, schemes which they never should have touched and which the Dominion government itself, in various parts of its operations, was carrying out. Take for instance the subsidizing of railways. Just as soon as the Dominion began the system of subsidizing railways some provincial governments started the same system in an extravagant, useless and reckless way, as though they had found some new method by which party capital and public patronage could be used to political advantage from a party point of view. Thus we had for some years a ridiculous

subsidizing of railways by some of the provinces. With reference to none of these matters does it seem to me the Dominion government has made any careful inquiries, nor is it able to place before us anything more than the general assertion of the Prime Minister that, looking over the whole field, he thinks that provincial affairs have been economically and carefully managed and that consequently no fault is to be found with the provinces on that score.

There is a marked difference between the Dominion and the provinces as regards resources. Direct taxation is one of the sources which local governments have for revenue replenishing their treasury, but it is not the only one. There are resources within the provinces themselves in the franchises of the different provinces—franchises of great value. These have been differently treated by different provinces and differently treated in the same province under different governmental management. Take for instance the province of Ontario. Up to the time the present Conservative government in that province came into power certain classes of franchises, most valuable, were treated differently from what they are to-day. Take the mines and pulp wood preserves, water-power franchises and the like, you have the province of Ontario to-day, in a little district up in its northern territory, actually making out of its use of the public franchises millions of dollars per year, whilst in other provinces these resources are not husbanded, but are given away for a song and consequently are lost as sources of income. Scattered all over this country, in each of the provinces, there are inestimable valuable assets over which this Dominion government has no control, and from which it can never get a farthing. Over these the provincial government have full power, and out of them, if properly looked after, they can get a very large accretion to their revenue, as Ontario at present is getting. It is quite a mistaken idea to think that all the elasticity in this matter of revenue is in the Dominion and that little of it is in the provincial power. When you come to look at it properly, it seems to me that the Dominion is bounded and limited and that the province are almost unlimited. What has the Dominion? It can impose excise taxes and customs duty. Outside of those two and Dominion lands and some little revenue it may get from its Dominion minerals, there is no elasticity in the revenues of the Dominion. We cannot make the excise and custom taxes indefinitely large. There is a limit beyond which we cannot go, and when we have reached that limit, which must always be a moderate one, the only elasticity there is with reference to the Dominion sources of revenue is increase of consuming population.

Mr. FOSTER.

In every province in its mines, fisheries, timber areas, silver, gold, copper and coal areas there are immense franchises which, if properly husbanded, will for the future work out most profitable sources of taxations and income. So that we must look with caution and reserve upon this general statement that the provinces are limited. The provinces also have that wide field of the income tax and succession tax. The succession tax to-day in Ontario brings that government over a million dollars a year, and as the province grows richer and more populated, that inheritance tax, equitably placed and no great burden, will be a vast source of income. The same statement applies to the other provinces. Therefore, the situation is not so bad as it was painted with reference to the inelasticity of provincial sources of revenue and taxation.

Therefore, I think that this government ought to have made a full examination not only into the expenditure of these provinces for a series of years, but also into their available sources of revenue; and, before immense sums of money were voted out of the Dominion treasury, the government should have carefully pointed out to the different provinces both those expenditures which might have been deemed extravagant, and the need of utilizing all the resources in the great franchise of the provinces as available means for replenishing their treasuries. But the government did not do this, and here we are with this large demand, this great charge placed upon the revenue of the Dominion amounting to $6,000,000 at the present day, and, with the guard of the old census limitation of 1861 taken off Ontario and Quebec, a limitless capitation tax for the future, the only change being that when a province attains a certain population all above that population shall be allowed for at the rate of 60 cents per head instead of 80 cents per head. When we have 100,000,000 of people this tax will show in its vaster proportion, but it is just as burdensome and just as large proportionately for the smaller population as it will be for the larger.

So much, then, with reference to the basis upon which these allowances in the re-arrangement have been made. What may be said as to the next point of question, namely that, as you have made another inroad upon the constitution of the country, and as the way has been not only pointed out but actually travelled, how will you place a barrier which will not be readily passed in future? The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) spoke of this as being a permanent and unalterable arrangement. What element of permanency or lastingness is there in this proposition which was not in any other proposition brought before this House and embodied in Acts of parliament here and in the British parliament?

Mr. SPROULE. None whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. None whatever. In all fairness, let us ask ourselves if there is any use at all, except a blinding use, in applying these terms, 'lasting' and 'permanent' to this proposition which has been placed before us? This will be 'lasting' until the provinces come together again and make another demand based upon changed circumstances and changed conditions. It will be 'permanent' until some government in the future yields to that almost irresistible demand against it and then goes to the British parliament and says: We as a free country having absolute authority over our own finances, ask you to enact that what we have just declared for shall be the law and the constitution for the future. Is it a bar of even a feather's weight that you have to go to the British parliament and ask for that? In certain cases it might be. If it were a question for instance, of the separate or free schools, the British parliament might say: There is a pact upon different lines from this and we must be very sure of the justice and the permanence of the demand before any change is made; or they might absolutely refuse to make any change thus keeping faith with the men who made the arrangement in the first place and who, perhaps, would not have gone into confederation had not that pact been made. But what British parliament will have the right to say to the parliament of Canada when it asks to make provincial allowances of $3,000,000 instead of $2,000,000. Can it say we cannot do it because your present allowance is part of the constitution and it has been enacted by the British House? Consequently these words 'lasting' and 'permanent,' though they sound large and good are not worth a hill of beans—there is not a feather's weight of power in them. This is lasting and permanent until the next raid is made, and until the government of the Dominion again gives way to the raid and the British parliament is asked to change the figures in the clauses fixing the financial arrangement between the provinces.

Now, leaving that, it seems to me that some guards might have been placed. Did it ever occur to the government—it must have occurred to them, for it occurs to every one, and has been mentioned in this discussion—that when you have a spending power that is not under obligation to find the means it spends, you have a spending power that is more likely to tend to extravagance rather than to economy. That is the difficulty in this case. The province of Quebec, let us say, or the province of New Brunswick, spends with a lavish hand and rolls up a debt which it knows it never well can meet. But it does this with sublime indifference to fate. Those in charge of its affairs speak the spendthrift's words: 'It will last our time.' Or, even if they know that in their time the burden becomes too heavy, they say: Well, we can make a raid on their friends at Ottawa and get an extra allowance and so we will even up. And every time this is done there is a greater incentive to repeat it. But, you say, it must be done. But must it always be done? Is it not possible to put some checks on the provinces, that they may not come again and again asking subventions from this federal parliament? I think it is quite possible. For instance there might be a check on the debt-creating power of the province. It is so in the United States. Many states in the union are constitutionally bound not to exceed a certain debt per capita of their population—when they reach that limit they must stop, and when they want to spend a dollar they must find the dollar first. Was there any discussion of such a check in this interprovincial conference, or was the door left wide open so that any of these gentlemen who might be disposed to be extravagant, might, in the next ten years, make another raid upon the Dominion treasury and get what they want? There was another check which, it seems to me, might have been proposed with advantage. When you give a fixed allowance you are in this position: That fixed allowance is enough for to-day; but, ten years from this time the provinces come and say, as they have in this instance, that the fixed allowance is not enough and that they want more. The question is naturally asked: On what basis do you say that you should get more? On the basis that we gave you up the customs and excise, and your customs and excise have increased largely in these ten years, therefore our vested rights in them, so to speak, have increased, and we want an increase in the yearly subvention. Was it or was it not possible that a subvention to the provinces could have been arranged or a percentage plan, giving to them a certain per cent of the excise and of custom revenue, whatever it might be? Then when they came back, as come back they will in future years, that plea would be gone for ever, because, as the customs and excise of the Dominion increased, their subvention would increase as well. There you could make a finality. But with a fixed sum you never can make a finality. Some such arrangement might have been arrived at in order to prevent this everlasting recurrence which I foresee, becoming easier each time that it proves successful, to prevent that everlasting recurrence, finally to the great injury and may be harm to the Dominion of Canada as a whole.

There was another thing that might have been done. Year after year in this parliament we have had questions brought up between the provinces and the Dominion. Take for instance this one. No one doubts in this parliament, and I do not believe a man will be bold enough to deny it, that we are to-day paying for judges whom we ought not to pay for, that in different parts of our country there are judges more than are necessary, and that consequently the public funds are being paid out unneces-

sarily, and in that sense wrongfully. But we are met by the Prime Minister, whoever he may be at the time, with this statement: But we have no power over that. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, any one of the provinces can establish judgeships by legislation, and we have got to pay them. That is not true, we have not got to pay them, but it makes a rather awkward predicament as between this government and a province if this government refuses to pay a judgeship. But that is what practically works out. That question was brought up here two or three years ago when Mr. Fitzpatrick was Minister of Justice, and it was agreed that when this interprovincial conference took place that matter would be brought up with the various premiers, and we would see whether some living arrangement could not be come to by which there should be a redistribution and in the end a lessening of the too numerous judgeships which we have. Here you have had your conference, and I have not seen that that question was brought up at all. What more have you? You have discrimination of the provinces against the charters of the Dominion. You have the overlapping of insurance jurisdiction and consequently of insurance expense. You have duplication in branch after branch of work. You have a Minister of Labour here in the Postmaster General, you have departments of labour in the provinces; and the other day we had in the city of Toronto the spectacle of two commissioners of labour, one for the Dominion and the other for the province, both paid officials, both with their staffs, and both working on the very self same thing in order to make easier the settlement of a strike which took place in the province of Ontario. What in the world is the reason why we must have double labour commissioners, double pure food officials, double health boards, double immigration agents, double fishery officers and a whole lot of duplications in public works? There was a time when the public works line was well defined. There was a time when the fathers of confederation and those who worked after them knew what the line was, where public works were performed by the Dominion and where they were held over for the provinces. That line is absolutely obliterated, and to-day this Dominion government does its public works service on the smallest lakes and the smallest rivers in any province of the Dominion, and even goes so far as to build bridges and the like of that. Now was there any reason why, when this financial question came up for review, should not have had those duplications and overlappings done away with, and that a statesmanlike plan should not have been adopted to have all these matters discussed and settled at the same time, so that you might have avoided extravagance and uselessness in expenditure and might have come to proper terms with the different provinces?

To-day, Sir, a doctor goes from one of our provinces into another, and he is not able to practise his profession unless certain sometimes very burdensome, formalities are carried out. A barrister goes from one of our universities and from one of our cities to take up his residence in another province, and he finds that he is no longer a full fledged citizen of this country so far as his right to practise his profession is concerned. The same with other things. Why was not an attempt made to take up these questions with the provinces and settle them together, and so not only to avoid useless and burdensome expenses, but also avoid difficulties which are not making for the oneness and union of this country? To-day a province, in restraint of trade and against the general trade of the country, gets a narrow revenue by taxing a commercial traveller who comes from another province. The man who starts as a citizen of the province of Quebec finds, when he gets into the limits of another province, the bailiff taps him on the shoulder and says: You shall not do commerce in our province unless you pay a tax. And yet we have not had any settlement of that kind at this interprovincial conference. All these things might have been taken up and a great many of them might have been settled. For here was a golden opportunity, and how easily you could have pointed out to some city or some province that they might now very well forego the few hundreds of dollars revenue that they got from taxing commercial travellers from other provinces, when you were giving them these hundreds of thousands of dollars, and an extra revenue out of the Dominion treasury; and it would have been acceded to. The Prime Minister mentioned some of these in the conference but he had not sand to carry them out. He seemed to be there just to give what they asked and to get nothing in return, not even a guarantee that they would allow commerce and trade to run like the current coin of the realm from one part of our country to the other.

There is one other point I wish to take up. I do not believe that the province of British Columbia had fair justice meted out to it at that interprovincial conference by this government. $100,000 said the provincial conference. Yes, $100,000 said the Prime Minister and his government, and $100,000 it must be for ten years. A pertinent inquiry has been made this afternoon: Will these mountains disappear, will the wagon roads be any the less, will the spaces in British Columbia coalesce and draw closer together after ten years? Despite the panegyric in which my right hon. friend indulged in reference to the possibilities of that country he missed a fine opportunity, when he was quoting Edward Blake, for

whom he has such a great reverence, in that he did not quote Edward Blake in his fine and airy and ponderous characterization of British Columbia some years ago, as an inhospitable sea of mountains towards which it was futile and criminal to direct the rails of a great transportation system and to endeavour to pierce the mountains in that country. Another illustration of the great changes that take place. But, Sir, as I read the presentment of the Premier of British Columbia as to these immense spaces, the difficulties and cost of travel, the absolute impossibility of having railways through most of the districts, and the lines of wagon roads that have to be built—railroads they are in every respect except that you do not put down sleepers and rails but they are costly and the repairs are interminable and costly as well—I realized the enormous difficulties with which that province has to contend. Taking all these into consideration should not the plea of the Premier of British Columbia have merited better treatment and better success than it seems to have attained at the hands of this government? I wonder if it is true after all that Mr. McBride was bowled out from the conference as an inconvenient member thereof, with the idea that he should be followed to British Columbia, that the strength of the Yukon and this government should be united and that he should be run to his political death as a judgment and punishment for having asked for what he believed to be necessary on the part of his province. Whatever the minister may say to-day you have not a final settlement and it would have been worth a good deal more to have had every province into this arrangement of its own free will than to make any arrangement which leaves one great province—the province of British Columbia—one of the greatest provinces of this country—outside of the pale of a satisfied province, a province with a grievance against this country and consequently a recurrent and constantly recurring demand until that grievance is satisfied. What would have been a few hundred, or a few thousand, or a hundred thousand dollars more to having a province fairly well satisfied with its conditions, abnormal conditions, conditions which are natural and geographical to a large extent and which can never be overcome or gotten rid of, and then have a settlement, which, though it may not be permanent and lasting, would have an element of permanency and lastingness about it and one which all the provinces forming that settlement agreed should be speaking in general terms, a permanent and lasting settlement.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister entered so very fully into the history of this question of provincial subsidies and entered so fully upon the principles which govern the application of these subsidies—that I think I should hardly be able to add anything to what has been said, although I think it might be well to offer a few observations in reply to several points raised by my hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). He dwelt at some length upon the points upon which the federal and provincial authorities might differ from time to time. I quite realize that under our federal system of government it is inevitable that there shall be occasionally these questions, especially in regard to the overlapping of legislation. I might even go so far as to say that there would be extravagance on the part of a provincial government; yet, in the discussion of this question of our constitution and the friction, if it might be so called, which arises from time to time, owing to the provincial and Dominion authorities not seeing things in the same light, or owing, in other cases to the overlapping of certain lines of public business where each government is desirous of accomplishing the same purpose, I fail to see that a discussion of all these things is necessary in connection with the matter which is before the House and which relates entirely to the distribution of provincial subsidies. It is necessary for us to grasp firmly the principle upon which these subsidies were granted, and the principle upon which we are proposing to enlarge these subsidies to-day. It is essential that we shall remember that the Dominion was made from the provinces and not the provinces from the Dominion. If we had had one great country with a legislative union and if we had afterwards deemed it wise to divide that country into a number of provinces and to create a federal system, then the central power would have had the right to determine what should be the rights and privileges assigned to the local authorities. But the condition of things was reversed. The provinces existed before the Dominion, the provinces had to be brought together in order that the Dominion might be formed, and the provinces had the right to determine the terms and conditions upon which the Dominion should be created. Now, as a mere matter of political economy, I suppose that most students will say that direct taxation is about the most simple and the most just form of taxation. The student of higher politics will always tell us how much money is wasted in the collection of the revenue by a system of indirect taxation. He will tell us very probably that when a man pays a dollar in direct taxation he is more likely to have a watchful eye on the expenditure of that dollar than if he contributes it in some indirect way, when he does not happen to be aware of the fact that he is contributing it. We will all admit that, but while the student of higher politics will tell us that this is good political economy, the average man in this parliament, the average man in this

country and the average man in the provincial legislatures will tell you that it is a beautiful theory but that in practice it cannot be worked out. If we felt that it could be carried out in this way we would simply abolish our customs taxes and excise duties. We would apply direct taxation. But we know that the people will not accept that way, we know that the people will not contribute towards the public exchequer in the form of direct taxation. When the provinces were asked to become parts of a great Dominion they had the right to stipulate the terms and conditions upon which they would enter, and they determined that they would not accept the principle of direct taxation. They determined that they must receive out of the federal treasury a proper proportion of those customs and excise duties which they were called upon to surrender. The principle of avoiding direct taxation, of raising money not only for the purposes of the Dominion but for the purpose of the provinces as well by indirect taxation was recognized by the provinces from the beginning, had to be recognized from the beginning, one is justified in saying; otherwise, the provinces would not have come together. Had the provinces been told at that time, that though they were not to be obliged at once to enter upon a system of direct taxation, they must expect to look forward to it at an early date, I think most of the provinces would have objected. Although for the moment they consented to a limitation upon the subsidy they were to receive, it is only reasonable to suppose they imagined that with the growth of the country their other revenues would be so increased that they would have been able to carry on their public affairs without resorting to direct taxation. It is not reasonable to suppose—as has been suggested in the discussion to-day—that the provinces entered confederation with the expectation that they should be called upon to resort to direct taxation, in a general form, for the purpose of maintaining their provincial governments and provincial legislatures.

The principle upon which the subsidies were fixed at the time seems to me now, as it has always seemed to me in the past, to be somewhat unsound. The principle of a contribution of a proportion of the federal revenues to the provincial treasury was recognized. But, there seems to have been no well defined principle as to the distribution of that proportion. It might have been done on the basis of population—the population of the various provinces increasing from time to time—but that was not done. The population was to limit it up to a certain point, and it was said to the provinces: You shall not have any allowance for population beyond a certain figure. It might have been done in the way suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) under an arrangement whereby a certain percentage of the customs or excise duties would be assigned to each province. That way was not taken and if we proposed it to-day I do not think it would bring about any different result from that which we have before the House. If it be admitted that the provinces were not expected to resort to direct taxation, but that they were to receive a reasonable share of the Dominion revenues in order that they might make up the loss they sustained in yielding their revenues to the common treasury, then once that principle is acknowledged, it ought to have been acknowledged either on the basis of population without limitation, or, upon a percentage of the customs and excise duties. The question of giving a percentage of the customs duties, if it ever were considered, was set aside, and the records of the debates on confederation do not show that any such proposal was carefully thought out. They did grant the subsidy upon the basis of a limited population. If the principle is good at all for granting the subsidy out of the Dominion treasury on the basis of population, then there should be no limit to that population. You might make a limit as you have done in these resolutions when you come to a very large and dense population, in which case you would not need so much per capita as you would in a smaller province; but I have never been able to see why in the case of the smaller provinces it should be determined that we, recognizing the principle of payment by population, should say: We will give you a share of the Dominion revenues, but the moment your population reaches 400,000 the subsidy beyond that must stop, and you will get no increase. Now, every soul added to the population of a province after the 400,000 limit, adds to the burden of local government. You need more roads, you need more schools, every one of the items which enter into the outlay of provincial government is increased with the increased population of the province. Why, under such conditions, there should be such a limit stipulated, I have never been able to understand. I think the proposal which is involved in this resolution, of a subsidy per head of the population, to continue and increase as the population increases, is a sound one. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says that in future years the provinces will come to us and demand a larger share, on the ground that the Dominion revenues are greater. They come to-day and because our revenues are greater and because there is no elasticity in the present financial scheme, they ask for increased subsidies. Under the scheme now proposed the elasticity which is lacking at present is created; and should they come again we can answer: You cannot demand more subsidy on account of increasing Dominion revenues, for you are getting a larger share now through

increased population. The revenue will undoubtedly keep pace with the population; as the population increases, the revenue will increase and the provinces will receive an increase of subsidy in proportion to their increase of population. That is a sound principle. As I have said, every addition to the population of a province adds to the burdens of the provincial government, and if it is a sound principe to assist the provincial governments at all out of the federal treasury, then that assistance should be based upon population, and without the limitations which have existed in the past and which are now to be removed.

Mr. SPROULE. Where would you be if your revenue was increased out of all proportion to your increase of population ?

Mr. FIELDING. Then the various provinces would get in proportion to their population and I think that would be a fair basis. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) belongs to a province where 'representation by population,' was very popular ; in this case it is subsidy by population and I am satisfied it will work out fairly and justly. I have not made the calculation but I venture to say it is highly probable that the percentage of the Dominion revenues given the provinces in 1867, was greater than is the percentage of the present revenue to be given under this scheme. The increased subsidy we grant to them is not very large, while we all know that in the mean time the customs and excise revenues of the Dominion have increased to an enormous extent. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) alluded to this increase of subsidies as $3,000,000 or thereabouts ; it is $2,342,000, and we might as well have the exact sum. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asked the right hon. the Prime Minister, upon what basis these figures were reached——

Mr. FOSTER. What is the basis ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the answer of the Prime Minister was a fair answer. What was the basis in 1867, other than the understanding among the provinces of what they thought would be fair and reasonable for the maintenance of their provincial governments. That was the basis in 1867, and why is it not a reasonable basis in 1907. There can be no other basis than a calculation as to what is fair and reasonable sum to enable the provincial governments to maintain themselves in a proper way.

Mr. FOSTER. I had particular reference to the principle upon which the fixed amounts are granted. Perhaps the Minister of Finance will explain that ?

Mr. FIELDING. I will have to answer my hon. friend by saying, that it is on the principle of 1867 which had in view the making up from these several sources what might be a fair and reasonable sum. The subsidy which goes to the provinces goes under two heads ; first, there is a fixed sum for each province——

Mr. FOSTER. For what purpose ?

Mr. FIELDING. For the purpose of supporting their legislatures. Then there is a sum per capita, and the two combined form what is called the provincial subsidy. Under the original British North America Act we had these fixed arbitrary sums granted to the several provinces for the support of their governments and their legislatures, plus the amount per capita. There is no means of finding any basis upon which these sums were fixed other than that the two sums united were calculated to meet the amount which it was thought would be necessary for the maintenance of the provincial governments.

My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) had a good deal to say about British Columbia. It seems to me he is particularly sad because we did not get up a quarrel with British Columbia on the subsidy question. He thinks it very strange that the Dominion should have said to the province of British Columbia : We prefer you would discuss this question of an extra allowance to your province with your brethren of the other provinces. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) seems to think there was some particular reason why this government should have been willing to sit in judgment and determine just how much British Columbia should receive. Why did this conference assemble in the city of Ottawa ? What was the purpose of this conference of the provinces, if it were not that they should come together and by comparison of their needs, and their claims and their resources, agree upon a sum which might be asked in the name of all the provinces from the Dominion.

My hon. friend says it is a very easy way of settling the matter. I am glad that he thinks so. It is a much easier way than it would be for this government to undertake to give a lump sum to a particular province, with the result that all the other provinces would be discontented. It is a well known fact that in the past if, for any cause—and I must assume that the cause was a good one—this parliament gave to any one province a sum of money that was not given to another, there was always a chance for provincial criticism to arise. I well remember, though it was long before I came to this parliament, that when an extra sum was granted to the province of Nova Scotia, it was claimed by members representing the other provinces that they were treated unjustly. Reference has been made to-day to the complaints put before this parliament at that time. Which is the better way—that this government should undertake of its own motion to grant a large sum to a pro-

vince and leave the other provinces to feel that they were not fairly treated, or to say to all the provinces: We recognize the principle that you are entitled to a larger grant from the Dominion treasury, but we do not wish that there should be any provincial quarrel or jealousy in this matter, and we ask you to sit down and agree among yourselves, if the Dominion government can distribute two millions or more to assist you to carry on your provincial governments, what the basis of that distribution should be, so that every province will be treated fairly and there will be no provincial jealousy. That is the fairest way; and so, when these provincial delegates came together for that purpose, recognizing as they all did the fairness of that position, was it not most reasonable for us to say to Mr. McBride, as we said to Mr. Whitney, Mr. Gouin and all the other premiers: We want you to assist us in this matter; we want you to agree upon a basis for the distribution of this money; we do not want to go before parliament with a quarrel among the provinces on this subject. We went out of our way a little, I think, to say to these gentlemen that we wanted them to be considerate of British Columbia, and I venture to say that they were. With regard to the fixed sum to which my hon. friend has referred as one of the ways in which consideration can be given to the smaller provinces, I cannot tell the exact basis on which the fixed sum was originally arrived at; but the effect of that arbitrary grant to each province was this, that the smaller provinces received a larger per capita allowance than the larger provinces received. In the existing financial arrangement under which we are paying the subsidies there is a considerable advantage to the smaller provinces, if that fixed sum is worked out on a per capita basis; and that advantage, which British Columbia, with the other smaller provinces, is enjoying, is increased by the new subsidy scheme now before the House, because it will be found that the fixed sum adopted in this new schedule gives the smaller provinces more consideration on the per capita basis than they are now receiving. I think the intention of the fathers of confederation must have been to deal in that way with the inequalities of the different provinces. It is a reasonable proposition that one province with a population of a couple of millions will not need at every point as much per capita as another province with a small population. Just as the proportionate cost of any business is reduced as the business expands, so the great province of Ontario could get along with a less sum per head for certain purposes than British Columbia or Nova Scotia or any of the other smaller provinces. I am sure that that idea must have been present to the minds of the fathers of confederation; and, although we have no explanation of it in detail, I am satisfied that one of the objects of that fixed and arbitrary sum which they provided for in the British North America Act was that the smaller provinces would receive greater consideration by that means than they would upon the per capita basis.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, we have, on the advice and at the request of the premiers of the various provinces, accepted and enlarged that principle in the new scale of subsidies, and under it the smaller provinces will receive a larger sum per capita than is paid to the larger provinces, and I think all will agree that that is a desirable end. I think it is well to bear in mind that British Columbia and the other small provinces already receive similar consideration in the existing scale of subsidies. British Columbia will now receive further consideration in the special grant of $100,000 a year for ten years. My hon. friend asks: What will happen in ten years? Will the mountains disappear? No, but we hope that, by reason of the development of that province, in its forest wealth, in its minerals, in its agricultural resources, in its fruit-growing capabilities, which alone are capable of making it a great province, it will have a population ten years hence which will secure to it, under these resolutions, a large and liberal subsidy, so that it will no longer require that special grant, which it requires to-day because it is a province with a great territory, great physical difficulties and a comparatively small population. My hon. friend thought we should enter into an examination of the financial administrations of the various provinces. I think hon. gentlemen will see that it would be impossible for us to take up an investigation of that nature. The provinces are independent——

Mr. BERGERON. Not when they come for money.

Mr. FIELDING. This money is not paid to the provinces as a favour. The grants now given to them are necessary to carry out the spirit of confederation. I do not think we are in a position to dole out gifts of money to the provinces when they can make a good claim on their merits; and if anything has occurred in these provinces which hon. gentlemen in this House do not approve of, I do not think it is for us to call in question the acts of an independent province. What we might think extravagant, the people of the province might regard as a wise and proper expenditure. For example, the hon. gentleman thought it would be well for the provinces to leave railway subsidies alone, because of the liability of provincial and

Dominion subsidies to overlap. I will not undertake to speak with regard to all the provinces, but with regard to my own province, with which I am most familiar, I can say that if it had not been for the action of the local government in assisting in the development of that province by railway enterprises over and above what the Dominion government has been doing, I venture to say that, small as its population is, it would not have two-thirds of the population it has to-day. There is a mistaken idea in the minds of some persons that the aid granted by the Dominion government for railways is sufficient to secure their construction. I have no doubt that what occurred in my own province has taken place in the other provinces. Hundreds of miles of railway have been constructed in Nova Scotia with the aid and assistance of the local and Dominion governments ; and with all the Dominion has done—although of late years we have been more liberal with our Dominion subsidies—these railways could not have been built if our provincial government had not come liberally to their aid. Therefore I cannot admit that the provinces are to be condemned for having entered on the work of railway construction, for unless they had done so these railways would never have been constructed, and certainly the province of Nova Scotia would not have been able to keep pace with the others in the march of progress. I can say that there is not a mile of railway constructed in my own province—and I am purposely confining myself to that—which my hon. friend, on a careful examination, would say is not necessary and useful for the development of the country. And if these roads were necessary and useful, and if they could not have been constructed without provincial assistance, surely we ought not to undertake to condemn the local government because, out of their limited means, they did the best they could to assist railway enterprises in the several provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the government take into consideration the changed policy which we adopted years ago of giving the provinces subsidies from the federal parliament for building railways because they claimed that the provincial subsidies were not sufficient ?

Mr. FIELDING. That was not taken into account in the rearrangement of these financial matters but was taken into account in the discussion of the railway question, at all events in my own province. What was the attitude of former governments, and I am not drawing attention to this for the purpose of fault finding ? Of course the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway were built as great national roads, but in 1883 the late Conservative government entered on a policy of subsidizing what some call local railways. The grant in aid of these was limited to $3,200 per mile. But there is hardly a road in the Dominion, unless in some exceptionally favoured location, that could be constructed on a subsidy of $3,200 per mile, and consequently that assistance, so well intended, failed to realize expectations. When therefore our government came into power we adopted what is sometimes called the double subsidy. That is to say, up to a maximum of $6,400 per mile, a railway was to receive a subsidy in proportion to the cost of the undertaking. But even with that double subsidy, you cannot get a railway constructed in a sparsely settled portion. If you have a rich district in the fertile Northwest, which has been long settled, and in which there are towns and villages, perhaps you can get a railway built without a subsidy at all ; but in the more sparsely settled districts, neither $3,200 nor $6,400 per mile will secure the road. You need the co-operation of both the local and Dominion governments in order to get a railway through such a section. I give these illustrations from my own province, but no doubt they apply equally to others. To say, as a matter of principle, that a local government should not subsidize railways is to take a mistaken point of view.

The other point made is on the question of permanency. How do we propose to make this final ? Well, all a man can do, in any event of life, is the best he can. Any legislation of the parliament of Canada, whether we used the word 'final' or not, of course we can from time to time amend. But by these resolutions it is proposed that an imperial Act shall be passed providing that, for the purposes mentioned in section 118 of the British North America Act, which deals with the subsidies to the provincial governments and legislatures, the sums therein proposed shall be final. Therefore we do everything possible to make the arrangement final. Can we get over that ? Yes. Even after you get an Act of the imperial parliament saying that this is final, this parliament may from time to time grant moneys for some other purposes and give them to the provinces. I frankly admit that. I venture to say that for the purposes set forth in section 118 of the British North America Act this parliament, after the enactment of this amendment by the imperial parliament, would not grant additional sums. But though we might not grant them in that direct form, we might grant them in some other way. I do not believe we can devise any means which could prevent the people and parliament of Canada spending their own money in the way they may deem most advisable. If therefore, in the face of an imperial enactment, this Dominion parliament should see fit, for one reason or another, to make some special grant to any particular province, nothing that we or the imperial parliament can do will prevent

it. But inasmuch as there have been differences in the past owing to provincial jealousies over the provincial subsidies, we have thought it well to make some effort to have the present arrangement made final, in so far as it is possible by human effort to do so, and we have undertaken to do this by asking the imperial authorities to declare that the sums granted the several provinces for certain purposes shall, for those purposes, be final and unalterable.

Mr. BERGERON. I was astonished when I read the resolution we are now discussing. Of course we have had provincial conferences held with the object of obtaining an increase to provincial subsidies. The first took place in 1887. Then there was one in 1902. The first one took place in the city of Quebec, under the leadership of the late Mr. Mercier and all the provincial premiers attended it. But I do not think I am wrong in saying that at that time no one took the demands of the different provincial premiers seriously. If I remember well the province of Ontario, although then well represented by Sir Oliver Mowat, did not expect that these demands would materialize. The whole thing was looked upon, in the province of Quebec at any rate, as a political move on the part of Mr. Mercier directed against the Ottawa government rather than anything else, and it must have been so considered for a long time even by my right hon. friend, because, although he was then a member of this House, he never directly or indirectly made any move here in that direction although it would have been easy for him to have proposed a resolution to that effect calling on the Dominion government to meet the demands of the provincial premiers. However the movement was not looked upon seriously. Nor was it looked upon any more seriously in 1902. It was not until last summer—and I do not want to insinuate that my right hon. friend gave way before the threats of Mr. Gouin—that any one believed the matter would ever come before parliament. As far as the province of Quebec is concerned, I view with a great deal of alarm any attempt to amend the British North America Act.

I am sorry that it should come from the Prime Minister who hails from that province. The amount of money immediately involved, of course, is a secondary consideration. For my part, I am not convinced that the provinces are in such need as has been said this afternoon, and so I think the question is placed upon a false foundation. Now the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) spoke a great deal about what the provinces asked and what they desired, and what they wished, in 1867. I have heard the Liberals on the hustings for the last thirty years, say that the provinces had never been consulted when confederation was established. Confederation was made by the great public men of the day, Liberals and Conservatives, meeting together. I do not find fault with their work—it was a good work. They determined to bring the provinces into one Dominion. That was a good object. But they did not consult the provinces about it. I have often heard a gentleman whom the older members of this House well remember, Mr. Mitchell, speak about his experiences, when he was charged with bringing into confederation the province of New Brunswick in which the government was beaten. Nova Scotia came in against her will. Quebec was not consulted, nor was Ontario. But it was decided that these four provinces should become the Dominion of Canada. When the confederation was framed certain powers were given to the central government and others to local legislatures. But any one who reads with attention the confederation debates will see that, in spite of their differences, all the men there had the same idea—that confederation must be established. Some of the fathers of confederation wanted a legislative union —one government for all the provinces. I think they were wrong. Others wanted the federal system. But, reading the speeches of Mr. Brown, Mr. Dorion and others who favoured a federal union, we find that even they designed that the local legislatures should not be parliaments and should not be expensive. Each province was allowed its separate autonomy, but Mr. Brown said, and so did Mr. Dorion, that the local legislatures were supposed to be economical, they were to have a small membership and their sessions were to be short. Even to-day, after forty years, the Quebec legislature sat, this year, only about five or six weeks, and if they sat regularly the whole week, they could get through their work in less time than that. But the provincial governments have grown expensive. They have created debts. According to the intention of the fathers of confederation the provincial governments were not to run into debt. It is true, they were granted a few dollars of revenue as has been mentioned here this afternoon, but they were supposed to gather their revenue mainly through direct taxation. And there was a reason for that. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has just mentioned it, in saying that direct taxation, as Mr. Holton said, is the best way of taxing the people because they know what their government is costing them and they are more enlightened in their political affairs. It is said that this is an unpopular method of taxation. The fathers of confederation did not so regard it, but looked upon it as the best way for the provinces to raise their revenue. And I think they were right. As I have said, the provinces are not to-day in such great need of money. The Quebec government, the other day, showed a surplus. The government of New Brunswick, which met the legislature a few days ago,

showed a surplus. The province of Ontario has an immense surplus. Why should we take money out of the federal coffers, money that belongs to the people of Canada and give it out piecemeal to these local governments encouraging them in lack of initiative and making it unnecessary for them to find money where it should be found—within the province itself? It is a dangerous policy; we are opening a door which may let in great evils into the Dominion, and particularly into the province of which I come.

Now, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) this afternoon, said, that this would be the end of the raids of the different local governments upon the federal treasury. What guarantee has he of that? It seems to me that these local governments—not carrying the comparison to an offensive length—are like children; give them something and they want more. Why, it began in 1869. Why did Nova Scotia make her demands in that year? There were political considerations which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) probably knows better than anybody else here. There was one man in Nova Scotia—a great man, who had not accepted confederation—who had to be conciliated. He was to come into the ranks of the party then in power, which he did. But to open the door and make his change of allegiance more easy, he was given the opportunity to say that he had done something for his province by winning better terms for it. That was the first raid on the federal treasury. Then came New Brunswick. Ontario and Quebec did not want anything. Mention has been made of what happened in 1884. Quebec did not ask any favour in that year. But, when the Dominion was guaranteeing a loan of $30,000,000 to a great railway company, the representatives of Quebec in this House thought it a proper occasion to demand justice from the Dominion government for their province. They required a guarantee by the Dominion government of the debt for the construction of the North Shore Railway, asking that the same should be done in Quebec as had been done in Ontario where the road from Callander to Gravenhurst was bought. Quebec did not look upon it as a favour, but as a matter of right. Quebec never made any raid upon the Dominion treasury. But so far as these raids are concerned the Prime Minister has no guaranteee in making this arrangement with the provinces, that the provinces will not come at some future time demanding more. I have said that the local legislatures are too costly. Of course, all we are looking for, whichever side of the House we may occupy, is the good of this country. My opinion is that there are too many politicians in Canada. This country is over-governed. The local legislatures have too large a membership. In Quebec for instance, they have seventy-three or seventy-four members. I am convinced that fifty members could represent that province in the local legislature perfectly well, and the same proportion would be enough for the other provinces. These gentlemen are paid an indemnity. I do not begrudge them that. But, when that question was mentioned at the time of confederation, the indemnity of the local legislatures, was put at the lowest possible figure, and it was declared that the less they were paid the better it would be because they would make their sessions shorter and would to their work better. All this has been changed and the representation in the different provinces has become expensive.

Now there is a danger of over government in this country. The people some day may find that they are too much governed. They might come to that conclusion, particularly if the politicians continue to be like those we have seen, who are ready some of them to offer resistance to the Dominion government if it does not yield to their demands. Some day the people of this country might rise and say: We have too much of that. And I ask my right hon. friend, because I imagine he has the same opinion on that subject that I have, where would we be in that event? If we have to-day the federal system it is due entirely to Quebec, who demanded it. Sir George E. Cartier made a fight on that question and carried his point, contending that Quebec was in a different condition from the other provinces. I said a moment ago that our different local governments are too costly. I want to give my right hon. friend one example; it is a small example, but by small things we can judge bigger ones. Take the way the criminal courts are administered in the province of Quebec. There was a term of the criminal court in my county the other day and there were three Crown prosecutors paid at the rate of $20 a day for a term lasting one month. There were four cases, two were abandoned, one was judged, and one was declared not guilty, and that term lasted nearly a month. People who see these things are scandalized. The right hon. premier may say: The provinces can change that if they like, they have their destiny in their own hands. Well, we know how this is done. We know that to-day when the patronage is at the disposal of the federal government, people are far from doing whatever they want. There is another thing. Take our own government in Quebec. As soon as the session is over, although it is a short session lasting six or seven weeks, the ministers all have to make a trip, I suppose for the benefit of the province. They go around promenading here and there at a cost of $2,000 or $4,000 to the province. All these things involve expense but never mind, it is the Dominion government which provides the revenue. It is finding the money to give with the right hand and with the left hand it hands it over to the local government. I know it may be said to-

morrow, particularly by the papers in our own province, that when they get money from the Dominion government it is like getting a present. People are looking for expenditures in their own counties for building wharfs and public buildings. They say: The more we can get out of the government the better for us—just as if the Dominion government did not belong to them, and that it was not their money that was being spent. Some will say there is an opposition in Ottawa opposing such a scheme. It is true I oppose it because I believe it is bad in itself, it is particularly bad for us in Quebec. The more money you give to the local governments the longer you will prevent them from resorting to direct taxation, and only in that case will the people realize where the money comes from and where it goees.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). The subject of this address contemplates a step of great importance. Not only does it alter the basis under which the provinces came into the confederation, but it is supposed, from the remark of the premier, to afford relief to the various provinces in regard to money matters for all time to come. The step I think is in some respects a very necessary one. The promoters of confederation were no doubt wise men in their day, but we can see now that with all their ability they could not foresee the events of the present day, and the necessities of the provinces that have arisen during the past forty years. I believe that new situations will arise in the future. The Prime Minister said this is going to put an end to all coming back to Ottawa. The provinces have been coming back and coming back, but this is going to be the final coming back. Well, I think that circumstances will arise in the future that will call for a new readjustment, when the wealthier provinces will be asked to assist those who are poorer. I believe that long before another forty years elapse some of the provinces will becoming back here calling for readjustment and aid. For instance, it has been pointed out to-day that British Columbia is going to get $100,000 extra indemnity because she has some peculiar disadvantages to overcome. It has also been pointed out that in the next ten years the resources of British Columbia will be bringing her in untold wealth, and that she will not need any more assistance. I believe that is perfectly true. But it will not be true of some other provinces like Prince Edward Island and Manitoba, who have no timber resources, who have no mines, and who will not be gathering revenues internally as some of the other provinces will be doing. Right down in Nova Scotia to-day the revenues coming in from their coal mines amount to $643,657 a year. Other provinces like Prince Edward Island have nothing to fall back upon, but the aid they get from the central government and from direct taxation. All the provinces of the Dominion however have found that the revenues granted them from the central government at the time of confederation have not proved sufficient, and they are now coming back for a more equitable distribution of the funds to relieve their needs. As the memorial points out, the revenues allowed to the various provinces under the terms of union have not proved adequate for the carrying on of the local administrations without unduly burdening their existing resources. This address is supposed to suggest a remedy, which the Prime Minister says will be a final remedy.

Now I want to speak particularly as regards the province of Prince Edward Island, and before going into details I want to refer to the history of these provincial conferences. The first conference was held in 1887. Resolutions were drawn up by representatives of all the provinces except Prince Edward Island. Her case was not put forward at all. At that time she was allowed $70,000. There was not even a provision made at that time for the payment of a per capita allowance such as was given to her by the terms of confederation, although Manitoba and British Columbia which came in under precisely the same wording in their terms of union were looked after. Again in 1902, another conference was held and upon this occasion the representatives of Prince Edward Island were present. They apparently made no special claims for Prince Edward Island and the per capita allowance under the terms of union were not protected. But, we find that British Columbia and Manitoba were looked after. In 1906 another conference was held, and our representatives, Hon. Mr. Peters and Hon. Mr. Hughes were sent up with resolutions from their local government authorizing them to accept certain conditions. The conference was held in the city of Quebec. The resolutions of this conference were affirmed with certain amendments in the local assembly of Prince Edward Island. I quote from the legislative assembly reports of Prince Edward Island, April 9, 1906:

Whereas, a conference was held in the city of Quebec on the 18th, 19th and 20th of December, 1902, of representatives of the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba, duly accredited by the respective governments of those provinces at which the resolutions reproduced in the annexed schedule were passed, and so on.

(c) The population as ascertained by the last decennial census to govern except as to British Columbia, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island, and as to these provinces the population to be taken to be that upon which under the respective statutes and terms of union in that behalf the annual payments now made to them respectively by the Dominion are fixed until the actual population is by the census ascertained to be greater and thereafter the actual population so ascertained to govern.

This is reciting the resolutions as passed at that conference and reaffirming them in the local legislature while amending them so as to include in the per capita representation the protection of Prince Edward Island. We find that at this conference of 1906, Mr. Peters and Mr. Hughes made no attempt to protect Prince Edward Island in regard to per capita representation, although resolutions were passed putting in Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta and again leaving out Prince Edward Island. There has been a great deal of dissatisfaction in Prince Edward Island in regard to what was done by the then leader of the government, Mr. Peters. He, in fact, claimed that the interests of the Island were protected. If any body will read over the main address before the House he will see that the section (b) does not protect Prince Edward Island in regard to her per capita allowance. For that reason I put upon the order paper of last Friday a resolution in the following words :

In the case of Prince Edward Island, the population to be taken to be that upon which under the law, in that behalf, the annual payments now made by the Dominion are fixed until the actual population is by any census ascertained to be greater, and thereafter any increase of population so ascertained, to govern.

This is practically reaffirming the terms under which we came into confederation, and which the right hon. First Minister has said to-day means that we shall be paid on the maximum population at any time until our population reaches 400,000 ; that is to say we shall never have a decrease in the per capita allowance but we shall always have an increase. Now, the right hon. First Minister has seen fit—I presume because there has been such a protest in Prince Edward Island because the terms of confederation were not protected by our representatives—to introduce an amendment to the main resolution which will protect the interests of Prince Edward Island in this regard. I might also point out that the Hon. Mr. Peters, on February 25, 1907, in the House of Assembly of Prince Edward Island, said:

A great deal of misapprehension exists as to the constitution of the conference. Sir Wilfrid Laurier called together all the local premiers. The premiers were among themselves to discuss their claims, come to a conclusion about them and then present them. When these subjects had been discussed we sent for Sir Wilfrid. As strongly as I can I want to impress upon this honourable House how this conference was constituted.

The question before the conference had nothing to do with per capita. The question was what each province was to get for a specific subsidy. Before the conference met we knew what we got—$30,000. After the conference had closed it was agreed by every province that we should get an increase of $70,000.

The question of eighty cents a head on population was not discussed except incidentally.

It seems to me that it is a very strange statement for one of our representatives to make when he says that the question of the per capita representation was not discussed at all. It apparently was not in the hon. gentleman's mind because he did not see fit to protect the interests of the province with respect to the allowance that we were getting under the terms of confederation since he was allowing some $5,000 to slip away from the province. It appears to me that from the large amounts that are going to be handed over to Quebec, Ontario and every other province except Prince Edward Island, the per capita allowance is one of the most important things that could be dealt with at the conference. The only sop that was held out to Prince Edward Island was the miserable $70,400 that does not even wipe out the annual recurring deficit in Prince Edward Island. Hon. Mr. Peters further said that the great question was :

The great question was, what shall you get for the support of government and legislation. I do not know how it was arrived at we got $30,000 formerly ; it was based on estimates. At the time we went into confederation it was impossible to decide what the amount should be. Well, time rolled on ; the amount was found not sufficient. But we got along on the $30,000, and are proud to say that the province improved. Then a lot of influences converged to put us in a position to go and demand as a right that which, if we stood alone we would have had great difficulty in obtaining. It was necessary to have the goodwill and the good-fellowship of the other provinces, and we did have it.

The eighty cents a head was granted on account of our giving up our customs and excise. I want to remark here in passing that we gave up in customs and excise to the Dominion of Canada, figuring at the present time on basis that our population is one fifty-second part of the population of Dominion, over $1,115,000 and taking all sources of revenue into consideration we gave up over $1,500,000 and we get back some $211,000 on account of cash subsidy and $500,000 more in other items. But the difference between which we pay and which we receive in return is a large and increasing drain upon our resources. In this regard our payments and liabilities in the confederation are large and we get a very small return. The specific subsidy was granted for government and legislation, and Prince Edward Island got the very small allowance of $70,000 a year. I wish to point out to this House that the gentlemen who represented Prince Edward Island at these conferences did not represent the views of the legislature nor did they represent the views of the people of that province as regards the claims of Prince Edward Island to further consideration. At the conference of 1906, neither of the gentlemen representing Prince Edward Island put forward the

claim to our original per capita allowance, nor did they put in any amount for special claims under clause (c) in return 29a which reads as follows:

Resolved—1. That the subject-matter of the resolutions adopted by the conference of the representatives of the several provinces, held at Quebec in December, 1902, and which were shortly thereafter presented to the government of the Dominion and which were ratified by the legislatures of the then existing provinces, except that of British Columbia, be now pressed upon the government of the Dominion for immediate and favourable action, under reserve of the right of any province to now submit to such government memoranda in writing concerning any claims it may have to larger sums than those set out in the said resolutions, or to additional consideration or recognition.

I have here the minutes of the proceedings of the 1906 conference, printed in pamphlet form and handed to the members of the local legislature by the Hon. Mr. Peters, and I find from it that Mr. Peters advanced no claim for any special amount for Prince Edward Island, and appeared satisfied to sanction the small allowance of $70,000 as a full settlement of our claims for all time to come, as the First Minister says to-night. I repeat that neither did Mr. Peters nor the Hon. Mr. Hughes represent at that conference in any sense the real views of the legislature and the people of our province.

Let me point out that the province of Prince Edward Island is now in a serious financial condition. The total debt of the province on September 30, 1906, amounted to $805,853; whereas twenty years ago the debt of Prince Edward Island was less than $10,000. Twenty years ago Prince Edward Island paid $615 annual interest on her debt, whereas this year Prince Edward Island will pay in the neighbourhood of $40,000 interest on her debt. Sixteen years ago Prince Edward Island collected no taxes, but last year the provincial government collected in taxes some $90,000. Twenty years ago the total annual expenditure of the province was $263,000, and last year it was $360,000. The House will readily see that the financial situation of the province is getting to be serious. We began with no public debt in 1879, and we have now a public debt of $805,853. We have recurring annual deficits for the past twelve years of some $45,000 a year. The following figures will show what the condition is.

The receipts and expenditures for the last four years are as follows:

	Receipts.	Expenditure.	Deficit.
1902	$324,670 37	$336.792 48	$ 12,122 11
1903	318,766 17	339,238 11	20,471 94
1904	307,730 50	375,880 13	68,149 63
1905	313,445 02	359,561 99	46,116 97
1906	258,234 90	286,196 44	27,961 54

Mr. LEFURGEY.

Deficit, 1904	$ 68,149 63
Deficit, 1905	46,116 97
	114,266 60
Average deficit for the two years	57,133 30

On account of the Hillsborough bridge which will connect two parts of the railway system on the island, and which should have been built and paid for entirely by the Dominion government, $9,750; we will have also an increase in the interest on the public debt amounting to $2,500. This means that for next year we will possibly have a deficit of $69,383.30. At the conference in 1906, the Hon. Mr. Roblin proposed, seconded by Hon. Mr. Peters, that the commercial travellers' tax be done away with. Now, this tax is largely in restraint of trade, and it is a great shame that the finances of the province are so depleted that the provincial government had to resort to such taxation. It was apparently understood, however, at this conference that if Mr. Peters got this great big sum of $70,000 a year for Prince Edward Island the province would wipe out the commercial travellers tax. This tax amounts to about $7,500 a year, and if it is abolished that would leave a probable deficit next year of $76,883.30. Therefore, the $70,000 which Mr. Peters accepted to relieve the financial condition of the island will leave us with a net deficit of some $7,000 a year to begin with. Prince Edward Island never had enough money from the time she entered confederation to carry on the affairs of the province, and we were absolutely without any resources unless we resort to direct taxation.

We did carry on the government of Prince Edward Island for a number of years without taxation, but with skimping every needed improvement on the island. We at that time drew $200,000 from our capital account at Ottawa, $109,567 in windfalls for piers and other things that tided over the situation, and later we added to our revenue some $50,000, part of it for non-fulfilment of the terms of union with regard to winter communication. We have been dragging on in this half-hearted way, the province not being able to progress. I may say for both the Liberals and the Conservatives, that the provincial administrations of Prince Edward Island cannot be charged with great extravagance. The whole trouble is that we have never had the money to spend. British Columbia and Ontario present cases of large expenditures along lines of different improvements; but they had the money to spend. Prince Edward Island needed these improvements. Prince Edward Island has been forced to be entirely too economical for its own growth. If you take the financial statement of the province of Nova Scotia just issued, you find that that province, out of

its revenues, has been able to expend in 1906: on capital account, $817,692.21; on bridges, $113,773.67, and on the Halifax and Southwestern Railway, $692,119.34. Both these last items are valuable assets to the province. Nova Scotia expended on agriculture, in 1903, $36,900, and in 1905, $55,677.29, an increase of $18,777.29; New Brunswick is in very much the same situation, while Prince Edward Island has been able to expend in the year 1906 on capital account only $22,061.57; on bridges, only $4,671.85, and on agriculture, though it is above anything else an agricultural province, only $4,507.69. The result of all this has been that the province of Prince Edward Island has had to resort to direct taxation. We have now a tax on our land, an income tax, a commercial travellers' tax and a tax on banking institutions. We have exhausted almost every available resource for taxation; and yet, with all these taxes, we are up against an annually recurring deficit averaging in the past twelve years some $45,000, and in the past two years, $57,133. And yet the representative of Prince Edward Island, the Hon. Mr. Peters, comes up here to a conference to seek for a remedy, and accepts $70,000 in lieu of all we need. The hon. First Minister says he wants this to be definite, and he wants us to approach the subject in a spirit of fairness, so that we may put the provinces in such a financial position that they will be able to meet their local requirements, and will not be coming back to this parliament year after year. Does the right hon. First Minister mean to tell this House, in face of the case I have presented to-night, the facts of which he can verify in the blue-books, that the province of Prince Edward Island is going to be satisfied with $70,000 a year, with no possibility of an increase in the per capita allowance, while every other province of the Dominion gets from $137,885 up to $789,484, which sums will be growing greater each year? The right hon. gentleman sanctions an alteration of the British North America Act for what purpose? To deal equitably with the provinces; and yet he gives to the wealthiest province of the Dominion, the province of Ontario, $789,434.80, and to Prince Edward Island only $70,000. Moreover, this $70,000 is reduced to very small proportions if you take into consideration the fact that Prince Edward Island is to pay a proportion of this $2,430,000 odd that he is giving to the provinces. The proportion which Prince Edward Island has to pay of this will amount to some $40,000, which reduces the $70,000 to a very small amount to wipe out the annually recurring deficits, amounting at the present time to $57,000 odd. I wish to point out how we stand with regard to education. The amount we spent out of our whole income on education for nine months in 1906 was $126,708.93. We have the poorest paid salaried teachers in the Dominion of Canada. Their average salaries have gone down in recent years, as the following figures show:

Average salary in	1889.	1903.
First-class, male..	$457 93	$336 15
First-class, female..	455 00	202 69
Second-class, male	273 58	236 38
Second-class, female.. ..	205 91	188 60
Third-class, male..	209 03	188 78
Third-class, female..	149 77	144 40

Take this one question of education alone, we are not able, with our present revenue in Prince Edward Island, to keep our teachers at home. We are taxed up to the limit, we have raised taxes from every possible source of revenue, including the tax on commercial travellers, and still cannot afford to pay our teachers sufficient salaries. Year after year they are leaving us for the provinces of the west where they can get larger salaries than we can afford to pay them. One of the great difficulties we have to contend with, says Dr. Anderson, the Superintendent of Education, is the small salaries we pay our teachers. The doctor goes on:

> In every other department of activity the rewards are higher. Consequently young men engage in teaching merely as a stepping stone to one of the more fortunate professions.
>
> Such being the case there is no permanence in the profession. There is a continual stream of teachers abandoning it, while their places are filled by inexperienced youths. Latterly the same has become true of the women teachers. Not only have they chosen to adopt other professions, but the demand for teachers in the northwest and British Columbia has so impresed them by the liberal salaries which are offered that they, and men too, have turned thither in considerable numbers. Manifestly what must be done is to endeavour to neutralize, if possible, the influence of these attractions by largely increasing the salaries. I know that if a minimum salary of $450 for first-class teachers, as principals in first-class schools, and $350 for the principals of ordinary graded schools, were aimed at and reached, the leakage would be greatly lessened.

I could go on through almost every item of expenditure to show what difficulty we have on the island in conducting our public affairs. Our members are paid practically nothing for their legislative duties. Our roads and bridges are in many cases not up to the standard of those in the other provinces. In nearly every item of expenditure, our province is literally starved. Therefore, as a representative of that province, I have to condemn this address absolutely and in no particular representing our wants and needs.

If you will take the difference in the expenditure of the province of Prince Edward Island, when it came into confederation and compare that with the expenditure in 1905, you will find considerable increases in

almost every line. Let me draw attention to the following statement:

—	Expenditure, 1872.	Expenditure, 1905.	Increase.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Education	64,220 26	122,897 08	58,676 82
Public Works of all kinds	74,219 09	94,504 02	20,284 93
Administration of Justice	5,879 06	19,842 54	13,963 48
Legislature	14,437 09	8,827 87	
Executive Council	2,228 21	623 85	
Lunatic Asylum	5,105 44	29,358 19	24,252 75
Poor House	4,983 09	4,207 48	
Agriculture	3,283 14	5,870 17	2,587 03
Paupers	2,846 28	3,788 90	942 62
	177,201 66	289,921 10	120,707 63

This matter should certainly have had some consideration in the address before the House. But there are also other matters. The right hon. the First Minister read an extract from a speech of Mr. Bake, in which the latter said that all matters of whatever kind, all claims of whatever kind, should be settled once and for all and he affirmed this principle. I want to point out that there are a number of claims of Prince Edward Island not settled. There are the claims arising out of the terms of the union with regard to communication. There are the claims arising out of the settlement of the fore shore question. There is the question of representation which will be dealt with in another direction to-night. There are a number of other claims of Prince Edward Island which were never touched upon by this conference, yet the First Minister calls this a final settlement of all our claims. This address might well be laid over and a business conference held. As the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said the conference simply met and shook hands. They met again and passed general resolutions with regard to all the provinces except British Columbia, and then they met again and considered the claims of British Columbia. And from all we can understand, there was very little discussion as to the relative merits of the claims of the different provinces for increased subsidy, and surely none with reference to Prince Edward Island.

I beg therefore to move:

That subsection (a) of paragraph A of the said address be amended by striking out $100,000 and inserting $128,000 in lieu thereof.

I find that Prince Edward Island, when she entered confederation, had the sum of $30,000 allowed her for government and legislation. Under the new arrangement there is no real basis on which the $100,000 is figured. The right hon. the First Minister has acknowledged that, but he said this is a matter of compromise. It is simply a matter of putting down an amount that is supposed to put the province in some way in a condition to meet its obligations. I find that British Columbia, when she entered confederation, had $35,000 allowed her for government anl legislation and that under the new terms she has jumped up to $150,000. Consequently though, there was only a difference of $5,000 between the two when they entered confederation—British Columbia getting $35,000, and Prince Edward Island, $30,000—there is now a difference of $50,000 between them, British Columbia getting $150,000 and Prince Edward Island $100,000. The proposal under this head in the address before us is as follows:

A. Instead of the amounts now paid, the sums hereafter payable yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures, to be according to population, and as follows.

(a) Where the population of the province is under 150,000 .. $100,000
(b) Where the population of the province is 150,000, but does not exceed 200,000 .. 150,000
(c) Where the population of the province is 200,000, but does not exceed 400,000 .. 180,000
(d) Where the population of the province is 400,000, but does not exceed 800,000 .. 190,000
(e) Where the population of the province is 800,000, but does not exceed 1,500,000 .. 220,000
(f) Where the population of the province exceeds 1,500,000 .. 240,000

The next jump, I find is only to $30,000. What I suggest as a fair compromise under this item is that the adjustment should be made in the same ratio—British Columbia with $35,000 at confederation, is to get $150,000, then Prince Edward Island with $30,000 should get $128,570. The other provinces get larger proportionate increases, except Nova Scotia and Ontario—and except also, of course, Saskatchewan and Alberta, but these, as the Prime Minister pointed out were given special allowance in view of changed conditions, since confederation when they were created provinces. Owing to the peculiar situation of Prince Edward Island, there is every reason to believe, the Prime Minister will see the fairness of giving that province at least the same ratio of increase with regard to government and legislation that is given to British Columbia. I desire to make it clear that I do not favour this address as a final adjustment even with this amendment; but, if the address is to be carried, I think the Prime Minister will see that it should be amended under this head as I propose.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.). I desire to speak on the amendment, and claim

the right to speak on the address later on and to move an amendment to it. I think I shall be in order—

Mr. FIELDING. Not unless a further amendment is moved.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I intend to move an amendment.

Mr. FIELDING. On that, the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) will have the right to speak.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I wish to speak briefly on the present amendment and a little later on to speak on the address. I suppose this amendment will be disposed of before any motion in favour of the address is put ?

Mr. FIELDING. Speaking now, the hon. gentleman exhausts his right to speak on the main motion, but he can speak on his own amendment when he moves it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that an hon. member who moves or seconds an amendment to the motion exhausts his right to speak, and if he attempts to move a second amendment will be out of order.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) had better speak on his own amendment. Perhaps he did not catch the Speaker's ruling—that he will exhaust his right in speaking now.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member seconds the amendment which has been moved, he will exhaust his right to speak. If some body else seconds the amendment, the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) will have the right to speak.

Mr. A. MARTIN. It does not matter either way. I listened with a great deal of interest to the leader of the government and the other gentlemen who discussed this subject. This proposition has been a long time—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) but if he speaks now he cannot move the amendment of which he has given notice.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Cannot I move it now?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, there is an amendment now before the chair which must be disposed of before another is moved. If the hon. gentleman speaks now he speaks to the motion and he cannot move an amendment.

Mr. LEFURGEY. He can move an amendment to the amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. This amendment must be seconded before it is properly before the House. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin) is seconding this amendment. If he is doing that he is exhausting his right.

Mr. LAKE. I wish to withdraw my seconding of it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Let me understand the matter. This amendment has been moved by Mr. Lefurgey. I understand that Mr. Lake withdraws his seconding of it. Who, then, is the seconder ?

Mr. FOSTER. I second it.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). As has already been pointed out, the allowance which have been set out in this address have been agreed upon between this government and the governments of the several provinces, with the single exception of British Columbia. Therefore, I take it that it is not to be expected that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will entertain any amendment to these terms. At the same time, I would point out that in this matter, as in most matters that this government has to do with affecting the interests of New Brunswick, that province will suffer a very grievous injustice. I propose, therefore, to attempt to show in what way New Brunswick will be unjustly dealt with by the adoption of the address. In the first place, I would point out the provision concerning that province and its relation—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) intends to discuss something different from the resolution ?

Mr. CROCKET. I am discussing the main motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is an amendment before the Chair. Better discuss the amendment.

Mr. CROCKET. I think it is open to discuss the main motion together with the amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I submit that if we go on discussing the main motion while this amendment is before the Chair, we shall be led into endless confusion. There is the amendment of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) and I think, that we had better dispose of that. Then, if there are remarks to be made on the main motion they had better be made.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I wish to know if it is not competent for an hon. member to discuss the main motion and the amendment together ? One cannot deal intelligently with the matter, except by making comparisons between the main motion and the amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By way of comparison no, but by way of argument upon the main motion. I would suggest that if we do that we may be led into serious confusion. I understand there are to be amendments moved from the point of view of New Brunswick, of Saskatchewan

and of other provinces, and there is one amendment moved from the point of view of Prince Edward Island. Now if you confuse all these amendments I am afraid we will get into a tangle.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not propose to move an amendment, but I desire to discuss the main motion, and I understood from the observations of the Minister of Finance just a moment ago that it was open to any member to discuss the main motion as well as the amendment. I think I am in order in so doing. I was about to point out the state of the law as it affects the province of New Brunswick. Section 118 of the British North America Act, which is the law that is now applicable, reads as follows:

The following sums shall be paid yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures:

Ontario	$80,000
Quebec	70,000
Nova Scotia	60,000
New Brunswick	50,000

and an annual grant in aid of each province shall be made, equal to eighty cents per head of the population, as ascertained by the census of 1861, and in the case of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, by each subsequent decennial census until the population of each of those two provinces amounts to 400,000 souls, at which rate such grant shall thereafter remain. Such grants shall be in full settlement of all future demands on Canada, and shall be paid half-yearly in advance to each province, but the government of Canada shall deduct from such grants, as against any province, all sums chargeable as interest on the public debt of that province in excess of the several amounts stipulated in this Act.

Now it will be seen that under that section, while the per capita allowance to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec was limited to the population as it was ascertained by the census of 1861, the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were each entitled to increase their allowance until the population of each province reached the figure of 400,000 souls. Now the Ontario subsidy was in this way limited to $1,116,872 on a population of 1,396,091, that being the population of Ontario in 1861, six years before the confederation agreement came into affect. In the same way the Quebec subsidy was limited under the terms of the original Act to $889,252 on a population of 1,111,596, that being the population of the province of Quebec in the year 1861. New Brunswick began with an annual subsidy of $201,637 on a population of 252,047 in the year 1861. Nova Scotia began with a subsidy of $264,685 on a population of 330,857. That subsidy has been already increased to $320,000, being 80 cents per head on the maximum of 400,000 souls mentioned in the statute. In the case of New Brunswick that province has not yet reached the limit of 400,000, as the population at the last census was 331,120, upon which the present allowance is $264,896. Under the terms of this resolution therefore, while the provinces of Ontario and Quebec take on no increased obligations with respect to the per capita allowance to the province of New Brunswick, the province of New Brunswick is called upon to pay its share of the increased per capita allowance to Ontario and Quebec. Under the present population figures, the subsidy of the province of Ontario will be increased by $629,485, and the Quebec subsidy will be increased by $429,866, of which sum New Brunswick must pay its share, while the province of New Brunswick receives, so far as the per capita allowance, no benefit whatever by the adoption of this address, inasmuch as it was entitled, and is entitled under the present law, to go on increasing its subsidy until its population reaches 400,000 souls. Furthermore the province of New Brunswick, which in this way receives, so far as the per capita allowance is concerned, no benefit and will receive no benefit by the adoption of the address, except in the remote contingency, I fear of her population going beyond the 400,000 mark, will be called upon to pay its share of the per capita tax to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec on whatever increase may occur in the population of those two provinces to the extent of 2,500,000 on the basis of 80 cents per head, and beyond that population, on the basis of 60 cents per head, without any limit whatever. That I conceive to be a very grevious injustice to the province of New Brunswick. It will be seen I think by the observations I have made that the province of New Brunswick receives no advantage whatever from this resolution with respect to the per capita allowance. The advantage enures entirely to the larger provinces. As representative of one of the constituencies of New Brunswick, one of the smaller provinces of this confederation, I think it is my duty to enter my protest against the proposed change.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman calculated what New Brunswick gets for government and legislation?

Mr. CROCKET. I will deal with that in a moment. Furthermore, the removal of the original constitutional limitation upon the per capita allowance cannot possibly inure, under ordinary expectations, to a province situated as New Brunswick is with its confined boundaries. While we all hope that our population will eventually increase very materially, I do not think the most sanguine citizen of New Brunswick dreams of the population of that province ever reaching the figure of 2,500,000 souls. The fixing of that figure as the limit for the payment of the government per capita allowance, with the provision that beyond that number an allowance of 60

cents per head shall be paid without any limit at all, is a matter which does not affect the case of New Brunswick and which is entirely in the interests of the larger provinces. All we get, I may say, Mr. Speaker, under the terms agreed upon between the government and the representatives of the different provinces and which are embodied in this address which is under consideration, is the increased allowance which is made for the purpose of legislation and of government. We receive an addition of $130,000. Our former grant was $50,000 and now we are to receive $180,000, but I want to point out in this connection that while we receive $130,000 of an extra grant for governmental purposes the people of the province of New Brunswick will be levied upon to the extent of $145,229, being $15,229 more by virtue of this proposed resolution than we receive thereunder. That, I may say, is an imposition upon one of the smaller provinces of this confederation. Worked out to a per capita basis it means that every man, woman and child in the province of New Brunswick will contribute 43·86 cents. 43·86 cents will be levied every year upon every man, woman anl child in the province of New Brunswick to provide for the aggregate of the increases which it is proposed to grant under this address, while the grant that the province of New Brunswick will receive under the proposed resolution will amount to but 39·26 cents per head of the population. That means that every head of a family in the province of New Brunswick will be required to pay $2.19 additional to make up the aggregate of this increase to all the provinces of Canada while for every head of a family in New Brunswick the government of that province will receive from the federal treasury but $1.96. In other words, every family in New Brunswick will be required to pay 23 cents additional every year for the support of the governments of other provinces of this Dominion. That seems also to be a matter in reference to which any representative from the province of New Brunswick has a right to complain and as to which it is his duty to complain.

Another calculation that I have made which perhaps shows more clearly than any other that can be made the injustice which will be entailed upon the province of New Brunswick by the adoption of these terms is that which shows the percentage of increase over the former allowance which was given to the various provinces of the Dominion. I have figured the matter as carefully and as closely as I can and I find that the percentage of increase in the case of the province of Ontario is 66; that is to say that Ontario, under the proposed resolution, will receive 66 per cent more than she formerly did; British Columbia will receive 64·4 per cent more than she formerly did, exclusive of the special subsidy of $100,000 which will run for but ten years; Quebec will receive 62·5 per cent more than she formerly did; Prince Edward Island receives 56 per cent more than she formerly did; Nova Scotia receives 46·7 per cent more than she formerly did; Manitoba receives 43·2 per cent more than she formerly did, and New Brunswick comes out at the small end of the horn with only 41·3 per cent more than she formerly received. So, from that calculation it is very apparent that the people of the province of New Brunswick have a right to complain of the proposed resolution. In consideration of the fact that the province of New Brunswick is one of the smaller provinces of this Dominion, with its boundaries confined, as I have already pointed out, it makes the grievance all the more serious, and I think it ought to appeal to the Prime Minister as something which should be remedied even at this late date and notwithstanding that the delegates of the province of New Brunswick assented to such unfair terms as these. I think no one can read the British North America Act, and especially the provisions relating to the financial assistance to be given to the various provinces, without seeing that it was recognized by the fathers of confederation and by the imperial parliament in the passage of the Act, that some concessions and advantages should be given to the smaller provinces. The hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) to-night spoke of the per capita rate in regard to the different provinces, stating that he thought it would be found that the increases would produce a smaller per capita contribution to the larger provinces than to the smaller provinces, but I do not think that is a fair test of the justice of the allowances which are now being considered, because it seems to me that it was in the contemplation of the fathers of confederation and the imperial parliament that the smaller provinces would require and should be given more per head for the purposes of government than the larger provinces and if a statement were prepared I think it would be found in regard to these increased subsidies that there is but very little difference between the per capita rate as it will apply to the large provinces of Ontario and Quebec and of the very small province of New Brunswick. I think this calculation that I have submitted to the House in regard to the percentage of increase of the various provinces shows that the advantages which the province of New Brunswick as one of the smaller provinces secured in the original terms are now being abrogated and that the effect of this resolution will be to turn the advantage to the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec. If, therefore, this government imagines that the people of New Brunswick will regard this increased subsidy as a boon or a windfall that is coming

to them they greatly underestimate the intelligence and common sense of the people of that province. Even if the scheme were an equitable scheme—and I think I have shown that it is very inequitable, particularly in regard to New Brunswick—there is no particular advantage that would accrue to the people of that province because it will be recognized by everybody that every dollar that this government gives to the province they must take out of the province in taxation. The matter amounts simply to this: that the provincial governments are asking the federal government to levy this additional taxation upon the people of the provinces and to pass that taxation over to the governments of these provinces to be expended by them.

I am aware that direct taxation is very unpopular, and I would not wish to be taken as advocating at this time at any rate the adoption of any such policy in this country. But I do say that it would be far better for the people of New Brunswick if, instead of allowing the government, after squandering her resources by improvident, extravagant, reckless and, I fear, corrupt administration, to simply knock at the door of the federal treasury and take all the money it requires to make good the consequences of such mal-administration—it would be far better if the government whose mal-administration has necesssitated the demand, were compelled to itself collect the additional taxation it requires to make up for its extravagance and waste. Under such a system, the people of that province would be more vigilant than they have been, and in that aspect it would have been far better if such had been the course pursued. I rose chiefly to complain of the injustice which was done the province of New Brunswick in this matter, and to point out how that injustice will work out. I only desire now to express my regret that the representatives of New Brunswick at the interprovincial conference have seen fit to assent to terms which are so manifestly unfavourable and unjust to the people whom they represented. In conclusion, I desire also to express my regret that there is no mention in this resolution (which contemplates an application to the imperial parliament for an amendment to the British North America Act) of any desire to amend that Act in respect to the representation of the maritime provinces in this House. That question has already been debated here, and I think the case which was made out on behalf of the motion of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) was a strong case, to which no adequate answer was made. It seems to me that this is an opportune time, when this parliament is asking the British parliament to amend the British North America Act, to remedy the injustice which has been done the people of the maritime provinces in the matter of their representation here. Before this discussion is ended, I hope to have an opportunity of voting for an amendment which will provide for the inclusion of that subject in the address to His Majesty.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.). This is one of the most important questions that has come before the House this session, and I may say that I have an amendment to offer. In view of the late hour, this subject cannot be disposed of to-night, and if the Prime Minister assents I will move the adjournment of the debate, it being nearly half past eleven now. If the right hon. gentleman does not consent to adjourn, I shall proceed to express my regret that the proposal contained in this resolution is not a full settlement of the outstanding questions at issue between the Dominion and the provinces. The conference paid attention to the financial question, and evidently advantage is taken of the poverty of some of the provinces to throw them a sop, especially the smaller provinces, in order to tide them over their difficulties, and in order to relegate to the background other questions which should have been taken up and decided. I thought my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Hughes) would have come forward with a resolution to increase the representation of the maritime provinces, for I believe it is important that this question should be decided now.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I rise to two points of order. My first point is that the hon. member has seconded the motion——

Mr. SPEAKER. That was withdrawn.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. My second point is that the hon. gentleman is introducing an amendment to a motion that involves the expenditure of public money, and such an amendment cannot be moved by a private member of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. This is worse than the Douma.

Mr. SPEAKER. The resolution now before the House has not reached that stage when it is necessary to obtain the consent of His Excellency.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I thank the member for British Columbia (Mr. Duncan Ross) for coming to my assistance, and I hope I shall be able to return him the compliment some day. My point is that if this year you go to His Majesty asking for an amendment to the constitution and that next year you go to him asking for another amendment on the question of representation it will have a very bad effect. I am afraid the delay means that the policy of the government is not to touch the representation question with their little finger, but to leave it until the maritime provinces get to the vanishing point, when the federal government will come to our relief. That

is on the principle of telling a sick person that you will come to his relief when he is dead. I am afraid that in the case of Prince Edward Island the vanishing point will be reached quicker than in the case of any other province, and I think the Prime Minister should act, and act promptly, to give us relief. Then, again, the question of the fisheries is a very important question. There is divided jurisdiction, and the fisheries of Prince Edward Island suffer more from this divided jurisdiction between the provincial government and the Dominion government than perhaps from any other affliction which this government has put upon it. It is not so many years since the oyster fishery alone of that province was worth nearly a million dollars. There is a far different tale to tell about it now. In the case of the lobster fishery, the provincial government, with one set of officials, licenses a lobster factory; the Dominion government also issues a license; the interests clash and as a result the productive fisheries of the province are going to waste.

Now, what about this distribution? This is a proposition that has been on the carpet for twenty years. Well, one would think that in twenty years the government would have had a great deal of time for consideration. They have been in power only twelve years; so they had twelve years at least to consider the question. The late government did not venture to take hold of it, and I think they were very wise, because the best we can say of it is that it is taking money out of one pocket by means of high taxation in order to put it into another. The question is, are the government doing this fairly? If they are, perhaps no great injury can be done, but if it is not done fairly, then, as usual, the weaker provinces are the sufferers. The maritime provinces under these resolutions are going to undergo a system of drying up, a system of exhaustion. It appears to me to be a case that fulfils the scripture of St. Matthew's gospel, which says that 'to him that hath more shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.' That is what the government are doing; to the larger provinces which have, they are going to give more, but from the smaller provinces which have not, they are going to take away even what they have. I have heard in this House on various occasions that this constitution is a very sacred document, that it is inflexible and unchangeable. The laws of the Medes and Persians are flexible and changeable instruments compared with the constitution of this country—that is, when the interests of any of the smaller provinces require a change. Then it is like the laws of Draco, written in blood, and unchangeable, indelible. But when the interests of the larger provinces require a change, the constitution is so weak and unimportant that it can be changed as quickly as you con snap your fingers. It is of no force at all when continuous communication with Prince Edward Island is concerned. I am going to examine the merits of the proposition which has been laid before us, and I am going to test it on the scale of the amounts paid for legislation, which I will show is not a very even scale. For instance, the lowest amount paid is $100,000, to Prince Edward Island of course. The next jumps to $150,000. That is a great jump; in all the other cases the increase is $10,000, $20,000 or $30,000. I will take Quebec, to which the allowance is $70,000 under the old scheme and $240,000 under the new scheme; nearly three and a half times as much. The allowance for British Columbia is four and ten thirty-fifths as much as before. If four and ten thirty-fifths more were paid to my province, instead of getting $100,000 it would get $128,000, and why should Prince Edward Island be treated differently from British Columbia? In this distribution, which the Prime Minister said was arranged in a fair spirit, is it fair that British Columbia should have $100,000 extra, besides an increase from $35,000 to $150,000, that is over four times as much as she got before, while Prince Edward Island only gets three times and a small fraction as much as she got before? If Prince Edward Island got the same proportion of increase she would get $128,000, and that would be only a small part of what is due to her. But that is not where the greatest injury is done to the smaller provinces. The hon. gentleman who has spoken on the question considers it as it stands to-day, but this is an arrangement which is expected to stand for the next twenty years, and how much will the subsidies be per capita at the end of that time? In twenty years, with all the improvements going on in this country, with the Transcontinental Railway and the Georgian bay canal, Ontario and Quebec will double their population. That will mean that Ontario, in place of getting as she does now $1,746,357, will then get two or three times that much, whereas in twenty years Prince Edward Island will get no more than she is getting to-day. She will get probably less, the premier's amendment will remedy a defect in the address. These conditions, so far as the per capita tax is concerned, are most unjust to the whole maritime provinces. You have increased the area of Ontario and the area of Quebec, and you are now going to give them 80 cents per head on their decennial census up to 2,500,000, after which you will give them 60 cents per head. In twenty years these provinces will receive twice as much as they are getting to-day. The provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, with their large territory, will also greatly increase in population, but what becomes of Nova

Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island in this race? They are not in it. In twenty years our per capita allowance will not be much more than it is to-day. I do not wish to detain the House, but I wish to move this resolution in amendment.

That all the interest charged against the province of Prince Edward Island in its debt account with Canada, on account of railways under construction by the province previous to its union with Canada, be refunded; and that no interest hereafter shall be charged the province for such railway expenditure.

I need not dwell on the reasons I have for offering this amendment. Prince Edward Island did not join confederation in 1867, when it was formed, but only joined it in 1873. The first to come in was Manitoba, and when Manitoba came in no expenditure had been made by its government on railways. Nor had any been made by British Columbia when that province came in. The Dominion government built the Canadian Pacific Railway for British Columbia, and I suppose that province's share of the cost, which was borne by this Dominion, would amount to $50,000,000, so that British Columbia and Manitoba came in without being saddled with a solitary dollar for the construction of railways. In 1873, when Prince Edward Island came in, there was under construction by that province about 200 miles of railway which cost it $3,144,000. My contention is that that amount should be assumed by this Dominion because Prince Edward Island handed over to the Dominion that railway when she entered confederation. Instead, however, this road that cost Prince Edward Island $3,144,000 was handed over to Canada for nothing. Not only that but ever since Prince Edward Island has been paying the Dominion five per cent on that money. The first thing this government did was to charge the province with the building of a railway which we handed over to the government for nothing. It was a huge blunder on the part of the province to give to this Dominion that road which cost the province $3,144,000. The Dominion government has continued from that day to this exacting from the island five per cent on that $3,144,000. Is there any proof required of that? Here is a statement of what was charged against Prince Edward Island:

		$ cts.
1873.		
July 1	Debit against the province for railway debentures issued.	1,324,606 54
" 29	Draft paid on account P.E.I. Railway.....	110,083 33
Aug. 11	Paid on contractor's account Per A. Drummond.....	83,133 00
" 11	Interest on $100,000, unpaid warrants from June, 1873..	493 15
Sept. 17	Paid A. Drummond on railway account.....	143,068 37
Nov. 18	" " ..	135,528 50
Dec. —	" " ..	32,406 35
1874.		
	Paid contractor on railway account	1,072 67
Jan. 19	Bill of exchange on railway account	103,848 39
Feb. 5	" " ..	23,207 30
" 25	" " .	19,511 55
May 14	" " ..	2,160 00
Mar. 23	" " ..	11,818 43
April 16	" " ..	88,340 69
May 12	" " ..	26,108 80
June 19	" " ..	229,725 86
" 19	" " ..	72,590 09
Aug. 31	Baring Bros., on account P. E. I. Railway.....	238,511 83
Sept. 30	Glynn, Mills & Co., on account P.E.I. Railway	106,077 00
Oct. 31	" " ..	89,236 39
Nov. 30	Baring Bros., on account P. E. I. Railway...	84,884 67
Dec. 31	Glynn, Mills & Co., on account of P. E. I. Railway.	140,000 00
1875.		
Oct. 30	Paid Bank of Montreal P. E. I. Railway account..... .	38,815 36
1878.		
Jan. 1	Payment on account of land damages, P. E. I. Railway.	30,355 98
Sept. 13	Paid Hon. G. W. DeBlois, on account of land damages..	8,174 00
1882.		
Dec. 15	Paid Provincial Secretary land damages on account P. E. I. Railway.	375 00
1888.		
July 25	To Provincial Secretary on account of land damages, P. E. I. Railway.....	81 07
	Total.....	$3,144,214 41

Prince Edward Island is the only province since confederation against which a debt of that kind was charged. If British Columbia had been charged the cost of building the Canadian Pacific Railway up to that province, do you suppose she would have come into the union? If Manitoba had to pay the expenditure made on her railways would she have come in? Why is it then, when you came down to Prince Edward Island, you insisted on that province making you a present of her railway? You took the railway, you compelled Prince Edward Island to finish it and put rolling stock on it, and then kept on operating it and charged against the island five per cent interest on the $3,144,000. That is not the way you treated the other provinces. Some years ago you attempted to bring Newfoundland into confederation and you offered her certain terms. Let us compare the terms you offered Newfoundland with those you insisted on getting from Prince Edward Island. I have here a statement of the debt submitted by the government of this country. The debt of Newfoundland was then given in sessional papers No. 2289, vol. 28, at $15,829,834.73. This is the basis of the proposal of union which was made by Canada to Newfoundland. The net debt of Canada at that time was about $250,000,000 or about $50 per capita and there-

fore $50 per head was offered Newfoundland the same as was offered Prince Edward Island. The population of Newfoundland was 207,000 which, at the per capita amount of $50 per head, would represent $10,150,000. That is if Newfoundland offered to enter the Dominion with a debt of $50 per head, it would represent a total amount allowed for indebtedness of $10,350,000. The debt of Newfoundland was as follows:

The funded debt of Newfoundland is	$ 9,116,534 73
And under loan, Act 58 Victoria, chapter 2	1,456,000 00
Floating debt	675,000 00
Amount required to complete railway to Port au Basque	3,620,000 00
Amount required to cover cost of Brigus Branch Railroad	312,000 00
Amount to consolidate liability to Newfoundland Railroad Company, namely, $45,000 at 4 per cent for 22 years	650,300 00
Total	$15,829,834 73

The debt allowed is only $10,350,000. So what proposal did they make? They proposed to deduct the expenditure that Newfoundland had made on her railway. Now the expenditure of Newfoundland on railways was as follows:

Cost of Northern and Western Railway to date, December 31, 1894	$ 4,446,000 00
Placentia Railway	525,000 00
Brigus Branch completion	312,000 00
Western Railway	3,620,000 00
Consolidated liability to Newfoundland Railway Company	650,300 00
Total	$ 9,553,300 00

And the government of Canada, with much greater generosity than they showed to Prince Edward Island proposed to deduct from the debt of Newfoundland all that that colony had spent on railways. Now, I claim, and I think claim fairly, that the treatment proposed to be accorded to Newfoundland, and accorded to every other province that has been added to Canada since confederation, is much more generous than that accorded to Prince Edward Island. The interest charged against Prince Edward Island on account of her railway is more than $155,000 a year, a sum which, if placed to the credit of the province yearly, would put her in finances on a fair basis and take her out of trouble. I think if the matter were left to arbitration, the award would be that other provinces had been more favourably treated, and Newfoundland had been offered more favourable terms, and that Prince Edward Island was entitled to terms equally good. Let me refer to the correspondence with regard to Newfoundland. I have here the 'Journal of the Assembly of Newfoundland' for 1894 and 1895, which contains the correspondence between the Dominion government of which Sir Mackenzie Bowell was the head and the government of Newfoundland. The journal says:

> By references to No. 3, it will be observed that the cost of the railway systems of the colony has been deducted from the net public colony (meaning Newfoundland) has been deducted from the net public debt.

That is exactly what we want for Prince Edward Island—the same treatment that was offered to Newfoundland—and I think we are entitled to it. I think there are many members of this House who doubt that Prince Edward Island paid for railways built by it previous to confederation. Well, if the province was not paid for its railway my resolution does no harm, for in that case Prince Edward Island will get no refund. But if the contrary is proven, we will get the refund. I hope we shall never hear a man saying in this House again that the Dominion built 200 miles in Prince Edward Island, when, as a matter of fact, the province has been charged interest ever since confederation on the money spent in building that road. Here is a letter written by Sir Mackenzie Bowell to the government of Newfoundland:

> When Canada assumed the debt of Prince Edward Island, equal to $50 per head, the island was chargeable with cost of its railway and other items. These amounted to nearly $4,000,000. Canada, it is true, owns and operates the railway, but at a large cost annually.
>
> Canada proposed to assume Newfoundland's debt, equal to $50 per head, part of which was incurred for railways, and in that respect offered her better terms than Prince Edward Island.

The Dominion owns and operates the Prince Edward Island Railway, but Prince Edward Island paid for it. I do not need to detain the House at greater length. I move the following resolution, seconded by Mr. Jackson:

> That the address to His Majesty the King be amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:
>
> That all the interest charged against the province of Prince Edward Island in its debt account with Canada, on account of railways under construction by the province previous to its union with Canada, be refunded, and that no interest hereafter shall be charged the province for such railway expenditure.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the motion designed to be exactly in the terms in which it is drafted?

Mr. A. MARTIN. It is simply an additional clause to the address.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is one amendment before the House, and, unless this is an amendment to the amendment, I do not see how I can put it.

Mr. A. MARTIN. This is an amendment to be moved as soon as the other is disposed of. I thought that under your ruling of a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, the position was that you were going to take the

vote on the first amendment. I yielded the floor to my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) on the understanding that the amendment was to be disposed of and I proposed to move a second amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The ruling was that the hon. member (Mr. A. Martin), as he stated at the time intended subsequently to move an amendment, if he seconded the resolution of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), he could not speak again. However, if this is not intended to be an amendment to the amendment it is out of order at the present time.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to make some observations upon these resolutions. In the first place, I desire to draw attention to the statement of the Prime Minister that the principle upon which the financial distribution to the provinces was made at confederation was not sound, and as an evidence of that fact he reminded us that from time to time special grants had been made to different provinces, but upon no regular or well defined principle, according as pressure from a particular province became too great to resist. He said that was continued up to the present time, and no government seemed to have moral courage to tackle the question and to put the financial distribution on a sound and correct basis until, as I understood him to say, that was done by the present resolution. If that be so, we would expect to find that the basis of this distribution was entirely different from the other, that it was upon some better principle, and more applicable to the various provinces, some with larger debts and some with smaller debts. With regard to the first distribution that was made in 1867, although it was intended to be a final and complete settlement as between the government and the various provincial governments, it did not turn out to be so, because an amendment was made two years afterwards, and we granted an additional subsidy to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in 1869. In 1871 and in 1873 we dealt with Manitoba on a different basis. In 1884 the pressure became so great from the various provinces, under an agitation starting from the province of Quebec, where an enormous debt was being rolled up, that it became necessary to relieve the provinces of their debts and assume some of their burdens. For that purpose, we readjusted the debts of the provinces, and the federal government took over a large share of them. We also gave a consideration to the various provinces for railways at that time, and that was done upon two principles: First, that the provinces were short of money to build railways and could not do it without going too heavily into debt, and therefore the federal government inaugurated a new policy by granting subsidies for building railways. That was done on the ground that the provinces were not able to raise the money except by unduly increasing their debt. Then in 1873 and in 1884 the railway debts of the provinces were assumed; in 1885, in 1887, in 1891, in 1898 and again in 1901 the financial relations between the Dominion government and the provinces were amended, and I think once in 1902.

Now, what was the old principle? The old principle was a fixed sum that each province was to receive for its legislature and government, apparently an arbitrary sum, for it appears to have been based on no principle. Ontario was to receive $80,000; Quebec, $70,000; Nova Scotia, $60,000; New Brunswick, $50,000; Manitoba, $50,000; British Columbia, $35,000; Prince Edward Island, $30,000. Now, the Prime Minister says that was not done upon any correct basis, and I agree with him. Then when we come to the amount of subsidy given per capita of 80 cents per head, the larger provinces that were increasing rapidly in population got no increased benefit, they got no additional amount of money. For instance, the subsidy to Ontario, if I remember rightly, was $1,116,000; that remained stationary year after year. The Prime Minister says that was not done upon a correct principle, and that no government had had the moral courage to tackle the question and put it upon a sound principle; therefore, I suppose we must assume that his government has the moral courage to do so. Now, what is the new principle? The allowance per capita is increased according to the increase of population up to 2,500,000 souls. Any surplus population above that amount will get 60 cents per capita instead of 80. Now how does this new system work out? The whole amount to be paid annually is $2,842,000. That is the amount that we have added to the obligations of Canada annually if this resolution passes. Capitalized at 3 per cent, that amount represents a fixed charge of about $75,000,000; that is to say, we have added practically that sum of money to the debt of Canada. So that we can fairly say that there has been added to the debt of Canada by this resolution about $75,000,000. Now, I come to the province with which I am more familiar and how does it work out in that province? Is Ontario paying more than her fair proportion, or is she paying less, or is she paying only her fair proportion? Ontario's population at the present time is 2,182,000. The population of Ontario represents about two-fifths of the population of Canada. Therefore, Ontario would be obliged to raise two-fifths of this $2,342,000. How much would that be? Two-fifths of that would be $936,500. Ontario would have to pay $936,000 annually of that amount. Now, then, Ontario raises two-fifths, but does she get two-

fifths of the distribution? Not at all. Ontario gets only $789,486, very much less than two-fifths. Therefore, Ontario is not proportionately receiving her fair share of the distribution and that is an injustice to her. When you come to the distribution amongst the provinces of the amount that is allowed for legislation and government we find that Quebec, having a much less population than Ontario, receives not a much less amount, but the same amount. Quebec gets out of this exactly the same amount for the legislation and government that Ontario gets. Ontario raises much more than Quebec, but Quebec gets as much as Ontario does for both these purposes—$240,000. They are both up to the limit in population that entitles them to $240,000; therefore, they both get exactly the same. That is an injustice to Ontario. In regard to how it works for the other provinces I cannot say because I did not have time to work it out, but I know that it is an injustice to the province I represent, that in that regard it is not fair.

Is this a final settlement? It is all very well to put in the resolution that it is a final and complete settlement. It seems to me that it is only at best a play upon words because it has no significance. We know for a fact that the first arrangement of confederation was intended to be a final and complete settlement, but that it did not prove to be such because we changed it before two years had elapsed and it has been changed almost every year or two since. Now we come down to a general arrangement and we are told that this is a final and complete settlement. I remember that when the arrangement was made in 1884 Mr. Blake asked the question if we ever would reach final finality, and it was declared that that arrangement was a final finality. But it was not. We have no more reason to think that this will be a final settlement than we had in 1867 or in 1884. But I am not going to complain because I recognize the fact that there can be no finality in this matter? What is government? Government is only the doing of what is necessary for the time being according to the conditions, the environments and the necessities of the situation, and as conditions change so must we change the laws, so must we change our financial basis, so must we change almost everything. We make a law to-day; it does not suit the conditions twenty years hence and we either repeal or amend that law. The same principle applies to every department of government whether it is in regard to provincial subsidies or anything else. Government is only evolution, and evolution is necessary if government is to be efficient. It has been so in the past and it will be so in the future. I do not complain of that beyond the fact that it looks entirely uselss to put that in the resolution because it can only serve one purpose and that is of deluding the people into believing that there will never be a raid made on the federal treasury again. This is not final and it will not be final.

Is this a fair settlement to all the provinces? It would require a very long analysis to ascertain if it is or is not, and I frankly confess that I have not made that analysis so that I cannot intelligently direct attention to that phase of the question. Therefore, I will leave that out with the single exception that I will make a few observations in regard to the case of British Columbia. I thought at the last provincial conference that the best case that was made out was by British Columbia's Premier, the Hon. Richard McBride, and I frankly confess that I never could see any justification for the absolute refusal to appoint a commission to inquire into the situation and to ascertain whether the allegations as presented at this conference were on a sound basis or otherwise. I thought it was unfair and I never could see any reason for it. I never could reach the conclusion that the proposition made to grant $100,000 a year additional to British Columbia for ten years was a fair compensation taking into account British Columbia's situation in the confederacy, British Columbia's physical condition and the disabilities with which she must always content as compared with the other provinces. That grant only applies for ten years. If the physical conditions of British Columbia were to change by that time, if they found it easier to build railways and to make roads less expensive to administer justice and do a number of other requisites than the present government must do, then I could understand that this would be fair, but because those conditions will remain the same at the end of ten years as they are to-day, and because those conditions which will mean increased cost of production, in my judgment it is not fair. Now, I thought there was another element that was not given the consideration that should have been given it, and that is the fact that British Columbia, owing to her geographical position in regard to the market and the position of the province in regard to her pursuits and productions, she must always be largely a greater consumer of imported goods than the other provinces, and, therefore, must pay a larger proportion of the taxes. She must pay a larger proportion of the customs and inland revenue taxes because of the fact that she is unable to raise or manufacture the products that she consumes. I think that the Hon. Richard McBride plainly showed that she paid more than her share of the consolidated revenue of the Dominion from these sources, and that although she paid a great deal more than her fair share she got

very much less than her fair share out of the revenue that was returned.

I think British Columbia will never be fairly dealt with until there is some allowance made her on that account. The Prime Minister said he would not take the administration of criminal justice into account, but if he desired to ascertain the great disadvantage British Columbia labours under in this respect, he has only to look to the fact that last year we paid $93,000 for the judges of the Yukon Territory which is about $155 a head of the population, whereas the administration of justice in some of the older provinces does not amount to more than 20 cents per head. The conditions in the Yukon are very similar to those in British Columbia, and although the cost of the administration of justice is not so much in British Columbia as in the Yukon, yet it is much heavier in British Columbia than in the older provinces. There is little or no consideration allowed British Columbia on that account except it may be the $100,000 granted for ten years. The Prime Minister told us that this being the result of a conference amongst the provincial premiers it was not for the Dominion government to change it. Well, in the case of the first four provinces that entered confederation their representatives conferred together and agreed upon a basis, but British Columbia did not enter confederation after a conference with the other provinces. Her negotiations were directly with the Dominion government, and because of her isolated condition at that time she was forced to come in, and she had to come in under very onerous conditions. British Columbia has dealt directly with the Dominion alone, and in that respect is in a different position from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario. There are undoubtedly exceptional circumstances which justify the claim of the Prime Minister of British Columbia for exceptional financial consideration. Now I wish to ask the Prime Minister about some of the details of the resolutions which he proposes. The resolution says :

(a) Instead of the amounts now paid, the sums hereafter payable yearly by Canada to the several provinces for the support of their governments and legislatures, should be according to population, &c.

I wish to ask the Prime Minister if that will apply to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. In the Alberta Act there is allowed to the province of Alberta a fixed sum for the support of her government and legislature amounting to $50,000 a year. Will the provision of this resolution which says: Instead of the amount now paid, do away with the provision of $50,000 a year in the Alberta Act?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the resolution proposed by the Prime Minister says :

Mr. SPROULE.

(b) Instead of an annual grant per head of population now allowed, 80 cents, the annual payments hereafter to be at the same rate of eighty cents per head, but on the population of each province, as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census, until such population exceeds 2,500,000, and at the rate of sixty cents per head for so much of said population as may exceed 2,500,000.

The per capita grant to the new provinces is based upon the population ascertained every two and a half years, while this is based on the population of the other provinces taken every ten years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The population of Alberta and Saskatchewan are taken every five years.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but there is an estimated population every two and a half years. Is the per capita grant for Alberta and Saskatchewan to be based on the population ascertained every ten years, or every two and a half years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The saving clause which I introduced to-day as to grants covers that point.

Mr. SPROULE. We had better be sure about that point, and also as to whether the provisions of this Act repeal the fixed amounts given for the support of the governments of the new provinces.

Mr. FIELDING. They would not get both.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask these questions so that we may know where we will stand in the future. I have nothing more to say at present, but I may have something to say at a later stage.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). Early in the evening my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) delivered a lengthy and eloquent dissertation against the principle contained in this resolution. Later on my friends from Prince Edward Island, and my friend from New Brunswick expressed themselves as in favour of the principle of the measure, but complained that the sums were not sufficient—also my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) made some observations in regard to the history of confederation. My hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket) contended that the province of New Brunswick was paying for the large sums given to the province of Ontario. To make out his argument it would be necessary that the inhabitants of New Brunswick should pay into the revenue per capita an equal sum to the province of Ontario. I think my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) answered my hon. friend from York, because he proved that the inhabitants of the province of Ontario per capita pay more into the revenue than the inhabitants of the province of New Brunswick or those of the province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not make that contention at all.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. I think it is true, from his reasoning nevertheless. In place of Ontario being a pensioner on New Brunswick, I think Ontario, being the larger province and consuming a greater quantity of goods per capita, pays to New Brunswick. So that my hon. friend from Grey has an advantage over my hon. friend from York, because his province contributes more to the revenue than does the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. CROCKET. I will ask my hon. friend if it is not a fact that the only way to arrive at a per capita tax of any kind is by dividing the sum you want to reduce to a per capita basis by the total population of the Dominion, which gives you the per capita rate applicable to all provinces alike ?

Mr. WM. ROCHE. No, it is the amount the province contributes to the revenue divided by the population. My hon. friend from Beauharnois made allusion to the manner in which Nova Scotia was admitted to the union. Now some of us in this House have some recollection of that time. I had the pleasure myself of coming to Ottawa in 1867 with the delegates who constituted the confederation. But the delegates from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island met at Charlottetown in 1865 or 1866 for the purpose of constituting a maritime union, and while they were in conference the delegates from Ontario and Quebec came down and proposed to the delegates there assembled a confederation of all the provinces. The provinces of Canada were at a deadlock; they could not carry on government any longer, and it was known that they wished to secure the maritime provinces as a sort of balance and equipoise upon which a scheme of government could be based, and upon which the government of the country could proceed. So the maritime provinces were really necessary for this confederation, and were the principal part of the confederation. A great many people in the province of Nova Scotia and some in the province of New Brunswick also, approved of the principle of confederation, but the people of Nova Scotia were diametrically opposed to the Quebec scheme, and emphatically to the amount of appropriation towards the expenses of local government under that scheme. The people of Nova Scotia resisted that to the utmost of their ability, and when the elections came on afterwards, every man who had taken part in the Quebec scheme of confederation was defeated at the polls with the exception of Sir Charles Tupper. The province of Nova Scotia followed that up by sending a delegation to England to resist the terms. It was not by ageement of those statements in conference that the subsidy to Nova Scotia was increased, but it was because the British government told those men that Nova Scotia must be conciliated. Mr. Howe was the spokesman of the people of Nova Scotia, and the advocates of confederation endeavoured to propitiate him by giving him office and after some time the Nova Scotia members were allowed to go to parliament and vote. In that manner the province of Nova Scotia slipped into the confederation; but the people of the province never approved of it. Let us remember in all these observations that it was not by the original agreement or generosity of those statesmen that Nova Scotia got an additional allowance, but by the compulsion of the British government which ordered those men to propitiate Nova Scotia, and give her a just and sufficient allowance to carry on her government as she had carried it on before. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) rather complained that the local governments had become too elaborate, and that idea was also enlarged upon by my hon. friend from Beauharnois. The fact is that when the subordination and inferiority of the local legislatures was proposed, the conference hung fire and was about to disband until some skilful politician introduced the idea of the elaboration of the local governments, and when they heard that Lieutenant-Governors were to to be appointed, with an elaborate paraphernalia, the confederation scheme went on swimmingly. The consequence was that the idea of an inexpensive local government was set aside, and the modern idea of an elaborate local legislature, with an adjustment of its services on a commensurate scale, was approved. But I think none of those statesmen at that time contemplated the rapid expansion and development of the country. I think none of them comprehended what services precisely would come under the local governments; I think none of them knew exactly how the expenses or the powers of the local governments were to be defined. If they did know, all our lawyers who have been arguing in Ottawa, in Toronto, and in London have very much mistaken the case, and were not enlightened by those who preceded them, for ever since that time the various powers have been contended about, and the amounts to be expended in the exercise of those powers have been in dispute. These gentlemen did not contemplate the development which would take place in this Dominion. They did not know the expansion of its revenue or the cost of those services which were included under the term local government. None of them could know whether the resources which were appropriated to the provinces would produce adequate revenue. Conditions were changing; the value of those assets was changing. Those

which were available at that time have diminished in value since, and those which were undiscovered and remained in the bowels of the earth at that time unknown, have since proved to be of immense value; so that people looked forward to subsequent readjustments as those conditions would change, and the revenues of the local governments had to be increased, either by the federal government or out of their own resources. Who could tell that the fisheries of the maritime provinces would not be as valuable to-day as they were at confederation or that the forests would be cut down? But we know that the demands of the provinces are increasing.

They want better education. In the province of Nova Scotia there are roads to be maintained and many rivers to be spanned by bridges, and the people are crying out for communication from the inland mines to the seaboard. They require ferries and steamboats, and the coast will always demand of the local government a large expenditure for roads, because it is intersected by harbours every ten miles. It must always be an expensive province to maintain. Just as these men did not know forty years back precisely how these resources would suit themselves to the wants of the people, who is to know forty years hence what will the needs be then? It is on this account that we had to have recourse to periodical arrangements. Perhaps the present arrangement may not be final but it looks as if it would last for a considerable time to come. If New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island did not get enough, under the old arrangement, Nova Scotia never did and never will. What province did get enough? Is it Ontario or Quebec? The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule)) made an appeal on behalf of British Columbia, with which we all sympathize, because we all admit that British Columbia deserves exceptional treatment. And she has got exceptional treatment. The province of Ontario has never been awake to its responsibilities in this Dominion. It is a splendid province. It is the centre which binds the whole Dominion together. It may be called upon for greater sacrifices but it can bear them. Its territories and resources are expanding. It has a compact figure because it is compact within itself. Its outlying parts are all accessible from the centre. It is the heart and soul of the Dominion and from Ontario should go out those generous impulse which should spread themselves throughout the whole Dominion; and where there is a proposal like this, which will give some revenue to an outside province, Ontario, which has borne the burden in the past, will bear it in the future and afford not only sentiment but material aid to such a province and cause its heart to go out in gratitude to the greater Ontario.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). My hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) must observe, from the opinions expressed, that he can hardly expect to receive much support for his resolution. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who seconded the motion, suggested that British Columbia has not received the consideration to which she is entitled. The hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) however pretends that British Columbia is getting more than her fair share. If, however, Prince Edward Island be given more, that will take from the share of British Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we vote on the resolution in each case.

Mr. FIELDING. But this resolution is practically to give Prince Edward Island $28,000 more. If that be done, it will place British Columbia, which the hon. gentleman says is now at a disadvantage, at still greater disadvantage.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be fairly possible to give $28,000 more to Prnce Edward Island and also to give an added amount to British Columbia.

Mr. FIELDING. No, because there is a certain sum to be distributed and the question is how are you to equitably distribute it? If you give any one province a larger share of this total sum, then you place the other provinces at a disadvantage. The hon. member for York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket) thinks that New Brunswick is not receiving fair consideration. But if we give a larger proportion to New Brunswick then we place all the other provinces at a disadvantage.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Upon what basis did the hon. minister arrive at the $100,000? British Columbia, which was allowed $35,000 when she entered confederation, is by the new terms allowed $150,000. But Prince Edward Island, which was allowed $30,000, is now only allowed $100,000.

Mr. FIELDING. We have been all over that, and I do not know that I could give the hon. gentleman any more information than he already possesses. I am not discussing this but am simply pointing out that if we give a larger sum to Prince Edward Island and if, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) argued, British Columbia is not receiving sufficient, we will be placing British Columbia at still greater disadvantage.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am only asking that you give Prince Edward Island the same ratio of increase as British Columbia.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend wants to change those resolutions so as to give Prince Edward Island $28,000 more than she is getting. But if British Columbia is suffering a disadvantage by this distribution and you add $28,000 more to Prince Edward Island and give nothing to British

Columbia, then British Columbia is suffering that much more disadvantage.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not see any reason in that. British Columbia had up to the present only $35,000. When she is getting that increased to $150,000, she cannot make any complaint if Prince Edward Island is treated in the same ratio.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not arguing the question of ratio. It is argued that British Columbia is not getting fair consideration.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Who is responsible ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think she is getting fair consideration, but the hon. gentleman wants to place her at a greater disadvantage by giving this extra grant to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. No.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it is a question of proportion.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I want you to figure it out as a question of proportion.

Mr. FIELDING. I take the facts as they are. You want to increase the vote to Prince Edward Island alone.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It has been stated that the increase is arbitrary. If Prince Edward Island is not getting enough, why not give an increase to Prince Edward Island regardless of any other province ? If the minister thinks she should have it, why not give it to her ?

Mr. FIELDING. I rather think she should not have it, but if I thought she should, the effect would be that all the other provinces to a small extent would be placed at a disadvantage.

Mr. FOSTER. I see the point my hon. friend is aiming at. It is as though the resolution were based on a proposal by the Dominion government to distribute $2,300,000, which total cannot be varied. If therefore you add $28,000 to Prince Edward Island, it must come off some one else or all the others. But I am not looking at it in that light. I am looking at it in this light. You propose that certain amounts shall be distributed according to population. Those who aggregate a certain amount which, added to the rate per capita, amounts to about $2,300,000 of an increase. The whole thing amounts to about $6,000,000. But it is nowhere stated in this resolution that $6,000,000 shall be granted and no more. If $28,000 more is given to Prince Edward Island and $100,000 more to British Columbia it only operates in this way, that the total amount is no longer $6,000,000 but $6,000,000 plus $100,000 plus $28,000. All you have to do is to add to the amount; and, if parliament directs that the amount shall be increased by $28,000 that Prince Edward Island may get that, and by $100,000 that British Columbia may get that, the government can easily do it. There is no sum of $6,000,000 voted and not to be increased. In fact, it is to be increased. It is only $6,000,000 to-day, but when the per capita allowance is to be paid on the added population, it will be more than $6,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING. Then, according to the argument of the hon. member (Mr. Foster) if we propose to give an additional $400,000 to any province it would make no difference to any other province. But every other province would say that it was affected injuriously by such an arrangement, in that the favoured province received an addition while it received no addition. Take, for instance, the calculation of my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket). He takes the total sum and reduces it to a per capita basis, then calculates what New Brunswick is to get, reduces that to a per capita basis, and says : You are giving New Brunswick less than she has to pay, and so putting her at a disadvantage. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman's figures ; I think New Brunswick is receiving fair consideration. But his estimate of the figures shows that if you give one province more than the scheme proposes you disturb the basis of agreement between the provinces ; and though, in the case of Prince Edward Island it may be only $28,000, yet by agreeing to it, you are placing every province at a disadvantage as compared with its position in the scheme now before the House. Do I make myself clear ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) makes himself more than clear. If the proposition is proved, as I think my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket) proved his, and as my hon. friend from Prince, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) proved his that you are dealing not justly, not on an equitable basis, with the provinces these gentlemen represent, you make it clear that the government is determined to put through a scheme which is not based on equity.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree that these hon. gentlemen have made that clear. But, I hold the view that on the question of the distribution in respect of provincial subsidy among the provinces, the best judges of the equities as between the provinces must be the governments of the several provinces themselves. And, if these governments themselves, being the parties most interested, assemble and assuming a certain sum to be distributed, say this is a fair proportion to each province, it is hardly open to any hon. gentleman to come here and say that this government is treating any province unfairly.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The argument of the hon. Minister of Finance amounts to this : He brings down to this House an inequitable agreement, and tells this House that

this must go through without change and that all the discussion upon it is mere talk. The representatives of the provinces assembled and agreed upon these amounts, and this House has no authority to change them. That is the hon. gentleman's argument.

Mr. FIELDING. I am going to help my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) by admitting that, practically, that is my argument. Of course this parliament, before passing an address to His Majesty, may add to or take from what is proposed whatever it pleases. But it must be remembered that these resolutions are not being originated by this government; they practically form a treaty among the several provinces of the Dominion. While we may change the verbiage of the resolutions, it would be highly improper to change a dollar of the sum agreed upon.

Mr. SPROULE. What would the hon. gentleman do with British Columbia which did not assent to this arrangement?

Mr. FIELDING. British Columbia assents to these resolutions up to a certain point, but thinks that she should have more. But she does not say she ought not to have anything at all, which would be the effect if the proposal of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) were carried out.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The amendment of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has the effect of changing these figures.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Then, it means nothing at all.

Mr FIELDING. The amendment of the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) simply gives effect to that which we all understood, to that which no province would dissent from. We are dealing with certain specific allowances and these only, and his amendment simply says that nothing contained in these resolutions shall be understood to interfere with any of the special arrangements made with the provinces from time to time. Everybody understood that in the provinces, and the amendment is only to make that clear.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Then, it means nothing will be of no effect.

Mr. FIELDING. I must say that to me it seems hardly necessary; it is probable that even without such an amendment the resolutions would be carried out as intended. The amendment is only to avoid a possible difficulty, and it does not change by one dollar the proportion that goes to the several provinces. But my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) argued in one part of his speech that British Columbia was not getting her fair share and in another that Ontario was not getting her fair share. Well, if you give British Columbia $100,000 more, you must do it at the expense of the other provinces—you take something away from them. The complaint of the Premier of British Columbia, Mr. McBride, is concerning the proportion—not that what he gets is not enough, but that it is not a fair proportion. Again I say, these resolutions form a treaty among the several provinces, and you cannot give what my hon. friend asks for Prince Edward Island without putting every other province relatively at a disadvantage.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) says that they have not changed the financial position by the amendment of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If the amendment of the Prime Minister means anything, I should think it would change the situation of Prince Edward Island to the extent of some $5,000. Under the clause under which Prince Edward Island came into confederation, the per capita allowance was to be 80 cents per head of the population as shown by each subsequent decennial census until the population amounted to 400,000. The maximum population of Prince Edward Island was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 109,000. Her population decreased, and it has been held, and supported by the First Minister to-night, that in no case could they decrease the per capita allowance of Prince Edward Island to a lower amount. In the resolution before the House section (b) reads as follows:

> Instead of an annual grant per head of population now allowed——

That is altering altogether the terms under which Prince Edward Island came in.

> —the annual payment hereafter to be at the same rate of eighty cents per head, but on the population of each province——

Not as augmented, but

> —as ascertained from time to time by the last decennial census, until such population exceeds 2,500,000, and at the rate of sixty cents per head for so much of said population as may exceed 2,500,000.

I think that is a fair interpretation of these two clauses, and Prince Edward stands to lose that difference of $5,000.

Mr. FIELDING. With regard to the position of Prince Edward Island, there is a peculiar expression in the legislation touching the subsidy, the effect of which is that she shall increase her subsidy with an increasing population, but shall not reduce it At one stage we thought that with a reduction of population her subsidy should be reduced, and the officials of my department made a reduction without looking as closely into the provisions of the law as they should have done. When attention was drawn to it we recognized the fact that the subsidy could not be diminished, but must be continued at its present point

until it should be augmented through increase of population. Now, we cannot change the terms of these resolutions as respects the distribution of public money. I say that special provision with regard to Prince Edward Island was known to the gentlemen who composed the provincial conference, and I think I am justified in saying that not one of them desired to make any change in relation to it, not one of them desired to deprive Prince Edward Island of that which she possessed. Therefore, this amendment, if it was necessary, simply gives effect to that which we know to be the wish of the Provincial Conference, whereas to change the financial arrangement giving one dollar more to any province at the expense of another would be at variance with the spirit of the resolutions, and would be a breach of faith with Mr. Whitney, Mr. Roblin and various other pemiers who have accepted this distribution as a fair one. I would therefore urge upon the House that we cannot possibly allow motions to pass which will deal with any particular province, but we must either reject these resolutions as a whole or accept them as a whole, subject to any verbal change, but not to any change of amounts.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lefurgey):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clements,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Gunn,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Lake,
Lalor,
Lennox,
Leonard,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Morin,
Perley,
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
White,
Wilmot.—34.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Black,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Calvert,
Carney,
Carvell,
Cash,
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
McColl,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Devlin (Nicolet),
Devlin (Wright),
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Geoffrion,
German,
Girard,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Miller,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Paquet,
Parent,
Power,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—96.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Harty,	Reid, (Grenville),
Lovell,	Ganong,
Dyment,	Haggart,
Talbot,	Northrup,
Maclean (Lunenburg),	McCarthy (Calgary),
Fielding,	Borden (Carleton),
Sifton,	Monk,
Belcourt,	Kemp,
Lemieux,	Osler,
Brodeur,	Barker,
Bickerdike,	Henderson,
Campbell,	Bennett,
Johnston,	Lancaster,
McCool,	Avery,
Galliher,	Wilson (Lennox),
Guthrie,	McLaren,
Macpherson,	Pringle,
Grant,	Clare,
Gordon,	Cockshutt,
Hall,	Porter,
Caldwell,	Smith (Wentworth),
Knowles,	Wright (Muskoka),
McIntyre (Perth),	Armstrong,
Schell (Glengarry),	Marshall,
Gervais,	Forget,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	Macdonell,
Cyr,	Barr,
Pickup,	Lewis,
Oliver,	Bristol,
Gladu,	Boyce,
Fortier.	Seagram.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am paired with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan.)

Mr. FIELDING. I am paired with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the main motion.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). Mr. Speaker, I shall not at this late hour, or early hour in the morning, inflict myself upon the members of this House at any length.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DANIEL. I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen present appreciate that statement on my part. But at the same time, I do not wish to allow these resolutions to go without uttering some small protest with regard to the terms which the province of New Brunswick obtains under them. I noticed that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated that these resolutions were in accordance with the view and were decided upon by the premiers of the various governments of the provinces concerned and he thought that they had consented to these terms because they were absolutely fair and just. I think that in so far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned the minister can hardly attribute the acceptance of these resolutions to the views that he expressed because the Prime Minister and his associates of the province of New Brunswick were willing to accept almost anything they could get because they had run the finance of the province down to such an extent that they were practically in financial extremes, so to speak, and so were glad to get the amount that was given or any other sum that the government chose to accord to them. In forming a confederation the smaller provinces have generally been treated with a greater amount of generosity than has been accorded to the larger ones. There is a good reason for that; it is because the smaller provinces have not the same chance that the larger ones have to expand. They have not in some cases the natural resources that the larger provinces have, they are in an entirely different position and that is the case in regard to New Brunswick. New Brunswick has no minerals or mines, or rather none of great extent, and she has to depend to a very large extent upon the lumber industry for her provincial revenue. As every one knows the lumber industry is a decreasing quantity. It is getting less and less and in a few years New Brunwick will have to depend entirely on her agricultural development and what little lumber may be left; in fact, there is nothing for her to look forward to in a few years but direct taxation of the people. As has been stated here to-night by the hon. minister no one in Canada appreciates the privilege of being taxed especially if that taxation takes the direct form. The terms upon which some provinces entered confederation were different from the terms under which other provinces entered. In other words, the terms of confederation have been uneven. Of that there is no doubt. The statement is made that the proposed resolutions will even up all these things, that it will put the different provinces on the basis of population, but I notice that even in these new subsidies the evening up process is not carried out and that the terms which were accorded to the different provinces remained as uneven as they were before. The hon. member for New Brunswick who preceded me gave a very fair statement of the case of that province and I shall not weary the House to any great extent by going over it again to-night. But, there are one or two things that should be taken into consideration in connection with the terms which should be accorded to the maritime provinces, which, so far, have not been referred to. It will be remembered that some years ago the Dominion of Canada, as it was then constituted, bought from the Hudson Bay Company a large part of the territory that now belongs to Canada—Rupert's Land, the Northwest Territories and other portions of the Dominion. That portion of the territory which was obtained, by a payment by the then federated provinces, from the Hudson Bay Company was appropriated to some extent by the province of Ontario and some of it was afterwards added to the province of Quebec. The maritime provinces which were then in the confederation paid their share of the money that was handed over at that time to the Hudson Bay Company, they received no benefit from that expenditure whatever so far as I know and that payment by the maritime provinces has never been taken into consideration in any balance with this government or in apportioning the amount which should be handed over to the various provinces. The territory which was handed over and which was bought from the Hudson Bay Company form now a large part of what is called New Ontario from which the province of Ontario is obtaining large emoluments. Thus the Rainy River district and the country running up to Albany river have been added to the province of Ontario and large territories have also been added to the province of Quebec, territories which were bought in proportion to their population by the maritime provinces for which, as I say, they have so far received no benefit or recompense in any way whatever. In so far as the original terms of confederation are concerned the people of the maritime provinces entered into confederation on the understanding and with the full and firm belief that the representation which they were given would never be reduced.

I believe every member from the maritime provinces who is here to-night will agree with me, that the people of these provinces would never have entered confederation had they believed it ever would be posible to reduce their representation in the federal parliament. The Prime Minister has stated that this is to be a final and unalterable settlement, and that it will be the first time in forty years that any application will have been made to the imperial parliament to change the terms upon which the provinces entered confederation. I was glad to hear the right hon. gentleman quote the words of Edward Blake: That when an arrangement was made with the various provinces, it should be final, equitable, and satisfactory to the people of the provinces. As we are making this application to the imperial parliament to amend the constitution as to the financial terms, we cannot do better than to include in it an application to have it provided that no province in the Dominion shall have less representation in this parliament than that with which it entered confederation. If that be done, one of the greatest grievances of the maritime provinces will be removed. Quebec, the pivotal province of the whole Dominion on whose population the unit of representation is fixed, has had her boundaries extended since confederation without any recompense or consideration being given to the other provinces. I believe that this is not only contrary to the spirit of the British North America Act, but to the letter of it as well. Section 3 of the British North America Act, of 1871, says :

That the parliament of Canada may from time to time with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any said increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

When the boundaries of the province of Quebec were enlarged, I take it that every province in the Dominion was affected thereby, because the enlargement of the territory of Quebec made it possible to alter the unit of representation in a greater degree than was contemplated by the British North America Act. Up to the present this enlargement has not altered the unit of representation, because the added territory is not peopled, but, with the transcontinental railway going through that very portion of new Quebec, and with the reported discoveries of valuable minerals in the region of Lake Abitibi, and in view of the excellent climate of that region as described by the Prime Minister, there is no doubt that before many years this new territory of Quebec will have a large population, the result of which would be to alter the unit of representation in a manner not contemplated by the British North America Act. I say, Sir, that that cannot be equitably or legally done, without making sufficient compensation to all the provinces affected thereby. The maritime provinces will be prejudiced more than any others, because their limits are circumscribed and there is no possibility of adding to their territory. Without wishing to take up any more time at this late hour, I move seconded by Mr. Fowler :

That the petition to the King's Most excellent Majesty be amended by adding thereto :

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, also represent that it is expedient to amend the terms of the British North America Act of 1867, relating to the representation of the several provinces of Canada in the House of Commons, so as to provide that the number of representatives of any province shall not at any time be reduced below that which was assigned to it when it entered the union.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the fact that this amendment is not at all relevant to the question now before the House, and is therefore out of order. The point could be elucidated, but it is sufficient to quote the standing authority, Bourinot, at page 442 :

Canadian speakers have frequently decided that amendments must be relevant to a motion or question. The English parliamentary authorities have up to very recently laid down the rule that a proposition may be amended, in parliamentary phraseology, not only by an alteration which carries out the purpose of the mover, but also by one which entirely destroys that purpose, or which even makes the proposition express a sense the very reverse of that intended by the mover ; and, in like manner, a motion which proposes one kind of proceeding, may be turned into another of a wholly different kind, by means of an amendment. For instance, where the motion pending was for the House to go into a committee of the whole, on the four per cent annuities Acts, and a motion was made to amend, so as in effect to substitute therefor a motion for certain papers connected with the passing of a decree by the government of Portugal materially affecting the commercial relations of that country with Great Britain, and the amendment was objected to, on the ground that it had no relation whatever to the subject of the motion, the Speaker said that, according to the forms of the House, and the law of parliament, there was no necessity that the amendments should be akin to the question. Sir Erskine May thus stated the former usage in his edition of 1879: 'There is no rule which requires an amendment to be made relevant to the question to which it is proposed to be made, except in the case of an order of the day.' Such a usage as allowing amendments irrelevant to a question, certainly seems opposed to those principles of sound reason which govern English parliamentary law generally. If such a practice were

generally tolerated, all the benefits of giving due notice of a motion, and allowing the House a full opportunity of considering a question, would be practically lost. A member would then be in a position to surprise the House at any moment with a motion of importance, and the necessity of giving notice would be superseded to all intents and purposes. It is not, therefore, surprising that the latest English decisions are in accord with those of the Canadian Speakers. Sir Erskine May, in the edition of 1893, however, lays it down as 'an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed—except in the case of amendments moved to the question for the Speaker's leaving the chair for the Committee of Supply or Ways and Means.'

The practice in the English parliament to-day is the practice that has prevailed for a long time, that all amendments must have relevancy; but the amendment of my hon. friend has no relevancy to the question before the House.

Mr. FOWLER. The resolution before the House is one to amend the constitution, and the amendment is also to change the constitution. Therefore, it must be relevant. It simply proposes to carry the motion a little further, by amending it with respect to the representation as well as with respect to the subsidies paid to the provinces. Therefore, the argument the right hon. the premier has put forward is not in point.

Mr. FIELDING. The motion is not to amend the constitution generally, but to amend it in a particular matter, and any amendment which does not relate to that particular matter would not be in order.

Mr. DANIEL. The resolution before the House is a petition to amend the British North America Act, and the resolution which I offer is simply an additional amendment to that Act. I think that the right hon. gentleman is perhaps going a little far in objecting to the amendment on the ground that it is not in order. It appears to me that it is simply carrying out his own resolution by going a little further in petitioning for an amendment to the British North America Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not competent to this parliament, when a Bill is before it, to amend that Bill in any direction it likes? We have sometimes imposed on corporations in connection with private Bills amendments which they did not desire. When a Bill is before parliament I think we have a right to amend it in a direction different from what is proposed.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion before the House deals with one specific question, the scale of payments to be made by Canada to the various provinces. The amendment proposes to deal with the representation of several provinces. It seems to me that it is entirely a different question, and that it is not relevant. I would, therefore, rule the proposed amendment out of order.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I move, in amendment——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoke.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand that the hon. member would not second the amendment, but thereafter spoke to it, I do not think he is precluded from moving an amendment.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I move, in amendment, seconded by Mr. Lefurgey:

That all the interest charged against the province of Prince Edward Island in its debt account with Canada, on account of railways under construction by the province previous to its union with Canada, be refunded; and that no interest hereafter shall be charged the province for such railway expenditure.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I have another amendment to move to the resolution which is before the House. It has reference to the public lands of the new provinces and the compensation that is being paid therefor, and is, therefore, I presume, relevant to the question before the House. This is a question which has been very much debated in this House during the last two years, one which was discussed at full length in connection with the Bills which were passed granting autonomy to the western provinces. I do not, therefore, intend to detain the House more than a very few moments at this late hour. I do not think, as a matter of fact, that there is one member in this House who will deny that it would be in accordance with the spirit of our constitution that every province of the Dominion should have the full ownership and control of the lands lying within its boundaries. During the discussion of the Autonomy Acts in this House, almost every gentleman who spoke on the other side of the House urged that the spirit as well as the letter of the constitution should be observed in passing legislation in regard to the new provinces.

That was urged over and over again with regard to nearly all the very knotty points which had to be decided. But there was one noticeable exception, and that was with regard to the public lands of the provinces. In the case of the public land, the spirit of the constitution was entirely departed from. All the argument adduced was for the purpose of proving that this parliament would have the right, if it choose to withhold the public domain from the new provinces. The spirit of the constitution having been cast aside, the main argument turned upon the expediency of the case. Some very strong arguments were put up on this side, notably by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier

(Mr. Monk) to the effect that it was not only against the spirit of the constitution, but the actual letter of the British North America Act that these lands should be withheld from the new provinces. No argument, so far as I can find out, was put up to disprove those made from this side except in the one case of the then Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). But while that minister quoted one decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, he rested most of his case upon the precedent established in the matter of Manitoba. He said that this House should consider not only the terms of the British North America Act, but the written constitution together with the intangible constitution which has grown up by practice and usage. It was mainly on that point that he based his argument. It would be unnecessary to point out to the government that they need not have gone so far if they were in search of a precedent. They need only have gone back to 1898 when some of these lands, which come under exactly the same category as those out of which the new provinces were composed, were handed over to the province of Quebec and given into the absolute possession of that province. But while the question of expediency was the chief question which was discussed on the other side, there was one member of the government who went a great deal further than any of his colleagues. That was the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who frankly declared that it mattered not to him what were the respective rights of the provinces and the Dominion, that in his opinion the lands should pass into the hands of the Dominion government to be administered by that government and not be put up for sale, but administered for the purpose of giving them away to settlers. A good deal of mention was made of a certain report of the Privy Council passed in 1884 with regard to the Manitoba precedent, and that order in council was quoted frequently. But I wish to point out that while the quotations in only one case contained the main argument which was adduced by the Privy Council on that occasion for not handing over the lands of Manitoba to that province, a very subsidiary clause was brought forward as the main argument. That was the clause which began by stating that another consideration had considerable weight with the members of the Privy Council in bringing them to form a decision. That consideration was that it was necessary, in order to maintain the immigration policy of this country, that the control of the land should be in the hands of the same authority as was controlling the immigration. I wish to point out that the condition which made the argument of any value has now completely changed, and that the last reports brought down by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) show that the larger portion of the immigration is now going to the provinces in the east. Therefore, the reason adduced by the government on that occasion can no longer have any weight. I think anybody who went through these debates will agree with me that the government apparently recognize the fact that they had no constitutional argument to advance for withholding the ownership of these lands from the western provinces—at any rate no argument which they considered of any weight—and based the whole of their plea practically on the matter of expediency. But, as I have pointed out, the conditions are now changed and the expediency now no longer exists. If I were to argue the question from the view of expediency, I would say it is inexpedient to depart from the recognized policy of the British empire, that lands within the boundaries of any colony should be vested in the Crown in the right of that colony. I would point out that the argument for retaining control of the provincial lands at Ottawa is on a level with those used in the old days for controlling the lands of a colony from London. The British government attempted to enforce that control with results certainly detrimental to the best interests of the empire. And I would say that so long as the Dominion government attempt to enforce the control of the lands of the western provinces from Ottawa, so long will there be friction in the west.

If I were to argue the question of expediency again, I would say that it is highly inexpedient that some provinces should exist on an inferior plane to others. I would argue that it is expedient that all the provinces should have equal rights; and I would contend that confederation can never be a permanent structure unless it is founded upon the basis of equal rights and privileges to one and all. I would argue that it is expedient that the business connected with the public domain in these western provinces should be conducted from a point so far distant from them as Ottawa. Such an arrangement must lead to many difficulties and must throw many obstacles in the way of the administration of the public domains. These lands can never be so satisfactorily managed from Ottawa, as they can be by the representatives of the provinces themselves. A very large meeting was held in Regina the other day of an organization which goes by the name of Equal Rights Association, a body composed of both Liberals and Conservatives who stand up for equal rights for the new provinces. At that meeting certain resolutions were passed, and amongst them one concerning the ownership of the land. I will put it on 'Hansard':

That the land, timber and minerals of the province——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) is moving a resolution ?

Mr. LAKE. This is the resolution passed at the meeting of the association held in Regina, I would argue that it is germane to the subject up before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, I have not yet seen the resolution that the hon. gentleman has proposed to quote. But, so far as I can gather, the question of the lands is quite apart from the scale of payments to be made to the various provinces of Canada.

Mr. LAKE. But the matter of these lands, of course, has a direct bearing on these payments which are made in lieu of these lands and which are referred to indirectly in the resolutions before the House. The resolution passed——

Mr. SPEAKER. So far as I can gather, the lands are an entirely different question from this scheme of the payments to the different provinces which is the matter before the House. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) is in order but I am prepared to hear the point discussed.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose you will dispose first of the point of order, Mr. Speaker? There is consideration given these provinces in lieu of their lands, and that is provided for under these resolutions.

Mr. FIELDING. No, there is nothing in these resolutions concerning compensation for lands.

Mr. SPROULE. The original Act provides certain considerations to some of the provinces in lieu of their lands. This is to take the place—is it not ?—of the original provision for any of the provinces. If so, it must touch either, what is given in lieu of lands or what is given per capita. I respectfully submit that one of the elements of consideration for which the provinces have received money is their land.

Mr. FIELDING. These resolutions are simply intended to affect the provisions of section 118 of the British North America Act, which provides for two classes of payments to be made to the provinces : One, the fixed sum to carry on civil government, and the other compensation at the rate of 80 cents per head of the population of 1861.

Mr. LAKE. I might point out that the resolution proposed as an amendment by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) today has a distinct reference to the payment of any special grant hereafter made by the parliament of Canada, to any province for any special purpose in such grant expressed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is simply to say that any privilege given to any province by any special Act outside section 118 is not to be affected by the resolutions.

Mr. SPEAKER. It seems to me that the whole question involved in the motion is the scheme of payments to be made by Canada to the several provinces, and that the question dealing with the land, so far as the provinces are concerned is entirely out of order.

Mr. LAKE. I must of course, bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOWLER (King's and Albert). I desire to say a word about the main motion, even though the hour is late, As a representative of the province of New Brunswick I feel that a duty is incumbent upon me to raise a strong protest against the manner in which that province has been used in connection with the increase in this subsidy. I do not know what influence was brought to bear upon the representatives of the province when they met at the conference with the government, but, certainly, New Brunswick is not given its fair share in connection with the distribution that has taken place. The larger provinces seem to have over-awed the smaller ones, and to have secured the lion's share for themselves. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend from York, N.B., (Mr. Crocket) in the very lucid speech he made on this subject, the proportion given to the province of New Brunswick is considerably less than the people of New Brunswick would be called upon to pay to the sum to be distributed. The hon. gentleman has already stated that the amount which we are called upon to pay is something like $145,000 whereas, the amount we receive is only $130,000. That is, the small province of New Brunswick is paying $15,000 more than it is receiving from the increased amount, whereas the larger provinces like Ontario and Quebec which have a wide area and great resources are getting very much more in proportion. The whole amount Ontario receives, is increased 66 per cent over the amount settled at confederation, whereas New Brunswick only receives some 41 per cent—the smallest percentage of any province represented at this conference. Now, it does seem to me that it is the duty of every one of the representatives of New Brunswick in this House to rise in their places and protest against the manner in which New Brunswick has been used in this matter. I should also say a word as to the motion which has been ruled out of order. I think we should have the representation that we were granted at the time we went into the confederation. It was certainly an oversight on the part of the fathers of confederation.

Mr. SPEAKER. A discussion on that would be equally irrelevant.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I simply reiterate that with respect to this latter subsidy, New Brunswick has certainly been gold bricked worse than any province attending the conference.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queen's, P.E.I.). I move that an additional allowance of $100,000 be granted to the province of Prince Edward Island. The Finance Minister said that these resolutions formed a treaty between the provinces. Now I do not agree with the Finance Minister in that statement. I think that the assembled wisdom of this parliament is better capable of judging of the requirements of the provinces than are four or five premiers of the respective provinces meeting together. In 1887, certain premiers met in the city of Quebec and adopted certain resolutions, and we are told to-night by the premier that these are the resolutions upon which is based this address to His Majesty now under discussion. These resolutions are in fact twenty years old, and since they were passed the requirements of the various provinces have changed very materially. In 1887, it would have been a boon to the province of Prince Edward Island to obtain an increased grant of $70,000, but to offer that province to-day $70,000 of an increase is simply a farce. As a matter of fact it is not $70,000, it is only $60,000; because some four years ago an arrangement was made between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion that as soon as the Hillsborough bridge was completed $10,000 should be retained by the Dominion out of the subsidy which is payable to the province of Prince Edward Island in order to meet certain expenditure which was made upon that bridge for local traffic. So we are in effect only receiving about $60,000. What was the object which the fathers of confederation had in granting these subsidies? The first resolution which was submitted to the conference was moved by Sir John A. Macdonald, in these words :

> That the best interests and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a federal union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such union can be effected on principles of justice to the several provinces.

You see the principle was to be justice to the several provinces, but what do we find since these provinces entered the confederation? At that time a large unorganized territory existed and was subsequently purchased by Canada from the Hudson Bay Company at an expense of something like $1,500,000. Since the confederation of the four original provinces there have been added Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Alberta and Saskatchewan have received grants of money and lands far in advance of what the maritime provinces have ever received. Saskatchewan and Alberta have received each the sum of $1,030,000. What is the financial condition of those provinces at present? Last year Alberta had a surplus of $473,252, and this year she has a surplus of $478,252. Now it is proposed to add to that surplus the sum of $130,000. These provinces are indeed put upon a splendid footing, far better than the old provinces ever enjoyed. What is the condition of the people of the maritime provinces? The forefathers of a great many of them emigrated to those provinces between the years 1776 and 1806, and had to hew out homes for themselves, they have worked upon their homesteads, they have raised families, but the population of those provinces has not materially increased during the past fifteen years owing to emigration.

What became of the surplus population of these three provinces? They have gone west and they have gone to the United States. It is asked to-day that great sums be taken out of the public chest of this country and given to the Northwest and that the maritime provinces shall be paid sums insufficient to maintain them decently. What did the resolution of Sir John Macdonald say? It said every province was to be maintained in a proper manner, so that they could make their revenue and expenditure meet, and in order that there should be no resort to direct taxation. What is the result in Prince Edward Island to-day? Instead of being able to run the government without direct taxation the people are being taxed out of the face. All kinds of taxes are resorted to. The taxation on land last year amounted to between $80,000 and $90,000 and notwithstanding the fact that there was, during the years 1904 and 1905 an average deficit of $57,133.30 this government refuses to-day, according to the statement made by the Minister of Finance, to allow in the readjustment of the subsidies, a sufficient sum to enable the government of Prince Edward Island to make both ends meet. Including the payment of $10,000 towards the Hillsborough bridge and an increase in the interest on the debt of about $2,500, the deficit during the present year will be something like $69,633.33, and we are told that the sum of $70,000 will be sufficient to enable this province to make both ends meet. During the year 1904 there were 28 vacant schools. Why? The province was unable to pay sufficiently high salaries to the school teachers and they went elsewhere. They went to Saskatchewan and Alberta where the salaries are twice as much as the people of Prince Edward Island can afford to pay. I think that when that condition of affairs is exposed this parliament should grant to the people of Prince Edward Island a sufficient sum to enable them to run the government in such a way that they would have a surplus as the people of Alberta have a surplus or a sum sufficient to balance their accounts. In the report made by the superintendent of education during the year 1906 to the

legislature of the province of Prince Edward Island, he says:

The great difficulty with which we have to contend is the small salaries that we pay our teachers.

Mr. Bennett, who was acting inspector for Prince county schools for a part of the last year, says: 'The increasing number of vacant schools in this county was strongly impressed upon my mind when I had been at work for but a short time.

Mr. Kielly, the inspector for Queen's county, refers to the payment of the teachers and the fact that the best teachers are leaving the profession.

Mr. McCormack, the inspector for King's county schools, says, 'The question of vital importance to us at present is the securing of a sufficient number of teachers to hold schools to say nothing of teaching school. Many schools are now vacant. . . . There is just one effective agency that will remedy this matter and that is the payment of larger salaries.'

How can the government of Prince Edward Island pay larger salaries when this government will not allow them a larger sum to meet the necessary requirements of that province? They have 28 or 30 vacant schools this year, because they cannot get teachers at the present salary and the debt is $805,853. What will the condition of affairs be in that province twenty years hence? I think this is a matter that the Prime Minister should fairly and squarely look at. I do not think that the premier of Prince Edward Island fairly represented the condition of affairs at the conference. He did not make any representation at all notwithstanding the fact that a resolution was passed in that conference in 1906 requesting that a statement from the different provinces be presented for consideration. The premier of Prince Edward Island did not present any statement at all, although the premier of British Columbia and the premier of Ontario did so. The premier of Ontario made a statement of the condition of affairs in that province, and I will just read for the edification of the Minister of Finance an extract from that statement:

You are no doubt thoroughly familiar with the grievances of which Nova Scotia complained at the time that province claimed better terms. You will observe that two of the grounds at least upon which redress is sought are identical. It was upon those two grounds, namely, inadequate resources of local revenue, and physical environment, that after careful investigation, the claims of Nova Scotia were recognized and allowance made therefor. You will remember also that as late as 1885 the grievances of Nova Scotia were still an issue in that province, when the legislature of that province passed a resolution declaring for better terms or secession. The Hon. Mr. Fielding, the present Minister of Finance, was leader of that movement and in the resolutions in question set forth that the disabilities, of which Nova Scotia complained in 1868, still existed and had become accentuated by the lapse of time. While no formal settlement of these grievances took place, nevertheless it is well known that the Dominion government made concessions which appeased the discontent and we have heard nothing more of it. There are, therefore, most substantial precedents to justify our course.

It was upon those grounds that Nova Scotia was conceded further subsidies from this parliament, namely, that it had not a source of available revenue. We received under the original terms of confederation something like $161,000 from this parliament. We received in addition $20,000 for another matter of damages and $30,000 for the non-fulfilment of the terms of union. We received altogether something like $211,000 and we are asked to accept $70,000 additional. What is the percentage of increase which was given to the other provinces?

Province.	Increased subsidy for Govts. and legislatures.	Percentage of increase.
Ontario..	$160,000	200
Quebec..	170,000	242 6-7
Nova Scotia..	130,000	216⅔
New Brunswick..	130,000	260
Manitoba..	130,000	260
British Columbia.. ..	115,000	328 4-7
Prince Edward Island..	70,000	233⅓
Alberta..	100,000	200
Saskatchewan..	130,000	260

Taking the general increases per capita, Prince Edward Island gets nothing; Ontario gets $629,484.80 increase; Quebec gets $429,865.60 increase; Nova Scotia gets $47,659.20 increase; New Brunswick gets $7,885.60 increase; Manitoba gets $81,952 increase; British Columbia gets $61,987; Saskatchewan gets $6,210. Alberta and Prince Edward Island are the only provinces that do not get an increase on the per capita basis. I hold that Prince Edward Island is entitled to as much consideration as British Columbia, which came into confederation on terms that it should get the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it got the Canadian Pacific Railway at great expense to the people of Canada. Prince Edward Island refused to come into confederation in 1867; she entered after a great deal of negotiation in 1873, and five years afterwards it was found the terms granted her were not sufficient to enable the affairs of the province to be carried on. Since then Prince Edward Island, like the other provinces, has been knocking at the doors of the Dominion treasury, and it is now absolutely necessary that Prince Edward Island should receive an increased subsidy to enable her to make both ends meet. The Prime Minister tells us that this is a final and unalterable settlement of the subsidy question. If that be so, then it is for the representatives of Prince Edward Island to show to this parliament that their province is entitled to as much consideration as is British Columbia. If

this be an unalterable and final settlement, as the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance tell us, then we should claim damages for the non-carrying out of winter communication since 1901. I can only repeat that the mercantile community and the farming community of Prince Edward Island are to-day at daggers drawn with the Dominion government because of the existing condition of affairs. They pay three times as much for the transportation of their freight as do the people on the Intercolonial Railway for the same distance. The farmers of Prince Edward Island have to pay 10 and 20 cents per hundred pounds more freight for their cornmeal, bran, etc., and they receive 1 or 2 cents a pound less for their pork and beef than do the farmers on the mainland. The rates charged for the three short hauls are excessive. It has been publicly stated that in 1905 the farmers of Prince Edward Island lost $700,000 for want of proper transportation facilities; in March and April, 1906, $200,000 were lost on potatoes alone for the same reason, and this season I venture to say that $500,000 or $600,000 has been lost by the Prince Edward Island farmers because of the stoppage of navigation. I believe that a further sum of $30,000 or $40,000 or $50,000 would about represent the inconvenience and loss which the travelling public has sustained during the last six weeks or two months. Let us take the freight rates on cheese, for example——

Mr. SPEAKER. Does not the hon. member think that this is pertinent to the question of transportation rather than to the motion before the House?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I am giving reasons which I think should induce the government to grant further consideration to Prince Edward Island, but in view of your suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I shall drop that subject for the present. Let us look at the expenditure on public works and other services. In 1873 the expenditure of the province on education and public works, administration of justice, legislation, executive council, charities, agriculture and paupers was $155,553.27, and to-day it has increased by $120,707.67. The Dominion government believes that by granting $70,000 they will put Prince Edward Island in a position to make revenue and expenditure meet, but they must remember that in the next fifteen or twenty years the cost of all these provincial services will increase, and that the revenue cannot meet the expenditure unless the province resorts to further direct taxation. I do not believe it was contemplated by the people who formulated confederation that it should ever be necessary to resort to direct taxation in the provinces. The condition of affairs with reference to the fisheries is at present very unsatisfactory, and I agree with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that it is the duty of the government to embody in this resolution an address asking for the settlement of the differences between the Dominion and the provinces as to the rights in the fisheries.

If the fisheries of Prince Edward Island were in the hands of that province they would obtain a revenue from the granting of oyster leases, the granting of lobster licenses and matters of that kind. But to-day it is uncertain who has the control of the fisheries of the provinces; and although it is well known to every man in Canada that this condition of affairs exists, the government of Canada does not think proper to ask the imperial government to change the constitution and to get legislation in that way from the imperial government settling the control of the fisheries of this country. We have, as I said before, nothing except agriculture. Nova Scotia last year received from royalties on coal, $643,357. At confederation Prince Edward Island had all the fuel that was necessary, and I presume that the delegates at the conference at Quebec thought there was at that time sufficient fuel in the province to last for all time to come. What is the condition of affairs there to-day? All the wood fuel is gone and we have to resort to coal, so that we actually pay to the province of Nova Scotia as our share of those royalties something like $12,000 a year. We have no lumber; we have to go to the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick for our lumber. If we want stone to build our roads we have to go to Gaspé, in the province of Quebec, or to Wallace, in the province of Nova Scotia; we are not in a position to build permanent roads in Prince Edward Island, because we have not the stone. What were the complaints made by Mr. McBride and Mr. Prior, the present and the former Premiers of British Columbia? They said they would require to build permanent roads all through the province and they put this plea so strongly before the conference that it granted British Columbia $100,000. Our soil is naturally soft, and if we wish to have permanent roads we must import the stone from the adjoining provinces to build them, and we are doing it every day at great expense to the people of Prince Edward Island. This is one of the matters which I wish to ask the premier to take into consideration: I do not think it is fair to ask the people of Prince Edward Island to pay a share of the increase of $789,484.83 to the province of Ontario or a share of the increase of $599,865.60 to the province of Quebec, while we only get what is conceded to us by the conference of 1887 These men have forgotten that conditions have changed, and as the hon. member for North Toronto said, they have taken automatically the figures presented to the conference of 1887 and have given them holus bolus to this House. There is not a particle of system about it. They have sim-

ply taken those figures which were put on paper by those men twenty years ago and asked the House to accept them, and we have the statement of the Finance Minister to-night that he did not know on what principle they were made up. No man in Canada knows how they were made up. They were the result of a compromise, and I wish to remind the premier that Prince Edward Island was not represented at the conference of 1887, neither was British Columbia, but British Columbia sent a statement. It was stated to-night that British Columbia assented to the subsidies granted in 1887. It did not, and has not to this day. It is true, it accepted what this parliament agreed to give, but it contended that it was entitled to more. Not a member from British Columbia has spoken on this subject, and we have the evidence of an election which was held in that province a month or six weeks ago, as to what the feeling of the people there is. It shows that they are not satisfied with the subsidies proposed to be granted by this resolution. It has been stated by the premier that it is not proper and not in the interests of confederation that any change should be made in the constitution without the consent of every province of this Dominion. I agree with the premier in that, but I go a little further, and I say that when two provinces object to a change in the constitution, as this is, it should not be carried into effect. When British Columbia was granted a certain sum, that was changing a part of her constitution; when Prince Edward Island was granted a certain sum that was changing a part of her constitution; so that you are changing the constitutions of these provinces without their consent. It is true, the premier came here accompanied by one of his cabinet and voted for the resolutions, but he had no authortiy from the legislature of Prince Edward Island to do so. The authority that was given to him was a resolution passed by the legislature on the 9th of April last, which was in direct contradiction to the vote he gave at that conference. That resolution provided that there should be no diminution in the per capita subsidy to the province of Prince Edward Island; notwithstanding that, the Premier of Prince Edward Island and his colleague voted at the conference for a diminution of the per capita amount, agreeing that it should be based on the census of 1901. The Prime Minister, knowing that there was a great agitation in the province of Prince Edward Island at the present time over this matter, and knowing that a resolution had been passed by the unanimous vote of the legislature of the province, thought proper at the last moment to agree—and that was the meaning of the amendment the right hon. gentleman moved—that Prince Edward Island should be allowed the rate which she had under the resolutions of 1873, and under which she has been paid on the maximum population of 1891. The right hon. gentleman has done what is right for the people of Prince Edward Island in that respect; they were entitled to that; but I would ask him to go a little further and look into the financial position of that province. It is his duty to do that.

It is not his duty to leave that to four or five premiers of the other provinces, who know nothing of the financial condition of Prince Edward Island. It is the duty of the premier and the Finance Minister to look into the finances of each province which receives benefit from the Domnion. What is the condition of affairs in Australia? That Commonwealth granted two thirds of its revenue to the different provinces whereas we do not grant more than a seven and one-half per cent of it. To-day there is collected in Canada in customs and excise over $60,500,000. Our share of that amounts to at least $1,250,000. It has been stated here that we only get some thing like $500,000. That may be a little under the mark but that is about the amount. So that, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned and according to the statement of Mr. McBride, Premier of British Columbia, these two small provinces are paying a great deal more to the government of Canada in customs and excise than they receive. This is unfair. There should be a fair amount paid these provinces. It has been stated by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) that the provinces by the sea do not pay a fair portion of taxes—that Ontario has borne the burden in the past and will in the future. I do not agree with him. Where do the people of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick get their goods? In Montreal and Toronto. The duties are paid in Montreal and Toronto and are credited to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, but the people of the maritime provinces pay these duties eventually. I think, Mr. Speaker, that as it is now three o'clock, when honest folks should be in bed, I shall conclude my remarks.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. I hope that no one will form an opinion of Prince Edward Island from the melancholy and dismal speech we have just heard. If the Island should be judged by that speech and those which occasionally come from some of my respected friends from that province, one would easily conclude that it was the most God forsaken part of the Dominion. I am glad to know it is nothing of the sort.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Let the hon. gentleman refer to page 35 of the report of the interprovincial conference at Quebec and he will find what his own opinion of the province of Nova Scotia was.

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad to be able to say that Prince Edward Island, in my judgment, does not deserve the description my hon. friend has given of it to-night. I think the tendency of two or three of my hon. friends to perpetually complain about its condition does injustice to themselves and the island. I believe that there is no portion of this Dominion which, for a long time past, has received fairer consideration from the parliament of Canada than the province of Prince Edward Island. In my opinion the people there do not at all sympathize with the perpetual grievance mongering of my hon. friend and one or two of his colleagues. The island is not doing as well from the point of view of transportation as we would like. It suffers from severity of weather in the winter, but that is made to appear a dreadful condition by my hon. friends who are prone to exaggerate. If anything can be done to improve the transportation facilities, every one in this House will desire that it should be done.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. We heard the hon. gentleman say that a few days ago.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes and we have improved the conditions of transportation beween the island and the mainland. They are better to-day than they ever were, much better than they were in the years when the hon. gentleman's friends sat here and were quite content to accept them without making much complaint. The island has been getting very fair consideration in all these things and nobody will be more anxious, I believe, than the members of this House that Prince Edward Island shall have the advantage of every improvement in transportation.

She has been dealt with liberally too in another respect. Twice in a short period she has received special grants of increased subsidy which might have caused comment from the other provinces but were accepted by them in a generous spirit. I am sorry these hon. gentlemen do not appreciate the liberality Canada has manifested towards their province. As respects the present scheme, can any hon. gentlemen say she is placed at a disadvantage? There are two ways in which a subsidy is granted a province. There is first a specific sum allowed for government and then so much per head. The advantage goes to the smaller provinces in the shape of a specific special allowance made for government and legislature. What do I find? Under the present scale of payments, Prince Edward Island, in the matter of allowance for government, if you convert it into an equivalent per capita, stands to-day in a better position than any other province. That is to say the fixed allowance for government—I am now distinguishing between the fixed allowance and a sum per capita—works out a per capita sum in excess of what any other province of the Dominion receives to-day.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. I would like to see that proved. Bring it down to figures.

Mr. FIELDING. I am bringing it down to figures. If my calculation is certain——

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not think it is.

Mr. FIELDING. From the best information I can get, the special allowance which is made for government in the case of Prince Edward Island works out twenty-nine cents per head and there is no other province in the Dominion where it is as high. My own province of Nova Scotia gets less per head for that purpose, and the conditions are worse in Ontario. As regards the special allowance for government and legislature, Prince Edward Island is highly favoured, and I am sorry that hon. gentlemen should seek to convey the impression that it is not. Turn to the scale of payments proposed here and not only is the island favoured now but in any change that we may make we give her still further advantage. Dealing with that item of specific allowance for government and legislature—

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. It is the only one we get. You have no right to put it on the basis of population if it is a specific sum.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not put it on the basis of population. I say that provision is made for a payment which works out a larger sum to the island per capita than to any other province. If we take the items of that class and compare them with those proposed under this schedule, what do we find? I find that the additional sum allowed Prince Edward Island under that heading would amount to 67 cents per head while the additional sum allowed to Nova Scotia will only work out 28 cents per head. I expect to be attacked in my own province of Nova Scotia and told that we have not given that province fair consideration. And the case would be worse if we take Ontario or Quebec, because they received a less sum by way of increase than does the province of Prince Edward Island. It is unfortunate, when that province is so fairly and justly and liberally dealt with, that my hon. friend should try to create a grievance. I repeat once more that these resolutions are a treaty between the provinces and cannot be changed except by breach of faith between the provinces. Hon. gentlemen speak as though this were a matter between the Liberal party and the provinces. It is not so, for all parties were represented in that conference. My friend Mr. Whitney was there and became a party to these resolutions. Mr. Foy was present. Colonel Matheson was present. And so was Mr. Roblin, the premier of Manitoba, and Mr. Colin H. Campbell. All these gentlemen united in the opinion that the pay-

ments arranged as between the various provinces were fair and should not be departed from. Mr. Whitney issued a statement in which he said: We urge that in the future that no special grant should be made to any one province. Yet this hon. gentleman comes here with a motion in favour of a special grant to one province with the argument that we are not dealing fairly——

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. If the hon. minister will allow me to ask him a question? When that motion was put in the conference had the arrangement of $100,000 to British Columbia been accepted?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know what that has to do with it. I know that in regard to British Columbia, Mr. Whitney held as strong a position as any one in the conference, that what was done was fair and just, and he refused, and properly refused, to make any change respecting the province of British Columbia or any other. Sympathizing, as I naturally would, as a maritime province man, with any just grievance of Prince Edward Island, I declare that it would be a breach of faith with Ontario, with Quebec, with my own province, and with all the others that participated in that conference to pass this amendment. I do urge that the House should recognize the compact that exists in these resolutions and not adopt an amendment changing resolutions which were agreed to in good faith and cannot be departed from without unfairness to the other provinces.

Amendment (Mr. A. A. McLean) negatived.

Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agreed to, and address adopted.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 3 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 26, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SUPPLY—INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply. He said: Mr. Speaker, there is a special matter set down for consideration to-day but I want to ask the assistance of the House for a few minutes in facilitating the passage of a special Supply Bill in accordance with the intimation which I gave yesterday. Perhaps there are some hon. members who are now present, who were not here at that time, and if so I would say that as the fiscal year is about to close and as it is not possible for us to have a general Supply Bill in time for the new year, I propose to take a vote for one-fifth of the items in the main estimates upon which the Committee of Supply have not already passed. The clerks of the House have made careful calculations and I shall ask the House, when we go into committee, to accept the items as prepared by them with the assurance that they are correct. The several stages are purely formal and I shall be happy to have the assistance of the House in putting these items through these stages which I hope will not occupy many minutes and immediately after that the motion to be made by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) will come on.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have no objection to facilitating the desire of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) only I would like to know if, after this motion has gone through, it will be in order to introduce another motion to go into Committee of Supply or an amendment thereto? I would not like the question of order to be raised by any hon. member because any hon. member of the House can take exception to the presentation of this motion again.

Mr. FIELDING. There will be no such question. I may explain to my hon. friend that the procedure is that after the committee has gone into supply the motion will be made that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, this day, immediately after which my hon. friend's motion can be made. There will be no objection whatever and we will not consume twenty minutes by this proceeding.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have no objection to helping the House to pass these estimates but I do so on the distinct understanding that there will be no use made of this in order to prevent the debate going on.

Mr. FIELDING. I will give the hon. member an assurance that if there is any delay, I will withdraw the motion and leave it open to the hon. member to bring in his amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There can be no possible misunderstanding when the matter for discussion was set down definitely for to-day and it will be the duty of every member of the House to carry out that arrangement. There is no objection to what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) proposes. It is understood, of course, as it was understood on previous occasions, that this shall not in any way interfere with the criticism of any items or of any vote upon concurrence which any hon. member may desire to offer.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly not.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. I beg to move:

That a sum not exceeding the amount set forth below be granted to His Majesty on account of the following services for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1908.

I shall not attempt to read the items; but I shall ask the House to accept the assurance of the clerks that the calculations have been carefully made, and that the effect of this motion is to take a vote for one-fifth of these items which have not already been passed upon by the Committee of Supply.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING. There are resolutions which were disposed of in the Committee of Supply some time ago, but which have not yet been concurred in. I beg to move that these several resolutions which have been passed from time to time in Committee of Supply be now read and concurred in.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions concurred in.

House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That towards making good a supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1908, the sum of $26,038,169.02 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolutions reported, read a second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 141) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1908.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FIELDING. While I have no doubt the papers are all in proper form, I think it better not to press the Bill to its final stage now. It will be placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading.

Mr. SPROULE. Print it in the meantime?

SUPPLY—REPORT OF THE INSURANCE COMMISSION; CHARGES AGAINST CERTAIN MEMBERS.

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

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I quite understand that the majority of the members of this House should be amused at the fact that in rising to speak on this occasion, I am greeted with the applause of only my good friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) who sits to my left. I can quite realize that some hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are not disposed to receive me with all that joy and contentment, with which, under other circumstances, I might be received by them. Be that as it may, I fear the members of this House may be somewhat disappointed in the proceedings of to-day. If it is expected by any one that I am going to engage in that kind of thing which has been so properly described by the President of the United States as the work of the man with the muck rake, I wish to dispel that expectation right now. I have not come here for the sole pleasure of dragging before the public the good name of my colleagues in this House with whom I may have had some political differences, but among whom, so far, I do not think I can count any personal enemy. I wish to say that the motive which impels me to bring this matter again before the House, is one which I think will commend itself to the intelligence of my colleagues. I may, perhaps, be able to claim that I have some advantage in presenting this matter, inasmuch as the future and the fate of either political party, as at present constituted, is utterly indifferent to me. I therefore bring this question forward, not with the view of helping the government to ruin some of their political opponents, nor yet with the view of helping the opposition to bring to task some of the members of the government, or some of the supporters of the government. I bring this question forward because I think it is my public duty to give voice in this parliament to the clamour of public opinion, as it is expressed at the present time throughout all Canada.

The origin of this question is not to be found in the records of this House; its origin lies in the proceedings of the Royal Commission which was constituted by this parliament last year to inquire into the business of life insurance in Canada. Without passing any judgment upon the attitude of the members of that commission, or upon the business men or the companies, that were brought under investigation, I simply state now that certain facts with which the names of members of this House, and the name of a member of the Senate, were connected, were brought to light. These facts are of public notoriety to-day; they are contained in official documents printed under the authority of the Crown and by the consent of the parliament of Canada. Upon those facts the press of the country have been carrying on a campaign of comment, I might say a campaign of slander, for about six months. Comments of such a character have been passed upon the honour, the integrity, the independence of members of this House that neither the

accused parties nor those who entertain the opinion that they have been remiss in their duty can allow this session to close without on the one side justifying themselves as public men and on the other side justifying their accusations against these public men.

The matter was brought to a crisis by the action of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), who, being attacked by one member on this side of the House, stood up and took the ground, which I am not prepared to condemn, that if he were attacked in regard to what he deemed to be absolutely private matters, he reserved to himself the right to carry the war into Africa and to bring to task some members on this side of the House. Had the matter rested there, I do not say that it would not have been the business of parliament to inquire, but certainly it would not have had the importance that it has to-day, and would not perhaps have necessitated the immediate action of the House. But what makes it the imperative duty of the House not to let this session pass without having the whole matter investigated is the fact that at the present time, owing to these accusations having been spread from one end of the country to the other and repeatedly commented on by the press, public opinion is losing confidence in the integrity of its representative institutions and in the integrity of the members of those institutions. It has come to the point, Sir, that, rightly or wrongly, there exists a strong impression throughout the country that this House, under various pretenses, whether it be that the Prime Minister should go to England next week or that the insurance report is not to be acted on this session by way of legislation, wishes to adjourn because both parties are afraid of the revelations that might accrue, because neither party in this House wants judgment to be passed on itself. I do not say that this is right or wrong; I say this impression is prevailing, and prevailing widely, because of the attitude of the hon. member for King's, N.B., who stood up in this House and stated, in most positive terms: 'If I am attacked I will retaliate.' He did not speak in any general terms, but he stated that he had in his possession data and material by which he could prove that several members of this House, members of the government, were guilty of improper conduct and should be impugned. Now, Sir, all the independent press of the country has taken the attitude of the hon. member for King's, N.B., connected with the reply of the right hon. the Prime Minister, as an offer to saw-off—I repeat again that I do not say it was the intention of the hon. member for King's—with the right hon. the Prime Minister. But after all, Sir, in this House as well as outside, judgment must be formed on the actions of public men from their words and their attitude. The language of the hon. member for King's is so well known that I need not read it again. However, perhaps it might be better to give a few sentences. I will come later on to the whole of what I may call the arraignment of the hon. gentleman. What did he say?

I shall allow no man to make an attack on me——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Of course, the House will observe that this is a reference to a former debate. I merely call the attention of the House to it.

Mr. BOURASSA. I quite realize that, but I expect that no exception will be taken in this case, because it would be impossible to pass judgment on this matter without referring to a past debate; and although I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I think that under the circumstances the whole House, and especially those connected with the matter, will warrant me in making these references. (Reading):

I shall allow no man to make an attack on me or my character without retorting. I shall discuss the character of hon. members opposite, whether they be ministers or private members, and their connection with women, wine and graft.

There are gentlemen opposite living in very frail glass houses. I have taken a little trouble and pains to gather together some data with respect to some of them; and if I am attacked, I do not propose to allow any such insinuations as were made by the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Ross) to pass without retaliating.

I should be a poltroon if, when I am attacked, I did not defend myself, and not only defend myself, but, having the material, if I did not use that material to carry the attack into the other side.

Let them bring on their scandal, let them produce their witnesses, and their evidence. But, let me tell you, if I am attacked, I shall defend myself, and not only defend myself, but also lead an attack.

Replying to the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire), he said:

It rests altogether with his own friends when they shall have it—they will have it as soon as I am attacked. That is all I have to say with respect to the matter now, but I shall have a good deal to say when the time comes.

Now, what was the reply of the right hon. leader of the government to that? When I brought this language to the attention of the House two days later, what did the right hon. gentleman say? He said:

Now, in connection with the other incident, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) made some very severe statements and some very grave insinuations. The hon. gentleman did not make charges. He told us he had provided himself with certain material, as he said, to carry the war into Africa and that if his conduct was discussed, or charges made against him, then he would take means to de-

fend himself by accusing other parties—making insinuations of a very grave character against some members of the government and of this House, but without making any specific charges. I thought at the moment that the matter was very grave and exceeded the bounds of what might be expected in the heat of debate; still it arose in the midst of a heated discussion, and there might perhaps not be so much importance to be attached to it. If, however, when the report of the commission is before us, and if, as a result of this report, his conduct is impugned, it shall, I think, be his duty to make good the insinuations he has made.

To all common sense people who have heard or read these words, does it not look as if the hon. member for King's had offered a bargain to the right hon. the Prime Minister that unless he was attacked there would be no revelation from him, and that the Prime Minister had accepted the bargain by saying: If there is in the report of the Insurance Commission anything against Mr. Fowler, then it will be his duty to proceed? I would like to know where the connection is between the report of a royal commission to investigate insurance and the relations of members of the government to wine, women and graft? I do not know that the Insurance Commissioners were instructed to inquire into the private or public conduct of ministers of the Crown. I do not know that they were called on to do anything else than the business which they accomplished; and even without any reference to the Insurance Commissioners' report, it would be the duty of the hon. member for King's to make good his threat that he would expose ministers and other members of the House. Now, Sir, apart from the semblance of accepting from the hon. member for King's the offer of a saw-off, the right hon. the Prime Minister admitted in most positive terms that this session could not close without the matter being discussed:

I have not made up my mind that at this moment the time has come for the House to take any action upon the matter which has been brought to its attention. But that the session cannot pass without this matter being brought to the attention of the House goes without saying. For my part, I believe that we should wait until we have the report of the Insurance Commission, and then the whole matter can be threshed out.

On that ground he was met by the hon. leader of the opposition, who stated most positively:

I agree with the Prime Minister that it is impossible this session should close without those charges which have been insinuated either being withdrawn or brought on for discussion or adjudication. So far as I am concerned—and I speak for every man on this side of the House in that regard—we do not propose that this session shall end until that matter has been discussed and until that investigation has been made.

The hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) himself admitted that it was necessary there should be an investigation. Here is what he said at the end of his remarks on that day, the 21st of February:

I quite agree with the hon. leader of the House that the time to thresh this whole matter out will be when the report of the Insurance Commission comes in. Then, whatever action it is necessary to take, I shall take in order to protect myself.

What did happen? I waited some time until that report was not only laid on the table but distributed to members on both sides, and long enough for them to have had time to read it and form their opinions. Then I brought the matter again before the House and quoted these words of the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition which I have just cited. Again the leader of the opposition repeated his offer to go on. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), one of those whose conduct has been most commented on by the Liberal press, stood up in a most manly way and repeated his offer not only to have his own conduct investigated, but to have an investigation into all the charges made and insinuated. He stated that the accusations made, not only in this House, but in the public, against members of the government must be investigated. He stated positively that the matter had become one of general comment throughout the country and that the House could not prorogue without having an investigation. What was the attitude of the right hon. gentleman on that occasion? With regard to the Insurance Commission report, upon which he had based his only reason for waiting before having the charges of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) investigated, he said:

The commission have reported that, in their judgment, there was necessity for legislation and have submitted a blank Bill for the consideration of the House, which is now in the hands of hon. members. Beyond this they did not report; they made no report against anybody.

The commission, he said, had made no report against anybody. After the Liberal press had been for six months branding the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the member for King's (Mr. Fowler), the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Lefurgey) as men unworthy of a seat in this House; after supporters of the right hon. gentleman had said in so many words that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was unworthy of a seat in this House; after the whole press of this country had been demanding an investigation—after all this, the right hon. gentleman stood up and said: There is nothing

against anybody in the report of the Insurance Commission. I shall come back to that point in a moment.

With regard to the other part of the dispute—the statements made by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler)—what did the right hon. gentleman say? He said:

I do not understand at the present moment how it is possible to investigate anything which has been said by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler). He did not mention any name, he did not mention any offence, he spoke in a general way. And I am at a loss to know at present what charges there are to be investigated.

And this not more than two weeks after the right hon. gentleman had said most solemnly that this House could not adjourn without having an investigation—without having the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) forced to make his charges or withdraw them. What has brought about that change? That is the question I am now going to discuss. That I was stunned by those two statements of the right hon. gentleman I freely admit. But this brings me to this point—and I do not say I am dissatisfied with the fact that it forces me to weary the House for some minutes with some of the findings of that Insurance Commission in that report in which the right hon. gentleman has found no charge against anybody. When I say I am not dissatisfied with the task, I say it purposely, not because it will oblige me, so to speak, to read statements that are of the most damaging character against some of the members of this House, but because it enlarges the scope of this discussion and will lead me to the conclusion that what is required now is not only that the charge of one member against another should be investigated, but that a committee be instituted to investigate and find out who are the honest and who are the dishonest men.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOURASSA. My hon. friends need not think I am taking this attitude with the idea of posing as a censor of my colleagues. Not at all. If I were to reveal the names of all my friends, either on the Liberal or Conservative side, who have asked me to press this matter forward though they will vote against me, it would be easy to prove that public sentiment, both in this House and out of it, is in favour of an investigation. I shall endeavour to prove that the vast majority of the members of this House—whom I esteem as honest and honourable men—should take upon themselves to make the line clear between the honest and dishonest.

To confine myself to the report of the Insurance Commission, I find that there are two companies with which it deals and with which are connected members of this parliament, namely, the Canada Life Insurance Company and the Independent Order of Foresters. Their inquiry into the business of the Canada Life brought to light the fact, well known in business circles, that the almost absolute control of that company was in the hands of Senator Cox. What is the opinion of the commission on that point?

The absolute control, real or potential, residing in the president and general manager, and in which his stock holding and offices secure him, have to a marked extent influenced the investments of the company, which have been made to serve not only the interests of the Canada Life Assurance Company but also his own interests and the interests of other institutions in which he was largely concerned. He says he has always made the interests of the Canada Life Assurance Company his first and chief concern, but many of the investments made by or on behalf of that company have been made to serve other interests as well. The dual position and conflicting interests of Mr. Cox in many of these transactions have been most clearly defined.

Then the report goes on to cite some of the dealings of the Central Loan and Savings Company. This company was under Mr. Cox's control to such an extent that the report says:

To use his own language, we are to treat it as being himself.

And it adds:

Upon one occasion, referred to hereafter, when he was himself, both directly and in respect of some of his business associates and some one or more of the institutions in which he had a controlling interest, largely concerned in maintaining the market price of a security of this description, he made use of the funds of the company to purchase the security for the express purpose of strengthening or upholding its market price.

Which in common words means that Senator Cox made use of the money of the people insured in the Canada Life to do some stock gambling in his own interest and in the interest of the companies with which he was associated.

Then it goes on with the recital of the purchases of the Dominion Coal Company's stock which Senator Cox caused to be supported by the Canada Life Insurance Company and proceeds:

The transactions by way of purchase with the Central Canada Loan and Savings Company, the other self of Mr. Cox, and with the Dominion Securities Corporation, the creature of the Central Canada Loan and Savings Company were numerous and profitable to those institutions. Following is a summary of them:

I shall not read the House the whole list, but it means that from 1900 to 1906, within six years, Senator Cox caused the money of the Canada Life Insurance Company to be diverted from its natural channels and

to be invested, to the small amount of $6,933,000, in stocks in which he was personally interested.

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

Now, Sir, this is most moderate language but it is far more effective than any scathing denunciation in the mouth and under the pen of a Royal Commission instituted by this parliament and having acted with all the requirement of impartiality—at least so we must assume as long as it is not proved to the contrary. It goes further:

A transaction having a different significance should also be referred to. In October, 1902, a large loan was made by the company to A. E. Ames & Co., upon the authority of the Metropolitan Bank and Sao Paolo stock. At December 31, 1902, the loan amounted to $389,500, and was secured by 3,400 shares of Metropolitan Bank stock and 1,040 shares of Sao Paolo.

I need not tell the House what the connection was between the firm of Ames and Company and the president of the Canada Life.

On that day, being the last day of the year, A. E. Ames & Co. appear to have discounted a note with the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

And here again I need not remind the House what the connection then was between the Canadian Bank of Commerce and Mr. Cox, the president of the Canada Life Insurance Company.

—appear to have discounted a note with the Canadian Bank of Commerce out of the proceeds of which they paid off the loan from the company——

That is the Canada Life Company.

—and the parties went through the form of releasing or transferring the securities; but on January 2, 1903,——

That is two days afterwards,

—the company paid off the bank and received the shares back.

Now Sir, what was that done for?

Although it is represented that this transaction did not result from a desire to conceal this loan from the Insurance Department,——

The reason is given later on—

—it was certainly calculated to have that effect, and it is impossible to give credence to the theory that there was any real paying off of the loan, in view of the circumstances.

There should be borne in mind also the letters of September 10, 1902, and December 15, 1902, from the department to the Minister of Justice in which securities of the Sao Paolo class were being questioned. It is difficult to believe that there was no connection between the raising of the question by the department and the temporary calling in of the loan at the critical date of the annual return.

Again, Sir, in plain language which can be understood by every man in this country, what does this mean? That Senator Cox, being president of the Canada Life Assurance Company, helped his son-in-law, the head of the firm of A. E. Ames and Company, to make false entries in the books of the Canada Life Assurance Company in order that the insurance inspector could not detect that the Canada Life Assurance Company, under the guidance of Senator Cox, was lending the money, the trust funds of the people interested in that insurance, on securities which had been questioned by the Department of Insurance—and notice to this effect had been served on the Canada Life Assurance Company—and yet the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) can discover no findings against anybody in that report.

Let us take the position now of the Independent Order of Foresters, the investigation of which has given rise to such comment upon the honour and integrity of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) stated before that commission that he was going to appeal before a higher tribunal. We have been sitting in this House some months and whether hon. members believe as the hon. member for Wright (Mr. E. B. Devlin) seems to, that the hon. member is unworthy of a seat in this House or whether like myself they simply wait until an ex-minister of the Crown, a man who has enjoyed the respect of the people of this country, a man who has moulded the policy of his party and his country, has cleared his reputation—we have waited until that hon. gentleman would call upon that higher tribunal; and if to-day I bring the name of the hon. gentleman into these questions it is not because of my being a political opponent of the hon. gentleman, but it is because I consider that the reputation of our public men, and especially of ministers and ex-ministers of the Crown, is not such a thing as should be trifled with, and my earnest wish is that that hon. gentleman should take this occasion to clear himself and to repudiate all the charges that have been made against him.

But all I have at my disposal at the present time is that report of the Insurance Commission, and what do I find there? After having reviewed the proceedings of the Independent Order of Foresters, the extravagant way in which they had tried to organize their business in foreign countries,

the unfortunate and nasty proceedings with which an ex-minister of the Crown, an ex-member of this House, was connected—I mean Dr. Montague—then the commissioners take up the history of the Union Trust Company. I need not relate to the House how and under what circumstances the Union Trust Company was formed, everybody knows, and I leave it to the words of the commissioners to define the situation.

There is nothing uncertain in the policy so outlined and advised, and it was the policy which, in its development, determined the status of the Union Trust Company as a large and bold operator with the moneys of the Foresters forming its capital.

The company was not intended to obtrude its paternity upon the public with whom it was to do business, nor was it deemed prudent that the personnel of its directors should indicate its relation to the order. In his letter of May 27, 1901, Mr. Foster advises :—

But whilst in reality the Trust Company will be controlled by the Foresters, it is not best that that point should be emphasized to the public—but rather the contrary. To that end we should, I think, be most careful in the selection of directors.

Now everybody knows how the Union Trust Company was formed and how it became, for all practical purposes, the investing department of the Independent Order of Foresters. The commissioners say :

In March, 1902, Dr. Montague, who was then Deputy Supreme Chief Ranger of the order, took up the idea of making a large purchase of lands in Manitoba and the Northwest. He associated with him in interest the Supreme Chief Ranger, the Supreme Secretary and Mr. Foster, the managing director of the Union Trust Company. The idea involved borrowing from the order the funds necessary.

Now it goes on reciting one of the deals made with regard to lands, and says :

The Trust Company seems to have subsequently been made the depository of further cash advances by the order, to be handed over to the syndicate of four to buy further lands.

And it must not be forgotten that the Union Trust Company was for all practical purposes the hon. member for North Toronto, who was the general manager and financial adviser of that company, and that the syndicate of four which received the money from the Trust Company to buy lands included the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

All these advances as made, were supposed to be added to the mortgage security to which reference has already been made. The Swan river lands were similarly purchased in the same year, the quantity being 9,920 acres and the price $52,080, and the conveyancing being arranged as in the other cases.

In connection with the purchase of the Carrot river lands, a commission of $10,000 was due by the vendors to one Pritchard, their agent. Of this commission Mr. Foster received one-half, of $5,000, causing a cheque of the Union Trust Company to issue to his order for the amount, and deductng it from the first payment to the vendors. This, he says, he divided equally among the members of the syndicate, and he speaks of it as a reduction made by reason of his efforts, in the price of the land, rather than as a commission.

Then it goes on reciting the opinions of the different winesses and it adds:

Assuming the money to have represented a reduction in price, it seems difficult in view of the trust on which the Union Trust Company, to its managing director's knowledge, held these funds, to understand the division of any portion of them among the borrowing syndicate.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow a question now and then ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask him if he has ever read that trust that is referred to there?

Mr. BOURASSA. I have read what is in the evidence ; I have not read the exhibits because they have not been published.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I caution my hon. friend, because I know he wishes to be fair, that it might be well for him to examine some of the documents before he takes as law and gospel the statement made by three gentlemen who, if they were in this House, would not be more than the equals of my hon. friend.

Mr. BOURASSA. I think I will clear the mind of my hon. friend as well as of any other gentleman, because his objection might apply to any point I am going to make out of that report. I will conclude by saying that in justice to the hon. gentleman we must give him a chance to make his case in this House as a public man. The only thing upon which I can now base my opinion and statements, the only thing upon which the ministerial press has been slandering the hon. gentleman, is this document and the evidence printed only a few days ago. Therefore the hon. gentleman cannot object to my reading the report as I find it. I am thoroughly British, and I hold no man guilty unless he is proved to be guilty. But at the same time, I say that until the hon. gentleman has appealed to a higher tribunal, he must act upon this report or ask for it to be revised if it is unjust to him. As long as he does not do so, we must accept the report as we find it. Let me repeat the last sentence.

What the moneys were deposited with him for was to purchase land to be added to the security held by the Independent Order of Foresters.

It goes on to recite the transactions between Mr. Roblin and Mr. Whitla.

The price offered by Mr. Foster in his letter to Pritchard of December 23, 1903 (exhibit 666) was $5.25 per acre, with, 25 cents per acre as commission, thus netting you $5 per acre.'

In his letter of January 5, 1904, to Mr. Whitla's firm, he reminds them that 25 cents per acre is to be paid as 'commission on sale' and he says this can be deducted from the cash payment, which was $1.25 per acre or better; 'you can send a cheque therefor signed by the vendors in favour of myself.'

The reply asks him for a cheque for the cash payment, 'less commission as per agreement'. The cash payment was $1.25 per acre on the 9,920 acres, or $12,400. For this Mr. Foster caused two cheques of the Union Trust Company to issue, for $9,920, or $1 per acre to Mr. Whitla, and for $2,480, or 25 cents per acre to himself. In this letter of February 2, 1904, Mr. Whitla, inclosing the cheque for $9,920, he says he is 'retaining the $2,480 commission'. The witnesses as to the transaction are Mr. Foster, pages 2647-2648. Mr. Roblin page 3131 et seq., and Mr. Pritchard pages 3046-3048. They differ in some respects, but the main features of the transaction are not effected by these differences. The $2,480 received by Mr. Foster was not in this case divided with the other members of the syndicate, but is professed to be held to await the final settlement of their accounts inter se. It is not apparently anywhere on deposit, or earmarked in any tangible form, and its diversion to either the private account of Mr. Foster or to the account of the syndicate was, like that of the $5,000, inconsistent with the trust upon which the funds were held.

Sir, these are the only words now before parliament and before the country. They import that the hon. member for North Toronto has misused a trust of which he was a trustee. Is the hon. gentleman ready to remain under that accusation? Is the Prime Minister, in order apparently to avoid an investigation into the conduct of some of his own colleagues, ready to say that these words from the Insurance Commission are not some of the most damaging words that were ever uttered by a tribunal against any man standing before that tribunal? On the one hand, the hon. gentleman is accused by the commissioners of having formed this syndicate in order to take the trust funds of which he was manager and loan them to himself as a member of the syndicate; secondly, that he has received a commission either from the party that gave him the money to be held in trust, or from the syndicate of which he was a member. This is the summing up by the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask my hon. friend to make that statement again, because it was a little confused as it reached my ears, and I would not like it to go that I am assenting to it.

Mr. BOURASSA. I repeat, first—and I am simply giving the opinion of the commissioners as I find it. The commissioners find, first, that the hon. gentleman became a member of a syndicate of four who received money from the Union Trust of which the hon. gentleman was the manager, and bought lands for themselves, for their own profit; and secondly, that during that transaction not only did the hon. gentleman take the money of the trust and gave it to the syndicate of which he was a member, but he received twice during the transaction personal advantage.

Mr. FOSTER. All of which, as contained in my hon. friend's statement, is absolutely a misrepresentation.

Mr. BOURASSA. Does the hon. gentleman claim it is a misrepresentation of the words of the commissioners?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a misrepresentation as the echo, whether it be a true and absolute echo of the commissioners or not.

Mr. BOURASSA. Well, I accept the correction of the hon. gentleman, because I leave it to the judgment of the House if the way in which I have summed up the words of the report is not a faithful echo. I read it three times without forming my judgment upon it, because I waited until the hon. gentleman brought up this report for discussion in the House. I will go further and will say that in justice to the hon. gentleman this House must give him a chance to defend himself.

Now the transaction which has created the most noise and called forth the most damaging comment with regard to several members of the other side, is not the portions of the report which I have just quoted, but it is regarding what is known as the Great West Land Company in which the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Lefurgey) are concerned. The report goes on to state that in the fall of 1903 Rufus H. Pope, an ex-member of this House, and Mr. G. W. Fowler, M.P. for King's, N.B., commenced negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purchase of land on behalf of a syndicate including, with themselves, Messrs. W. H. Bennett and A. Lefurgey.

In their efforts to finance the undertaking, Messrs. Pope and Fowler were brought into communication with some of the persons interested in an Ontario corporation known as the New Ontario Farm and Town Site Syndicate, whose incorporation had taken place on March 25, 1903. There were five shareholders in this corporation, each of whom owned one share of its stock, and it was said to have had some options in connection with lands in Ontario which were not supposed to be of any value. In the course of negotiations between the Pope and Fowler syndicate and this company, under circumstances and for reasons which have not been made clear to the commission, Mr. Foster, the general manager of the Union Trust Company, and Mr. McGillivray and Mr. Wilson, who were directors of the Union Trust Company, found their services enlisted.

It goes on to give the negotiations between the two syndicates.

On May 30, 1903, this conveyance was completed (it is part of exhibit 483). By it Messrs. Pope and Fowler transferred to the Union Trust Company as trustee the right or option to inspect, examine and purchase the lands mentioned in the agreement between Messrs. Pope and Fowler and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of April 24, 1903, at a price which was to net them a profit of $1 per acre over the $3.50 which they were to pay to the railway company.

By this agreement it was further provided that Messrs. Pope and Fowler were to be paid the $1 per acre, approximately $200,000, profit, $50,000 in stock of the New Ontario Farm and Town Sites Syndicate, and the balance as follows: one-sixth or approximately $25,000 on November 1, 1903, and the rest in five instalments of approximately $25,000 each, payable,

—and so on. That is of no importance.

The avowed intention of Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson from the beginning was to make the profit last named of fifty cents per acre for themselves, and it is difficult to believe that the beneficiaries undisclosed in the agreement of May 30, for whom the Union Trust Company was made trustees were not intended to be Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson, subject, of course, to their getting in such rights as the old members of the New Ontario syndicate, who had failed to finance their half of the proposition, might still be entitled to maintain.

Mr. Foster thinks that when this agreement was made, on May 30, 1903, and up to June 4, when certain further conveyancing took place, to which reference will be made in a moment, there had been no idea of the Trust C being brought in to advance moneys. He is, however, manifestly mistaken with regard to this, because on June 3, he brought, as manager, before the board of the Union Trust Company, the very proposition that that company should loan to the New Ontario Syndicate a sum not to exceed $140,000, for the manifest purpose of enabling the agreement of May 30 to be carried out.

Then it goes on to recite the resolution and it adds:

When, therefore, the conveyancing of June 4 is approached, it is manifest that the Union Trust Company had become bound to finance the proposition.

—on account of the resolution brought in by the hon. member for North Toronto as manager of the company. The report adds:

There is no reference in the minute to the personal interest of Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson.

I ask again, can the hon. member for North Toronto leave that report in the public archives of this country, in documents that will be referred to and quoted in generations to come, much more damaging than if they were uttered in the violent language of the popular tribune or in the violent lines of an anonymous article, in words which convey to the mind of anybody who is not familar with the facts, that the hon. gentleman, as manager of a trust company, caused that company to loan money in order to enable him to make a profit for himself without disclosing his connection with the transaction? I say again in justice to the hon. gentleman that we must ask him to make that transaction clear.

Mr. FOSTER. As another mild caveat, if either the hon. member himself makes the statement, or if the commission makes the statement that nothing was disclosed to the Union Trust Company the statement is not true in either case. It may be true that nothing is disclosed on the minutes but there are documents as well as minutes and it is a common practice to refer to documents but not to spread the matter on the minutes. If they make the statement there that because it is not disclosed in the minutes therefore there was no disclosure it is a misrepresentation. They knew that it was disclosed and therefore I say again that it is another misrepresentation.

Mr. BOURASSA. Quite so. If it was disclosed without anything having been written in regard to the matter then I will be most happy to afford the hon. gentleman a chance to prove it. I repeat once more that it is not my conclusion, it is not my judgment, but the words which I have just read from the report which are much more damaging than a straight accusation, because they say there is no evidence that the hon. gentleman ever divulged his private interests to the company. Now, the negotiations went on, and finally the syndicate formed by Mr. Pope and the three hon. gentlemen I have just mentioned agreed with the Union Trust Company and the name of the New Ontario syndicate was changed to the Great West Land Company.

Later in the same month Messrs. Pope and Fowler gave directions to the railway company to convey certain blocks of land in pursuance of the dealings that had taken place.

About the same time Messrs. Pope and Fowler authorized the railway company to convey also 8,640 acres, and the conveyance was accordingly made. The arrangement with regard to this is stated to have been the same as with regard to the other lands, Messrs. Pope and Fowler turning them over directly to the company and receiving a profit of $1 per acre, and Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson receiving a profit of 50 cents per acre. At this date they were the sole members of the executive committee of the Great West Land Company—having been appointed at a directors' meeting.

And so on.

On the 8th July, 1903, Mr. Foster reported to a meeting of the board of the Great West Land Company——

—that Messrs. Pope and Fowler had some additional land for sale and he is authorized to go on and complete the bargain.

It was thereupon resolved that Mr. Foster be authorized to purchase the additional lands,

paying therefor $5 per acre, $1 per acre in stock, paid up and non-assessable, and the balance in six yearly instalments, &c. The arrangement made between Messrs. Pope and Fowler and Mr. Foster with regard to this, and which was carried out, involved Messrs. Pope and Fowler making their profit of $1 and Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson theirs, of 50 cents per acre, as, in the other case. The minute makes no disclosure whatever of the personal interest of the three members of the executive in the transaction.

They go on further and they say :

It does not appear that the personal interest of these gentlemen would ever have been disclosed had it not been discovered upon an inspection of the stock-book of the Great West Land Company to the production of which vigorous and prolonged objection was made. It should be borne in mind that in this transaction, as well as in the main transaction, the Union Trust Company was finding all the funds necessary to carry the lands.

So, my hon. friend will see that, in the words of the commissioners themselves, we have nothing so far to enable us to form any judgment but that the hon. gentleman is impugned in that he did not disclose this transaction to his principals of the Union Trust Company and that they say it was not made public until an inspection had been made of the stock-book of the Great West Land Company which inspection was resisted for a time.

Mr. FOSTER. Which again is not true.

Mr. BOURASSA. Quite so ; but I am quoting the report. To simplify matters I would suggest that every time the hon. gentleman wants to make an objection to the report he should make it. Whenever he thinks that in my summary I go beyond the words of my report he will please indicate it to me. The report goes on to say that Mr. Stevenson, one of the directors of the Union Trust Company, became alarmed at these transactions and brought the matter up for discussion in order to find out whether it would not be better for the Union Trust Company to exchange their position as holders of the land and become mortgagees. There are various transactions and various meetings, but strange to say, and here again I wish the House to note the guarded and half disclosed words of the commissioners, the resolution which authorized the transaction is said to have been passed, and it is also stated that there is no evidence that the directors were present.

The directors' attendance book contains no record of a meeting of this date, nor any signature of directors.

Undoubtedly a mortgage was prepared and executed, and undoubtedly a formal release and abandonment of all the stock representing advances was also prepared and executed. Nor is it at all in doubt that a formal assignment by the company and by the president, Dr. Oronhyatekha, was made to Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson of the 237½ and 100 shares respectively.

Here are lines that do not contain any violent words, but the significance of the suggestion, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) cannot let pass without having it probed.

The 337½ shares were divided with practical equality between Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson.

None of the three gentlemen concerned seem to have seen any impropriety in taking part in the discussion at the board of the Union Trust Company of a question in which their interests were so vitally opposed to those of the Trust Company.

And here again I ask, can this statement pass to the country under the sanction of parliament, without the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) having an inquiry put through ? How can the Prime Minister now say, that the commissioners have found nothing against anybody ?

Now in the conclusion of that report, the commissioners say :

Your commissioners have no doubt that accumulated insurance funds are, in every essential particular, trust funds. They belong to the policy-holders and not to the shareholders. The directors are not in possession of them as trading capital in any sense or to any degree. They are not subject to trading risk. They are held in trust for investment and to be enventually paid to those whose moneys they are. Being trust funds the function of the directors in regard to them is the function of trustee. Once the subject is put upon this simple basis the criterion for determining the propriety of any particular dealing by the directors with these funds also becomes simple. Ought a trustee to do this with trust funds ? Once this is recognized as the test, all difficulty disappears.

If the concentration or individualizing of control is made the means of diverting the trust funds from the trust purpose, even temporarily, this fundamental law is broken. If vehicles of investment which are outside the statute governing investments are employed, the law is broken. If permitted vehicles of investment are employed to aid the private interests of the trustee, the law is broken again. No trustee is permitted to occupy a dual position with regard to his trust. He cannot be upon both sides of a transaction.

Don't you see the three little letters of the name 'Cox' painted in there ?

No director should be permitted to have any personal interest whatever whether as principal, agent or beneficiary in any property which is the subject of investment by his company, or in any of his company's transactions. Underwritings and syndicates for the handling of securities should be forbidden altogether. Nor should there be any dealing between an insurance company and any other company of which any director of the insurance company is a shareholder.

We have the statement of the commissioners, that the Union Trust Fund was

nothing else than the Order of Foresters; that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was the manager of that Trust Fund, and that he lent money to syndicates in which he was interested, and that besides he received a commission. How can the Prime Minister now stand before the country and say that there is no finding in this report?

Now, Sir, what more could be expected from that commission? It was not a Court of Assize. When the Prime Minister told me on the 21st of February that we had better wait until the report came down, did he expect that these commissioners would act as a grand jury and say: We convict the member of North Toronto as being unworthy of his trust. That was not the business of the commission. The business of the commission was to investigate where the money of the Forester's Insurance Society went. They did so, and with respect to the company with which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was connected they say, that it was improperly dealt with both with regard to the kind of investments, and to the interest the manager of the Trust had in these investments. Of course nobody expected that this insurance report ought to be legislated upon this session. However, I may say here in the names of hundreds of thousands and millions of policy-holders in Canada, that there is certainly as much necessity for insurance legislation this session, as there is for the Minister of the Interior bringing down, four months after parliament is convened, a Bill having for its object the revision of all the laws governing the lands of Canada for twenty years past.

But, leaving aside the question of legislation, it is not so much legislation that is expected from parliament and from the government. What the people interested in insurance companies expect from us, is, that we will show a strong hand in the inspection of the companies. What justice can be expected from a parliament and from a government, the leader of which says, in face of this report that there is no finding against a single member of parliament? Sir, if the Prime Minister should oppose investigation now, if the Prime Minister does not give the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) a chance to clear himself, or, if he should call on parliament to support him in absolving the member for North Toronto, what confidence can the people of Canada have in the justice of this government or in the justice of this parliament? What relief can the policy-holders expect, if in the face of a report presented by commissioners named by this government, stating that one member of parliament has been untrue to his trust, this parliament should say: we absolve that member in order that we may avoid an inquiry into matters that have nothing to do with insurance. That would be of bad omen indeed for the insurance policy-holders of Canada. I present this matter in the same light to the government and the opposition, to the Liberal party and to the Conservative party, and I say, that if you leave the matter as it stands now, the saying to-morrow will be: That Senator Cox and Mr. Foster have paired, and that the pair has been accepted by the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the first time we ever paired.

Mr. BOURASSA. It may be, and it is a very bad occasion to commence pairing, and, so far as the public reputation of these two gentlemen is concerned, it would be the last time they would ever have the chance to pair because they would disappear very soon from public life.

I have not yet touched the case of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler), of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and of the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Lefurgey). When the right hon. gentleman stated the other day that we must await the report of the Insurance Commission, and when he stated later on that he found nothing in that report, he could not have in mind those three hon. gentlemen, because if the Insurance Commission had as part of its duty to report either for or against the member for North Toronto as manager of a Trust Company, they had no business whatever to report against these three hon. gentlemen. The way these three hon. gentlemen came to the front, is simply as stated by Mr. Shepley, when he said, in reply to the objection raised by the hon. member for King's:

> We are not trying to impugn you, but we want to know what has become of the money of the Independent Order of Foresters.

And, in looking to what had become of that money, they found that the hon. member for King's, the hon. member for East Simcoe, and the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. had received some of that money.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman please state in what part of the evidence it is shown that I received from the Union Trust Company or from any person else, the $6,000 of my own money I put in that transaction?

Mr. BOURASSA. I will explain that in a moment, and my hon. friend will find that I am not at all trying to deal unfairly with his conduct.

I will explain that in a moment, and my hon. friend will find that I am not at all trying to commit him. I say that Mr. Shepley wanted to see what had been done with the investment. It was found that in the transaction which had taken place between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and these hon. gentlemen, and between that syndicate and the

Union Trust Company, these hon. gentlemen sold to the Union Trust Company at a higher price certain lands which they had purchased from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. As far as that is concerned, I immediately say to my hon. friend that I do not see any impropriety in it. Again, as in the case of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), as in the case of the Hon. Senator Cox, I have not come here to charge these hon. gentlemen. But what has happened? That evidence had scarcely gone to print before the whole Liberal press of the country took it up and branded those three hon. gentlemen as being unworthy of seats in this House. Let us lay aside, if you like, the accusations which were made before this session; but since the opening of this session, indeed, in this month of March, the Montreal 'Herald,' one of the most respectable organs of public opinion in this country, although a party organ, one that has always been regarded as an impartial one among the party papers, has published eight or nine articles, in which it accuses in so many words the hon. member for North Toronto, the hon. member for King's, N.B., the hon. member for East Simcoe and the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I., of improper conduct, of having concocted together and completed one of the greatest pieces of graft that was ever committed in this country; and in four of these articles doubt is expressed as to the ability of three at least of these gentlemen to hold seats in this House, because, as it says, it seems as if they had accepted favours from Mr. Daniel Mann in order to have their transaction completed, and had repaid that service by opposing the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. Now, Sir, these are no ordinary accusations. These are no more the accusation that these hon. gentlemen have taken money from the Independent Order of Foresters. We have the direct charge that they have received favours from a railway magnate who has to deal with this parliament every day, and the 'Herald' asks with what favours they have been repaid that service. But, Sir, leaving aside the Montreal 'Herald,' I will take up a paper which is justly considered, or at least claimed by many people to be, the most honest paper in Canada, a paper which, although usually siding with the Liberal party, is considered by every one to be entirely self-supporting and to be imbued with high ideals of morality and justice; I mean the Montreal 'Daily Witness,' which, in its issue of the 12th of March last, had the following remarks with regard to this transaction:

The original speculators, Messrs. Fowler, Bennett, Lefurgey and Pope, turned over the land in a few weeks to a syndicate, the members of which were Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson, at a price of $4.50 an acre, thus netting the considerable sum of two hundred thousand dollars. It was stated, however, before the Insurance Commission, that at the very time the Foster-McGillivray syndicate was paying the Fowler-Bennett syndicate $4.50 an acre, another syndicate, composed of Messrs. Foster, Montague and Dr. Oronhyatekha, was purchasing similar land from the Canadian Pacific at $3.50 an acre. It is clear that Mr. Foster was either, as member of the syndicate, paying a dollar too much for the Fowler-Bennett-Pope land, or as a member of another syndicate paying a dollar an acre under the market price. If the latter is true, what was the quid pro quo expected by the Canadian Pacific from these Conservative gentlemen? If, on the other hand, he paid the Fowler-Bennett-Pope crowd two hundred thousand dollars more than their land was worth, then, the shareholders of the Union Trust Company, whose money Mr. Foster was dealing with, are clearly that much out of pocket. A parliamentary inquiry should not only clear up these points, but should bring to light other matters that are now only hinted at.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow me a remark on that?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. If he is friendly to the 'Witness,' he has scarcely done it a good turn by reading that article, but he has certainly done me and I think this House a good turn. I imagine that my hon. friend would take this view from that, that I, standing in one place, was on the one hand paying a dollar more in respect of lands than I could purchase them for at the very same time, standing in another place, from the same quarter. This is the fact, is it not?

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, that is the fact as stated by the 'Witness.'

Mr. FOSTER. There is absolutely not a modicum of truth in that statement. I was buying other lands at that time, and whereas I paid the Pope-Fowler-Bennett syndicate $4.25 in cash, together with 25 cents in stock, $4.50 in all, I was paying at the very same time between $4.90 and $5.25 for lands not a bit better. There is absolutely such a misrepresentation in that that one wonders why so reputable a journal, without looking into the facts of the case, would put it into its sheet.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy at the interruption of the hon. gentleman, as I shall be at any interruption he makes, because every time he gets up he simply proves my contention that this matter should be cleared up. Last year or two years ago the hon. gentleman thought he owed it to his dignity as a member of parliament and as a public man to bring to the bar of the House a young man who occupied, after all, not such a responsible position in the press of the country, because forsooth he had accused the hon. gentleman of saying things disagreeable to the French-Canadians and the Catholics. For six

months past the whole ministerial press of the country has been charging the hon. gentleman with being untrue to his trust, with being a dishonest man, with being unworthy of a seat in this parliament; and yet the representatives of these journals have not been haled before the bar of this House. I do not know that the editor of the 'Witness' has received a single assignation from the hon. gentleman to appear before a court to answer for this most damaging statement; the hon. gentleman says it is not true, but he has done nothing to punish the writer of it. If my hon. friend will prosecute him, perhaps he will avoid the necessity of taking off his hat and getting up to make explanations. I am speaking most earnestly, because up to this time, in spite of political differences, I have always looked upon the hon. gentleman as one of the leading men of this country, and my earnest hope was that after the statement the hon. gentleman had made before the Commission on Insurance, he was going to appeal to parliament. I expected him to appeal to parliament. He may have had good reasons for not doing so, and he will no doubt state them; but so far he has not appealed to parliament. But it is never too late, Sir; it is never too late for a man of the standing of my hon. friend to take advantage of an opportunity to clear his honour; and therefore I quite understand that under the circumstances he has not taken the trouble to call before the bar of the House the journalists who have accused him of so many nefarious deeds, though he did it on one occasion in regard to statements far less detrimental to his honour. I take for granted, therefore, in view of the statements which the hon. gentleman has made this afternoon, in view of his contradiction of the findings of the commission, in view of his contradiction of the charges in the Montreal 'Witness,' that he will be the first man to stand up and support me in my proposal to have an inquiry that will give him all the opportunity he desires, to reinstate himself in that position to which, laying aside all party differences, I shall be most happy and proud to see him return.

Now, Sir, what happened in this House? I do not think I exaggerate when I state that many weeks before parliament was called together, not only did the public at large expect that this would be one of the first questions to be taken up, not only did the public expect that swords would be drawn before long and that blood would be spilt, but members of the House expected it. It was the current rumour in the lobby—the hon. member for East Simcoe has stated it. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) has said it. It was current rumour. The first thing that seemed to indicate this as part of the ministerial programme was the statement made by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. E. B. Devlin), in the discussion on the address, that he was greatly surprised to see the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in his seat—that, after the revelations which had been made, he thought that the hon. gentleman would never have the audacity to take his seat in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. Some time later, on the 7th of February, the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) referred to that land speculation with which the names of the hon. member for King's (Mr. (Fowler), the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Lefurgey) have been connected. He was immediately challenged by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to proceed with his charges, and I repeat that I am glad to find that at every juncture of this unfortunate affair, that hon. gentleman is perhaps the one who has shown the most courage and who has always demanded an investigation. On the 21st of February the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) again challenged the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). What did that hon. gentleman reply? He said—and I am not saying he was wrong—that he had no charge to make but that the matter was one of public notoriety. On the 19th of February the hon. member for Yale-Carriboo (Mr. Ross) challenged the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler), and then came the explosion. Since that time what has become of the whole campaign which had been carried on for six months in the various ministerial papers? What has become of all those threats? What has become of all those investigations which were threatened? When is that general clearing up to take place, which was announced so many weeks and months before parliament met? At the outset the right hon. the first minister said the matter was so grave that the session could not pass without its being investigated. The leader of the opposition endorsed that stand, although to my mind he was not clear enough, because he confined his statement too much to gentlemen on his side of the House. It had however this queer result that it got the Prime Minister to take under his protection hon. members on the other side. After the whole ministerial press and several members on the government side had announced that they were going to bring these hon. gentlemen before the bar of public opinion, there was dead silence and those hon. members found shelter under the maternal wings of the First Minister. Is it surprising that the impression should prevail in the country that there has been a saw-off in this business?

Now I want to make myself clear and be fair to the right hon. gentleman as well as those whose names have been connected

with the matter. I am ready to help them in destroying that impression, but if that is not done to-day, and done completely, the impression will prevail to the great detriment of public honour in this country. It has been stated of late that there is nothing to investigate. Of course I admit that we cannot touch Senator Cox in this House; but it is the duty of the government, acting through its members in the other House, to have that gentleman brought before his peers and clear himself or stand the result of an inquiry. With regard to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) it may be said, as was said lately in a ministerial paper, the Montreal 'Herald,' that his dealings with the Independent Order of Foresters are not subject to the authority of this House. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) himself said the other day that if he had some dealings with a grocery store, that would be no business of the parliament of Canada. I agree with him, but after the attitude taken by parliament last year, after that Royal Commission issued to those three gentlemen to investigate into the operations of insurance companies, the insurance business of Canada is no more in the same category as that of a grocery store. The parliament of Canada has taken upon itself the responsibility of making good to the hundreds of thousands of Canadian citizens who hold insurance policies that they will be protected against such practices as the commissioners appointed by the government claim the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has been guilty of. Those commissioners have reported against the hon. gentleman and have strongly advised this House to make it impossible for such things to happen in the future. Are you going to inspire confidence in the people of Canada by saying now: Yes, we are going to commit all the insurance managers, but we will blind ourselves and see no finding against the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)? We will preserve him in our ranks because forsooth if we did not, that might result in some damaging business in our own ranks being inquired into. This is no mere trade question or party question. We have taken upon ourselves the responsibility of controlling the insurance business. Two things must be done. We cannot base action on this report; we cannot pass judgment on the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) but must give him the fullest opportunity that can be found under British justice and British parliamentary procedure. If we want to be taken seriously by the people of Canada, if we want to inspire confidence in the pepole, if we mean to do what we have promised with regard to the insurance business, we must, before everything else, deal with the case of the hon. member who has been connected with that business, which is no longer private business but the business of parliament.

But, as I have said, this commission of inquiry was not appointed for the purpose of impeaching any member of parliament. This inquiry had for its object an investigation into the operations of all the insurance companies. The name of an hon. gentleman was connected with one of them, and the result of the inquiry is the report I have quoted. The result of that report is those articles which have appeared in the press from time to time within the last six months. The result of that inquiry is also the statements which have been made in this House. And I claim we have gone either too far or not far enough. We must go further and give the hon. gentleman ample opportunity to justify himself before the people of Canada, because everything which touches the honour of any member of this House, especially an ex-minister of the Crown, touches the honour of the people. I shall be most happy if the hon. gentleman can refute the report of this commission, but he cannot stand under that report, and parliament cannot stand silent and motionless under the accusations made against him.

I immediately agree that the question which arises with regard to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) cannot be raised with regard to the three other hon. members named in the report. They are not and they cannot be accused of having been untrue to a trust, which I claim is now a public trust, since we have taken upon ourselves to deal with the insurance business. But the direct accusation made against those hon. gentlemen by various newspapers and carried over the whole country is that they received special favours either from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or from one of the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company; and a straight charge is made against them by at least one government newspaper, that on account of that they have lost their right to their seats in this House. How can we know if that is true or not unless an inquiry is held, not for the purpose of bringing to light these transactions as the Insurance Commissioners brought them to light, but in order to see whether the comments based on that report are or are not true? We are bound, every time a public document leaves a suspicion as to the honour of a member of parliament, as long as this public evidence remains there uncontradicted, to give a chance to these hon. gentlemen to clear themselves. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has twice during this season required the investigation to take place. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) has made the same statement, asking for an inquiry. Therefore, I say that in justice to these hon. gentlemen we must of necessity either give them a chance to clear themselves or we must find out whether or not the accusations sent broadcast both

within and without this House by supporters of the government that these gentlemen are unworthy of seats in this House, are true; the accusations should be probed to the bottom, and if they are true these members should be treated accordingly.

It has been asked, and will probably be repeated to-night: Why do you not make a charge yourself? Why do you not take the risk? I shall be perfectly candid with the House and with the government; I am not going to give to the government or to the opposition a chance of making me the scapegoat in this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOURASSA. I know very well that it would have been most tasteful for several members of this House to say: All right, we will give you a committee; then proceed with your charges. Mr. Speaker, I have some knowledge of the parliamentary history of my country, and I know very well that when a government wants to block an inquiry it can always do it—and this has been done in the past. I know very well that when the whole Liberal party attempted to bring to task an ex-Minister of Public Works and the member for Quebec West, in the late Conservative government, they would never have succeeded had they not been helped publicly and privately by members of the Conservative government, who gave them papers to go on, and then lent them the help of the Justice Department to complete their investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. But there is more than that. On the one hand there are those accusations against the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), the member for King's (Mr. Fowler) and the member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey). What are those charges? Are they of the kind of personal charges which must be made by one member of parliament in order that the public and parliament may be made cognizant of the facts? No, Sir; the charges that are made are to be found in the interpretation to be put on public documents, and in this I agree with the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), that this is not a case of personal insinuation or charge, it is a matter of public notoriety, and that matter has been made public because of the action of parliament, for parliament has instituted that commission of inquiry; these facts have come to light, and it is the duty of parliament to complete its own work, as far as its honour is concerned, as far as the standing of these gentlemen is concerned; and, therefore, I say it is the duty of parliament to proceed with the investigation.

There is more than that. If the charges were made, if personal charges would be required, they ought to be made by such men as have the same opinion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as that held by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. E. B. Devlin) and as the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler), because the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has never retracted what he stated any more than the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) has retracted his charges. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has stated that he had no charge to make, because it was a matter of public notoriety, but that he was ready to pass judgment on the member for King's as soon as a committee was instituted.

Now, Sir, I go further. The campaign which has been conducted in the press of the country for the last six months has put public opinion in such a state of enervation and suspicion that it is not only the accusation of this man against that man that must be probed, but there is a demand for a general inquiry as to the conduct of any member of parliament or any member of the government against whom charges are insinuated daily in the corridors of the House, or on the street, or through the columns of the newspapers, by people who apparently know enough to brand these men as unworthy of seats in this House, but who have nothing to say of them in public. For my part, I know nothing else beyond what there is on public record, and, if that is needed, I am ready to state now that so far as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the member for King's (Mr. Fowler) are concerned, I believe that they at least stand committed, on the documents that are before the House, in such a way that parliament must go further; there need not be any more personal charges, and the government should take the responsibility of holding and conducting the inquiry, and should not leave it to the personal charge of a member of this House.

There is more than that. I say the government should take hold of this, and the machinery of the Department of Justice must be put into action in this matter, because otherwise it will be a farcical inquiry like many that have taken place in this House; and unless the machinery of the government, the machinery of the Department of Justice, is to be called into action and made to work with all earnestness and all good faith, nothing will come out of the investigation.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend really seriously suggest that the Minister of Justice should be set to investigate me?

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I did not say that——

Mr. FOSTER. Or his machinery?

Mr. BOURASSA—but I claim that if the committee is appointed and the hon. gentle-

man (Mr. Foster) is brought on trial there, that the legal officers of the Department of Justice should be at the disposal of that committee just as they were at a time that a colleague of my hon. friend was brought before a committee, I mean the Minister of Public Works in the last Conservative government, of which my hon. friend was a member. Does my hon. friend object to that? Does he claim that the government of which he was a member then acted unfairly? I claim they acted properly, and the Conservative party have always claimed credit for having done all in their power to let the full light into that matter. Why should they be laughed at by one of those whose name is impugned, because we know that the government can act in such a way as to throw light upon such a subject of inquiry. I have stated that in the case of the late government, not only was the legal machinery of the government placed at the disposal of parliament in order that light should be thrown on the subject, but some members of the government went as far as to betray themselves in order to get rid of an old colleague, of whom they were tired, and of whom they wanted to make a scapegoat.

A strange thing is the attitude taken by the government organs on this matter. 'Le Canada,' the organ of the government, the representative of the government in Montreal, came out the other day with an article saying, in substance: Why have an inquiry? We rest satisfied, we Liberals are satisfied that the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) should remain under the suspicion which the records of the commission throw upon him; if he wants an inquiry made, let him ask for it; all we want—it amounts to this—is that we should be free to go and slander the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the member for King's (Mr. Fowler) and their confrères, as we have done so long, and we have no interest in asking that there should be light shed on these subjects.

Sir, I say that public opinion is not at all satisfied with what has been done and will not be satisfied until this matter has been ventilated. I note a strange coincidence: the difference in attitudes, the difference between ferocious attacks that have been made during the last six months against the members of the opposition, and the present mild attitude on the ministerial benches where they seem ready to allow these gentlemen to go scot-free, coinciding with the attack that was made by the member for King's (Mr. Fowler), his threat that if the war was carried on against these gentlemen he would make himself clear. Now what were the words the member for King's used? First of all, the right hon. gentleman on the 8th of March, said that there was nothing, so to speak, in the statement of the member for King's:

He did not mention any name, he did not mention any offence, he spoke in a general way, and I am at a loss to know at the present moment what charges there are to be investigated.

Now let us compare the judgment of the Prime Minister with the words of the hon. member for King's. The first shot was aimed at the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross):

Go on; tell us the whole story. Let us have the whole story, and we will show your connection with Mr. Hill.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. With reference to the statement just read by the hon. gentleman, I have given it an emphatic and categorical denial in this House. The hon. gentleman cannot repeat it under the protection that it had been made previously by another hon. gentleman in this House. He must either make it on his own responsibility as a member of this House, or not make it at all, or not even read it at all.

Mr. BOURASSA. My hon. friend has gone a little ahead of time. He must not be in such a hurry as the hon. member for North Toronto was, because if he had waited five minutes I was going to tell him——

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. No. I want to keep the hon. gentleman straight.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it a point of order?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I rise to a point of order. If hon. gentlemen opposite desire to allow the member for Labelle to go on under the protection that the statement he is reading has been made by another hon. gentleman, I do not propose to allow him to do so. I have denied that statement and the hon. gentleman has no right to repeat it now unless he does so on his own responsibility as a member of this House.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not only glad to satisfy my hon. friend, but it is necessary for my argument that I should read his statement, and I am going to read it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the point of order is well taken, that an hon. gentleman having denied a statement in the House, it should not be repeated in the House.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am prepared to let the hon. gentleman read that statement, but if he does he must read it on his own responsibility as a member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The member for Yale-Cariboo must either take a point of order or not. If he takes a point of order, I have already given my ruling upon it.

Mr. BOURASSA. If I may be permitted to explain myself——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think no further explanation can be made now after the ruling has been given.

Mr. BOURASSA. May I be allowed to prove that the statement made by the right hon. gentleman that there were no names and no offences mentioned in the language of the hon. member for King's is disproved by the words of the hon. member for King's himself, especially in view of the fact that the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo has denied the statement containing names and offences? The argument I want to make is, not that the hon. member for King's has made a charge, but that the right hon. gentleman has made a mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point raised was that the statement made by the member for King's concerning the member for Yale-Cariboo having been denied by the latter, it cannot be repeated, and that is my ruling.

Mr. BOURASSA. Well, then I must take another course; anyway the statement is there. But the member for King's also says that he will 'give the true inside of the Hyman story.' Here is a name, here is a fact; what does it mean? I do not know what it means. How can I make a charge upon these words? Do I know what the member for King's had in his mind when he used these words? What is the true inside of the Hyman story? A minister of the Crown resigns and goes to the south for his health. He is asked by the Prime Minister to retain his seat in the Cabinet. Various transactions and sessions of a committee go on for three months, and the hon. member for London, or the Minister of Public Works is still where he was at the beginning. And here is a member of parliament standing up in this House saying that he knows the true inside of the Hyman story. What that means I do not know. Is it a matter of private concern or is it a matter of public concern? Does he mean that the Minister of Public Works has been derelict in his duties, or that he has been guilty of improper conduct? I do not know; the member for King's knows, and unless the member for King's is given an opportunity of formulating his charges we should not know. And although the Prime Minister has said that the member for King's has made no statement of fact, yet it goes to the public that the member for King's knows the true and unrevealed reason why the Minister of Public Works has tendered his resignation. More than that, the hon. member stated:

> I shall allow no man to make an attack on me or on my character without retorting. I shall discuss the character of hon. members opposite, whether they be ministers of the Crown or private members, and their connection with women, wine and graft.

Is this not an accusation, Mr. Speaker? Is there no fact mentioned here? It is exactly because the accusation is general that it is the most damaging. Of which minister or ministers is it true? It is either true or it is untrue. If it is untrue, can the Prime Minister allow for a moment this damaging accusation to hang over the heads of his colleagues? And if it is true will he allow suspicion such as that to hang over two ministers of the Crown as hon. ourable as those in front of me, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance? Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that in this statement there is not only one of the most damaging accusations that has ever been made against public men, but it is all the more damaging because of the lack of definition in it. It may apply to any one, it may apply to twenty, it may apply to thirty. Although hon. members of this House may be disposed to dismiss it with a laugh, I may tell them that in their laugh there is a trace of cynicism which the people of Canada will resent from this time until the charges have been cleared up. If you think that this matter is going to be settled by a mutual laugh on both sides of the House, I think you are greatly mistaking the morality of the people of Canada. Now, not only did the member for King's make this accusation, but he stated that he had material, that he had been gathering data, and this is what makes his charge entirely different from any other charge or insinuations that have ever been made in this House by a public man.

Now, I have been warned that my hon. friend from King's, N.B., was going to go for me—such is the usual expression—because I may have on this occasion or on that occasion, thrown suspicion upon this member of the government or that member of the government. Well, Sir, I will be ready to take up that question whenever it comes along. I will not oppose any rule of order as my hon. friend from Yale tried to do this afternoon. I am ready to have it discussed at any time. I am not going to plead innocence in regard to violence of debate. Each of us, perhaps with a very few exceptions, has indulged in some violent language here or there; but the material difference—and I wish the House to remember this—between a common charge or a common insinuation that may have been made in this House and the present one is that the hon. member for King's says: I have the material, I have the data which I will bring to light if you attack me. Then, on the other hand, the right hon. Prime Minister gets up and says: There is nothing against hon. gentlemen on that side of the House and I find nothing in the words of the hon. member for King's. If the intelligent press and the intelligent people of this country take this as a proposal to saw-off in order to prevent the culprits from being known, or in order to prevent accusations from being further ventilated, it is not my fault and it is not the fault of any member of this House, or rather it is not the fault of any one who has so

far remained silent on this question. It is certainly borne out and more than proved by the words of the hon. member for King's and the attitude of the Prime Minister.

Now, Sir, it may be said and I have stated in this House that accusations of immoral conduct are not perhaps within the jurisdiction of this House. I must say that when I made that statement I was entirely ignorant of what may have been in the mind of the hon. member for King's. I may say, whether rightly or wrongly, that I do not come into frequent contact with ministers of the Crown and perhaps that is one of the reasons why I did not understand what the hon. member for King's had in his mind. But, Sir, rumours are going all over the city of Ottawa, and insinuations are made right and left in the corridors of the House by members of parliament and by outsiders. I do not want to believe them, I hope they are untrue, but if one-half of them be true it is not only the right but it is the imperative duty of the government to intervene.

In regard to the morality of any minister of the Crown here again as in many other instances my guiding principle is the one which has been applied for many years past in the conduct of the government in Great Britain ; and the principle in regard to the morality of any British Minister of the Crown is the one which William Ewart Gladstone adopted and applied in the case of a man far abler and far more useful to the people of Great Britain than can be any minister of the Crown who has been cited as being in the stocks, and that man was Sir Charles Dilke. Sir, if half of what is circulated around the corridors of this House is true—I do not know whether it is true or is not true—but if half of it is true I say that it is the duty of the Prime Minister to interfere as Mr. Gladstone had to interfere with the private conduct and private life of Sir Charles Dilke, and if the Prime Minister is remiss in his duty it is up to this House to know the truth from the man who has the data and material to give and to see that justice shall be done. Otherwise it is not only three or four men who will be held in the stocks but it is the whole government, the whole majority of this House that will be held in the stocks by the public opinion of Canada because they do not want the truth to be known and the culprits to be punished. Again, it may be said that there is nothing to investigate, because, in the words of the hon. member for King's, there are no names given and no personal references. I do not know if the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) will again raise a point of order, but his name having been mentioned, and he having denied in the most undoubted terms the accusation which was made against him, does he think that is all that is necessary or does he not wish the hon. member for King's to retract his statement ? Is it sufficient that the public and the House should judge as between the affirmation of the hon. member for King's and the denial of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo ? It may be sufficient to comply with the rules of the House but it is not sufficient for public opinion and my hon. friend must understand that if he is what I hold him to be, an honourable public man, he cannot leave matters in this way and he must ask the hon. member for King's either to retract or prove.

In regard to the Hyman story too, I claim that it is the duty of the government not only towards their colleagues but towards the people of the country at large, if the hon. member for King's had anything in his mind—and perhaps he had nothing—to prove it. The hon. member for King's is known not to be a coward. If the hon. member for King's would get up and say : I spoke in a moment of excitement and I withdraw that statement because I know it is not true as it was simply uttered in a moment of excitement, everybody would forgive him. But, if he really knows or has any reason to believe that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) is not a worthy member of this House or of this government, if he knows that the Prime Minister is not acting properly towards his colleague the Minister of Public Works, he should be called upon at once to make his word good and give us the 'true inside of the story.'

In regard to the general accusation about wine, women and graft, I claim that if any ministers of the Crown—the truth of which accusation I do not know, and I am only giving general facts—are connected with wine and women in such a way that it has become a matter of public scandal, if they have used the property of the government to carry on their profligate acts, if they have been put out of hotels and public places of amusement because they have been guilty of misconduct with women, and if anybody has a knowledge of these facts he must make them public. If I had the least particle of evidence I would make a charge, but I have not. But I repeat that it is a scandal if the government and parliament do not take any action and do not see that a purification takes place.

Now, Sir, in regard to graft ; it is no more a question of personal conduct. It is a question of public interest. In regard to morals, of course it may be that the standard of morality is not as high in this country as it is in England. It is here stated and it is a fair point of view to take that if it be that the people of Canada do not insist upon the standard of morality that prevails in England we have no business to inquire into that matter. I am ready to agree with the judgment of the House as far as that is concerned, but I do not believe that the people of Canada have not the same standard of morality in regard to their public men, and in this I agree with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who said himself recently in speaking of the public men of this country that

you cannot entirely disconnect the private and the public life of a man. There are many things in the private life of a man that should not be investigated and especially in regard to the life of a private member of parliament who is responsible only to his electors. I agree that his electors may properly be his judges, but I say in regard to a minister of the Crown that it is up to the Prime Minister, it is up to the leader of the government to see that his cabinet is composed of men who are a credit to his party, a credit to the country and who cannot be cited as being the cause of scandal before the country. Why should these things be the subject of a personal charge ? I cannot make a charge. If I knew, I state again, that I would make a charge. If I had a tittle of evidence in my posession I would make a charge. But the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) has made a charge ; he has stated he had the data, he has stated he had the material. I am not ready to say to the hon. member for King's, as one newspaper said, that if he excuses himself and does not reveal what he has declared he can reveal, he should be branded as a coward or a slanderer. I would not go that far. I am not disposed in this matter to be violent with the accusers or the accused. All I say is, that both the accusers and the accused should be brought before a committee of this House, so that the truth may be known, so that justice may be rendered to whom justice is due, whether it be for their vindication or for their condemnation. What I claim is that these exchanges of charges and insinuations have been spread so broadcast, and have been so bandied about by newspapers representing the different parties, that it is no longer a question of personal accusations by a few men against another few men ; it is a question of the necessity of the parliament of Canada vindicating its own honour and the reputation of our public men.

Of course, it may be questioned whether the form of procedure of parliament does not require that a specific charge should be made; but my answer is, that things have gone beyond that point when legal quibbling and equivocation about parliamentary procedure should intervene to stop inquiry. The making of a personal charge is an excellent idea when a member of parliament may know a thing of his own knowledge. But, when we have to inquire into a matter of public notoriety, as in the case of the four opposition members whose names have been published far and wide in the Liberal newspapers, it is no longer a case of making a personal charge, it is a case of inquiring into a matter which has become publicly notorious. In the case of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) it is no longer a question of a personal charge, because we do not know what is in the mind of the hon. gentleman ; we do not know whom he wants to attack ; we do not know what he wants to charge against them, and unless he is given an opportunity to make his charge, parliament will rest under that cloud of suspicion which has been raised throughout the country.

Now, Sir, not only should that inquiry be held by parliament under the authority of parliament, and not only should the government take the initiative in the matter, but the inquiry should be broad enough so that every one who has a clear statement to make against any minister of the Crown or against any member of the House, should be at liberty to come before that committee and to make his statement, provided of course his statement is supported by evidence and that the charge is one which the House has jurisdiction to hear. If the House leaves this unfortunate affair to stand as it is at present, it is going to be made a party tune for both sides of politics. Liberal newspapers and Liberal stumpers will keep on charging the members that have been named on the other side of the House ; and the Conservative press will keep on stating that the member for King's was courageous enough to threaten the government and that the government had not the courage to take up the challenge, because the case of the Liberal members was so bad that they were afraid to persist in the accusations which their own newspapers and their own speakers had hurled against their opponents for so many months. What the public opinion of Canada requires is not an inquiry so that both parties may find enough mud to throw at each other, but a thorough inquiry which will enlighten public opinion, and which will enable parliament to maintain its reputation by punishing the culprits and absolving the innocent. It may be said that it is too late in the session for such an inquiry. That argument is not good. It is never too late for the parliament of Canada to redeem its honour. It is never too late for the government of Canada to ask parliament to support it in vindicating its honour. It is said that the Prime Minister must go to England. Whatever our personal opinions may be as to the necessity of the Prime Minister going to England, every true Canadian must believe that the Prime Minister cannot represent the people of Canada at the imperial conference while general accusations of graft and corruption stand against the fair name of Canada and her parliament. The Prime Minister cannot go to London with the session adjourned in a hasty manner, so that these accusations which have been made public and scattered broadcast and which have been repeated in this House by members of parliament, should remain uninvestigated and left to be forgotten, nobody exculpated,

and nobody punished, and the parliament of Canada retaining its honour only because of the gag. The truth must be known; it must be known now, and therefore I move seconded by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne):

That the report of the Royal Commission on Life Insurance and the evidence connected therewith have made public various transactions in which members of this House participated—namely, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler), the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), the hon. member for Prince, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey);

That such transactions have been commented upon, by several organs of public opinion, in terms reflecting upon the honour, the integrity and the independence of the above-named gentlemen;

That references to such transactions have been made in this House, during the present session,—namely, by the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), on the 7th and 21st days of February, and by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross), on the 19th day of February—in terms indicating that, in the opinion of those two hon. gentlemen, the above-named hon. members are guilty of improper conduct;

That on the 26th day of November last, the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) referred to the hon. member for North Toronto as being unworthy of a seat in this House, on account of the transactions above-mentioned;

That on the 19th of February last, the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler), addressing the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross), stated: 'We will show your connection with Mr. Hill—and we will give you the true inside of the Hyman story too,' and added, 'I shall discuss the character of hon. members opposite, whether they be ministers or private members, and their connection with women, wine and graft';

That these statements have become a matter of general comment and have aroused public opinion throughout the country, so that an immediate inquiry is imperative;

That the Prime Minister and his colleagues, being the principal guardians of the honour of parliament, should take the initiative in such an inquiry;

That the government should therefore ask the House to constitute a special committee to conduct a strict and impartial inquiry as to whether any ministers of the Crown or members of parliament have improperly made use of their positions as such for their private gain or have otherwise been guilty of personal misconduct under such circumstances or of such a character as to justify the intervention and censure of this House;

That any charges that may be preferred against any member of the government or of the House should be formulated before that committee, and that members of this House or other persons who have material or data at their disposal with reference thereto should divulge them to that committee;

That such committee have power to employ and hear counsel, to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation, and to report to the House during the present session.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of suggesting that, as this is a historic document, it ought to be correct as to historic fact. I wish to state that neither on the 19th of February nor on any other day did I make reference in this House to the insurance report.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton. N.B.). Mr. Speaker, as my name has been mentioned in the resolution moved by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and as it has also been referred to a number of times by the hon. member in the remarks he has made this afternoon, I feel that I need offer no apology to this House for asking for perhaps half an hour's time in order to discuss the question now before the House. I feel that it is matter of great importance to the policy-holders of the Independent Order of Foresters, of whom I believe there are from 50,000 to 60,000 scattered all over Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific who have been paying their money into the fund of that order, hoping to receive the benefit thereof, either for themselves upon their attaining the age of 70 years or for their representatives after their death, in the form of life insurance. There is a difference in the general policy adopted by the Independent Order of Foresters from that of the ordinary old line companies. The Independent Order of Foresters, being a purely mutual company, has for its basic principle, the idea that when a member dies, an assessment shall be made on the other members which shall bring in sufficient to pay the indemnity due. In order to put this company on a little safer and stronger basis, its officers some years ago decided to increase the dues. By that means they were able to provide a reserve fund as an extra security to the policy-holders. The company, through its managers, the late Dr. Oronhyateka, who spent the best years of his life in connection with it, worked out what I believe is a pretty good scheme of insurance. But they felt that their investments were not properly made, and that some scheme should be devised for giving the policy-holders greater security than they had had up to that time. Therefore about the year 1901 it was decided to incorporate what was called a trust company for the purpose of better investing the funds of the Foresters. I am not going into the history of the formation of the Union Trust Company. I understand that they first bought out a small trust company, the assets of which were not very valuable; but in the end the Union Trust Company was bought out, and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was placed in charge of it as manager. Before that hon. gentleman took charge, there was some correspondence between him and the late Dr. Oronhyateka as to the lines on which the company should be incorporated;

and I wish to place on record portions of a letter written by the hon. member for North Toronto, containing his views as to the lines on which the trust company should be organized and the amount of capital it should have for carrying on the business. This letter, which was written on the 30th day of April, 1901, appears at page 133 of the report of the Insurance Commissioners :

> I have thought carefully over the matter from my own standpoint and from that of the company and of the order of which you are the head and its large and steadily increasing financial interests which necessitate great care and responsibility in the matter of investments. It seems to me that a trust company with a small paid-up capital and depending alone on the general field for its business would require many years and much hard work to place itself in position to return any considerable profit to its shareholders. The field is not a wide one, and is already pretty well occupied by older and well established companies. . . . To make our business foundation broad and firm we should make sure of a generous paid-up capital so as to give confidence to our patrons and provide a basis for operations on an active and enterprising scale. We cannot afford to go limping along at slow gait.

That is practically the substance of the letter. As a result of that letter the Union Trust Company was organized with an authorized capital stock, if I remember rightly, of $2,000,000. A small amount of the stock was purchased by the hon. member for North Toronto, not then a member of this House, by Mr. McGillivray, a former member of this House, by Mr. Wilson, a lawyer somewhere in the province of Ontario, by a Judge McDougall, and by a Mr. Schofield. Though it is very immaterial, my recollection is that the first three named gentlemen took $1,000 each and the other two $3,000 each. That would make altogether $7,000 of capital put in by outside people.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether I am to follow my hon. friend in correcting him in every particular, but he is quite at sea as to the facts.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend, I presume, will have a chance to follow me, and if I make any misstatements of fact he need not grumble, because he will have every chance of making whatever capital he can out of the matter. I do not know that I am right as to the amount of outside capital, and I do not know that it makes any difference, because the hon. gentleman will not deny that in the end the capital stock was increased to $2,500,000, and that before he severed his connection with the company every dollar of that stock had been sold and the money paid in and turned into his hands as manager, and that of that $2,500,000 at least $2,490,000 was the money of the Independent Order of Foresters. Therefore the hon. gentleman handled a fund of which $2,490,000 was the property of the Independent Order of Foresters, and about $10,000 was the property of four or five other gentlemen. I do not think my hon. friend will be able to controvert these facts if he will keep himself close to the record. The point I am making is that the funds of the Union Trust Company were the funds of the Independent Order of Foresters. I know that my hon. friend is going to take the ground which he took before the insurance investigation, that it is nobody's business what became of the funds of the Union Trust Company—that at least it is not the business of the Foresters of Canada and not the business of this parliament. He is going to say that the Royal Insurance Commission was appointed to investigate insurance companies, and not trust companies. He is going to say that because the insurance company purchased the stock of the trust company, therefore the funds of the trust company became a separate entity, entirely disassociated from the Order of Foresters, and consequently neither the Insurance Commission nor this parliament had jurisdiction to investigate its transactions. It might be possible to so argue from a strictly legal and technical standpoint, but the hon. gentleman cannot get away from the fact that all this money he was investing was the property of the Independent Order of Foresters. When he was investing the funds of the Union Trust Company, he was investigating the funds of the Foresters. Therefore every Forester has an absolute right to ask the hon. gentleman to give an account of his stewardship, and we have the right to probe to the bottom the manner in which he invested the funds of the Foresters, because when he invested the funds of the Union Trust Company he was really investing the money of the Foresters.

I propose to discuss the manner in which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), as managing director of the Foresters, invested its funds. I know that he said before the Royal Commission, and not long ago in this House, and will no doubt say again, that it is nobody's business how he invested these funds, that he made money for the Foresters and we have no right to interfere.

Mr. LENNOX. What are you going to say yourself?

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend will have a little patience I will try and tell him, and I do not think he need be nervous over it. No one will ever accuse him of dabbling in funds or buying lands or anything else so that he need not become nervous. I propose to say something about the transactions of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—the purchasing of property and the investing of the funds of the Union Trust Company. I shall do so as

rapidly as possible, but will necessarily have to go into some detail. The first transaction to which I intend referring—and that is in the order of time—is the purchase of certain lands in Manitoba called the Carrot river lands from a syndicate, the president of which was certainly his political and I presume his personal friend. I refer to Mr. Campbell, the Attorney General at that time, and I believe still, in Manitoba. Some time in the year 1902 a gentleman representing this company came to the hon. member and offered him something like 40,000 acres of land at $5 per acre. The hon. gentleman purchased the lands without any great effort, so far as I can find out, to get them at a lesser price. These lands were sold to the Union Trust Company as trustee, and my recollection is that they were paid for, not by the Union Trust Company money, but by money of the Independent Order of Foresters. However, that is a matter of no importance because there is no distinction between the two. These lands were offered the Trust Company at $5 an acre and were purchased at that price, but a commission of twenty-five cents an acre was allowed, amounting to $10,000. And it is a fact that one-half of that commission was paid the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), which, he says, was subsequently divided up among three or four other gentlemen. What is the reason which the hon. gentleman gave the commission for accepting this $5,000? It was that to some extent this commission was a slight payment for services he had rendered the company in cutting down the price of this land and getting it at a cheaper rate than the company otherwise would have had to pay. Let us look at that for a moment. At that time the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was managing director of the Union Trust Compny in the receipt of a salary of $5,000 year. What for? Was it not to manage the funds of the Trust Company? Was it not to buy lands, if the purchase were considered a proper form of investment? And if he were able to buy these lands for $5,000 less than the owners of them got, who was entitled to the $5,000? Who was paying the hon. gentleman for his services when he was saving this $5,000 to the Trust Company? And by what right does he say he was entitled to keep it? That is one reason why this matter should be discussed in this House, and it is one of the matters my hon. friend will no doubt attempt to explain. I agree with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) to that extent, although I begret that I cannot agree with him in all the deductions he has made from the evidence. It certainly, however, is the duty of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to explain, in a little more detail and a little more explicitly, the reason why he considered he was entitled to pocket the $5,000 which rightfully belonged to the Union Trust Company.

Now, I come to the next transaction in the order of time—the purchase of about 10,000 acres of land from the Hon. Mr. Roblin—a gentleman who was also not entirely unknown to my hon. friend, upon whom my hon. frend looked as a personal and certainly a political friend. When that transaction came up, the hon. gentleman was entitled to some little credit for keeping down the price. The evidence shows that a man named Pritchard, then private secretary to Mr. Roblin, came to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and offered him this land at $7 an acre. The hon. gentleman said that that was a pretty big price, that they could not pay that price and would discuss it later on. He was going to Europe and would discuss it when he came back. When he came back Pritchard wrote him a letter in which he said the price would be $5 an acre and a commission of twenty-five cents per acre. Now the hon. gentleman did cut down the price from $7 to $5.25 per acre, but how much did the owner of the land get out of it? He got $5 per acre, and the hon. gentleman admits that he got twenty-five cents per acre or $2,500, and he admits that that money went into his pocket; and until there is an accounting it will not go out. The accounting, it is needless to say, has not taken place. I wonder how many months and years it will before it does. The accounting, it is needless to say, has not taken place yet. I wonder how many months or years it will be before the accounting does take place. Have I a license to insult people, the hon. gentleman asks? I would tell my hon. friend that I have a license to discuss what is contained in the evidence, and if I wanted to use the word 'insulting' I might refer to my hon. friend to the fact that when I referred to this in a jocular way some six weeks ago I was brought to book, and I think I may say in an insulting manner.

I come next to a transaction which will probably take a little more time to discuss because it is a little more complicated, I refer to the British Columbia transaction, although it is perhaps not the next in the order of time. The British Columbia transaction involves other gentleman than the hon. member for North Toronto, and I may state frankly that I have no quarrel with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler); I have no quarrel with his associates for making all the money they possibly could and all the money they did make out of this transaction. I have no quarrel with any gentleman who goes out in the open market and buys land and sells it for as large a profit as he possibly can do, and I have nothing whatever to say regarding the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) or the hon.

member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) or any other member of this House, excepting wherein, so far as I can see, it has a direct bearing on the funds of the Union Trust Company and upon that portion of the funds which the members of the Independent Order of Foresters have the right to investigate and to claim, if it belongs to them.

The first thing that happened in the order of time was that some time in October the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) took an option from a Mr. Ryan, of Toronto, on a certain piece of property in British Columbia called the Kamloops Lumber Company, and I want to be fair with the hon. member and to state that at that time he took two options, took an option for $250,000 and another one at $200,000. I have read these options, they are practically alike, excepting that in the one the consideration is $200,000 and in the other $250,000, and he had three months in which to take up that option. Subsequently the option was taken up and the hon. member for King's purchased the land, or rather entered into an agreement with Ryan to purchase the land on the 26th January, 1904. There again, there were two options, one being for $225,000 and the other for $170,000 and those two options are in practically the same words, excepting as to the price. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) I am sure will contend, he did in his evidence, that he absolutely bought this land, and he says the document shows he did. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I have read the document over and I find that he did buy the land except that there is a reservation contained in the documents by which they may be voided if certain things happen, that is if there is any question of title the option is inoperative, it becomes null and void and the hon. gentleman has not bought the lands and Ryan has no claim against him. I want to put the matter fairly because I have no object in putting it in any other way.

The next thing to which I want to draw attention is the fact that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) says that he bought the land in his own right and on his own initiative, yet it was a fact that on the 19th day of December, that is something over a month before he got his second option from Ryan, a resolution was passed by the directors of the Trust Company as follows:

A proposition was laid before the directors by the manager in reference to providing money for the purchase and working of certain timber berths in British Columbia as described in a memorandum of agreement entered into between Peter Ryan, of Toronto, and Geo. W. Fowler, of Sussex, N.B., giving an option to the latter by the former, and the manager was instructed to continue the negotiations——

There I call attention to the use of the words 'continue the negotiations' showing that negotiations had been in progress before this.

—and secure the reports of the examiners now upon the property on the understanding that if the reports are satisfactory the Trust Company will advance the money required to purchase the property and take a controlling interest therein.

This, you will bear in mind, was on the 19th of December, or about five weeks before the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) actually purchased the land from Ryan, or rather took a document which made a conditional purchase. Now it is as plain as the noon day sun that there must have been some negotiations going on at this time between the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and it is also a fact that at that time there were two gentlemen in the west who were examining this land not for the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) but for the Union Trust Company. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. These gentlemen went west some time in the latter part of November or the first part of December. They were on the land on the 19th of December, because it is so stated in the minutes of the directors of the Union Trust Company, and on the 6th day of January a letter was written by Messrs. McCormick and Irwin, and it turned out later on that these gentlemen were interested in the transaction from the beginning. A letter was written by these gentlemen to the Hon. Mr. Fisher, Temple Building, Toronto. I shall not read the letter because it refers very largely to lands not subsequently purchased by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) from Ryan. The letter refers nearly altogether to lands included in the first option and excluded from the last one. Up to this point my hon. friend will not deny that these men were sent out by the Union Trust Company because the evidence shows they were sent out by that company and before I am through I shall read the evidence to my friend and will satisfy him beyond the shadow of a doubt that these gentlemen were sent there by the Union Trust Company and were paid by the Union Trust Company. Won't I? Well, I will show them that they were paid by both, if my hon. friend wants that side of it. I will show him that they received $300 from the Trust Company and $13,000 from my hon. friend if that satisfies him any better, because that is the evidence. Now these gentlemen—if my hon. friend will have patience he will have a chance——

Mr. FOWLER. I propose to take the chance.

Mr. CARVELL. I know you do. If these gentlemen are sent out by the Union Trust Company, I might ask why did they not report to the Union Trust Company? My hon. friend will say that they did. True,

they wrote a letter to the manager of the Union Trust Company, on the 15th of January, from Enderby, referring to lands not in the transaction at all, but I have here exhibit 678, directed to George W. Fowler, Esq., M.P. It is a letter signed by W. Irwin and Geo. McCormick, dated Toronto, February 1, 1904, and it gives in detail a list of the different properties, it sets forth in glowing terms the advantages of these properties, it shows the money to be made out of them, it shows the value of them, it strongly advises Mr. Fowler to purchase them and, more than that, it recommends that a certain portion of this, that is the Albert-Canyon lands, should not be purchased, and if the Albert-Canyon lands were not purchased, that the purchase price be reduced by $20,000. This is on the 1st day of February, 1904, but the hon. member for King's, four days before this, had taken the second option. The Albert-Canyon lands were not included in the second option, therefore the member for King's must have had a private report from these gentlemen, because if he had not had this report, how would he have known enough to leave out the Albert-Canyon lands in the second option?

Mr. FOWLER. If so, what?

Mr. CARVELL. If so, then these gentlemen were reporting to Mr. Fowler.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman is all mixed up.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 140) to incorporate the St. Leon Railway Company.—Mr. Finlayson.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the St. Mary River Bridge Company.—Mr. Dyment.

SUPPLY—REPORT OF INSURANCE COMMISSION—CHARGES AGAINST CERTAIN MEMBERS.

Mr. CARVELL. Mr. Speaker, when the House took recess I was discussing the purchase of the Kamloops Lumber property, or the Ryan property, by the Union Trust Company and I stated that I have no objection to the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) or any other member of this government purchasing property as long as it is properly done and making a legitimate profit out of it. I wish to repeat that statement and I also wish to state that I do not understand that the hon. member for King's, the hon. member for East Simcoe, or the hon. member for West Prince occupy any fiduciary relation regarding the funds of the Independent Order of Foresters and are certainly under no obligation to protect them any more than any other gentleman in the Dominion of Canada is. It is not my purpose to discuss the details of this transaction. As I stated before recess there were two options, the difference between them being $55,000. The only point that any person can make on this question, in so far as the hon. member for King's is concerned, is that if he were acting as the agent of the Union Trust Company, then of course, he should account to the Trust Company for the money. If he were not acting as the agent of the Trust Company then he had a perfect right to sell the property for half a million dollars or any other amount that he could get instead of $225,000.

The next transaction that took place was the purchase of what is called the Shuswap property; that is the property owned by Shields and in which, I understand, Mr. McCormick was interested. I understand that that property was purchased by the hon. member for King's for $40,000. Practically at the same time, or within a week afterwards the Okanagan Lumber Company, the company owning mills and timber limits and formed practically by Mr. Hale, who was then a member of this House, Mr. McCormick an ex-member of this House, Mr. Irwin, Mr. Bellis and Mr. Bull, sold out their interest through the hon. member for King's to the Union Trust Company for the sum of $217,000, including land, mills, limits, timber ready to be cut and lumber. These three properties were put together in what was called the Kamloops Lumber Company and by the original arrangement the Union Trust Company was to take 51 per cent of the stock and the member for King's and Messrs. McCormick and Irwin between them were to take 49 per cent of the stock. Not only were the Union Trust Company to provide all the funds, including the 51 per cent which they were to furnish in stock, but they were to advance the money to the other three gentlemen as a loan and were to take their private guarantee and these three gentlemen were to have 49 per cent of the stock in the new company. There can be no fault found with this proposition provided the prices paid for these properties were fair and reasonable. I may say that the property took a wonderful jump in price, but I am willing to admit that property did go up in price in British Columbia. As far as the Okanagan Lumber Company was concerned this property was purchased in the autumn of 1903 for $40,000. They spent $25,000 on the property which brought the amount up to $65,000 and in May or June it was sold at $217,000, but, I must say that in so far as I can see there is nothing wrong

with that transaction with which this House has any right to interfere. The only reason I have for referring to this question at all is the fact that some time after this—nearly a year I think—a declaration of trust was made by the hon. member for King's whereby he declared that out of 660 odd shares which he held of the capital stock of the Kamloops Lumber Company he held 300 in trust for the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I think that the hon. member for North Toronto, in accepting this stock, placed himself in a position which I would not wish to accept and which I think the hon. gentleman would not accept again if he had a chance to do it over again after considering the consequences. However, that is a matter for the hon. gentleman to decide. It is true—and I want to be fair about the transaction—that later on, through the pressure exerted by Mr. Stevenson who was then vice-president of the Foresters Company, all of that property was given up to the Union Trust Company and therefore neither the hon. member for King's nor the hon. member for North Toronto made anything out of this stock. The whole thing went back to the Union Trust Company. That is all I have to say about the British Columbia business.

I might for a short time discuss what may perhaps be called the main issue and that is the Northwest Land Company. Here I want it distinctly understood that in so far as any obligation which any of these people were under in regard to the handling of trust funds can in no way apply to the three hon. gentlemen whom I have named here, but it can only apply to the hon. member for North Toronto. It seems that some time in the summer or autumn of 1902 a political pilgrimage of hon. gentlemen opposite was taking place in the Northwest—a pilgrimage by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) accompanied by a number of his most influential associates and amongst those associates were included the hon. member for King's, the hon. member for East Simcoe, the hon. member for Prince, and Mr. Pope, then member for Compton. It was thought that it would be a profitable thing to purchase land and try to make some money out of it. With that proposition I have no fault to find.

I have nothing to say about the private arrangement. As I understand it, an arrangement was made by which the member for King's (Mr. Fowler) and Mr. Pope were to become the agents of the others for the purpose of purchasing this property. According to the evidence, they went to the office of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and they were furnished with a plan, and they left that plan in the office and went back in about an hour, and when they returned a thin red line was drawn across the plan to indicate the route which the Canadian Northern Railway would take along the Saskatchewan river. That plan was then taken to the office of the Canadian Pacific Railway who owned the land, and after some dickering the land was purchased at what I must say was a very low price. There was evidence given that the land agent at Winnipeg refused to sell the land at $3.50 an acre at first. The agent was taken down to Montreal and I know not whether any persuasion was used, but I do know that when that land agent made his trip to Montreal these hon. gentlemen were able to get 200,000 acres for $3.50 an acre. The next stage in the transaction was a letter written by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) to the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) and though this letter is very well known, I do not think it has yet been placed on 'Hansard,' and so I will take the liberty of reading it :

October 4, 1902.

Dear Lefurgey,—We have succeeded beyond our wildest hopes. We wired D. M., and he met us at the train, Toronto, and took us to his office, and gave us the route so far as located ; of course, under cover of the strictest secrecy, so keep it mum, except to Borden, Bennett and yourself. We expect to have a wealthy Englishman named Lister and Col. Pellatt in the combine with us. We have increased the thing to 200,000 acres. On arriving here we interviewed Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and have every reason to expect most generous treatment as to terms and price. He said we should get the best that was going. We want to arrange a meeting there when the party returns to Montreal. Tell Messrs. Borden and Bennett about the meeting. It will be necessary for at least two of us to go this fall and locate, as it could not be done in the spring, and that is one of the things that must be arranged at the meeting.

GEO. W. FOWLER.

Shortly after that the member for King's and Mr. Pope went to the west, went over the land, made a selection, came back to the land office, and nothing more was done until the spring. Before they went it was understood that this company was to be limited to ten members, that each of the ten was to receive an equal division of the profits, and that each was to deduct a certain amount for expenses. It is in evidence that at least some of them put up $200 a piece, and Messrs. Pope and Fowler went west. I presume that $200 they put up all around went towards paying their expenses. In the month of March these hon. gentlemen had not been able to make their financial arrangements and it looked as though the thing was off. Finally, according to the evidence, they had to put up $60,000, and the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the member for Prince, P.E.I (Mr. Lefurgey), put up $6,000 each towards the first payment. The balance was raised by MacKenzie & Mann endorsing a note of the hon. member for King's and Mr. Pope. They raised something over $40,000 in this way

and were able to make the first payment to the Canadian Pacific Railway on these lands. Later on, these two gentlemen—because legally the option was the property of these two gentlemen alone—sold these lands to the New Ontario Town Site Company, and it is in evidence that at that time, practically the only persons interested in this were Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson, who were directors of the Union Trust. They were sold at an advance of one dollar an acre which would make $200,000 profit, and of that amount, $150,000 was put up in cash and $50,000 was to be paid in stock of the company which was to be organized. At the same time that this arrangement was made, evidently another arrangement was made by which the lands were to go into the hands of this syndicate at another advance of fifty cents an acre, amounting to $100,000, and the first arrangement was that this $100,000 should practically all go to the member for North Toronto and Messrs. McGillivray and Wilson. I want to be fair in this matter and I should say that it was not the intention that this was to be paid in cash at the time. I think the statement was made this afternoon that the money was to be paid in cash—and the hon. member for North Toronto very properly contradicted that. It is true that the Union Trust Company agreed to finance the matter by putting up the $150,000 in cash which went to the gentlemen composing the syndicate. They were then to put up the payments which would become due to the Canadian Pacific Railway on the option. And they did put up the option money, until finally they had altogether about $950,000 invested. It is also true that some arrangement was made at the request of the member for Prince and instead of taking the $100,000 profit in stock they only took $95,000 in stock, and the other $5,000 was distributed among the members of the syndicate. Then certain portions of the stock was given to different persons in order to qualify them as members of the Trust Company. Sir John Boyd got ten shares to qualify him as a director and Mr. Schofield got ten shares for the same purpose. Afterwards Sir John Boyd bought a small number of shares which were his own private property. Then there were ten shares distributed to Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson to qualify them, and 237½ shares were given to the Union Trust Company as a bonus to pay them to some extent for financing this transaction, and at the same time there were 100 shares given to Dr. Oronhyatekha also as a bonus, and it was understood all the way through that this stock was given to the company and Dr. Oronhyatekha as bonus stock in order to pay them to some extent for carrying through the transaction. A resolution was put on the minutes of the Trust Company, that the directors of the Trust Company would leave the matter open and they would have the right either to make advances as a loan to the syndicate, or as stock, whichever they chose. It must be remembered that the same gentlemen largely who were directors of the Trust Company were also directors of the Land Company. It is certain that the three most active members of the Trust Company, Messrs. Foster, McGillivray and Wilson, were practically the three owners of the Land Company. The first year the thing went along in this way; it was somewhere between heaven and earth; it was no debt which the members of the syndicate owed to the Trust Company, and neither did the Trust Company have any stock for their advances. Finally, in March, 1904, it was decided by resolution of the Trust Company that this should be taken as stock, and that from that date the syndicate should owe nothing to the Trust Company. This advance was placed in the form of stock, and now the Trust Company held the 337½ shares of stock and they held paid up shares for all the money which they advanced outside of that. It amounted to $200,000 or $300,000 at the time this decision was arrived at, but they had to go on and advance money so rapidly that in December, 1905, they had about $980,000 invested in the transaction. I know that the hon. member for North Toronto will state, as he stated before the commission, that we have no right to investigate this matter or to talk about it—that there is nothing wrong about it, that it is a perfectly straight transaction like buying a horse for one price and selling it for another. He will state that because they did not take out their profits of $95,000 in money, therefore they did not put themselves in the position of handling the trust funds; but the hon. gentleman fails to recognize the fact that at least one year after this transaction took place, by advancing to himself and his associates who were, like himself, trustees of these funds they were advancing to themselves $150,000 or $160,000 for which the trust company had no guarantee whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman say—that the Union Trust Company had no lien, no guarantee? The Union Trust Company had an absolute mortgage on everything as well as the stock.

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. gentleman had permitted me to finish my sentence, he would have known what I was going to say.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman was unfortunate in the way he began it.

Mr. CARVELL. I say that up to 1904 the trust company had no guarantee or mortgage or anything else except the fact that the Great West Land Company, which was the successor of the New Ontario Townsite Company, was a debtor to the Union Trust Company for the amount of money that company advanced except $1,400 for which it held stock. I repeat the statement, and my hon. friend cannot gainsay.

Mr. FOSTER. The statement is absolutely wrong.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman will have a chance to show wherein it is wrong. From 1904 down to the 28th of November, 1905, the Trust Company had no security for the advances except the stock of the land company. If the stock was all right, the Trust Company was all right. My hon. friend fails to realize that when the Trust Company were advancing their funds to the tune of $900,000, my hon. friend and his associates were not personally liable for one dollar of those advances. They stood in the position of reaping any advantages from the transaction, while they could not possibly lose a dollar if things went the other way. That is the thing for which I find fault with the hon. gentleman and for which the people of this country and the Foresters are finding fault with him, and that is the position which I think it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to attempt to clear up. I admit that there was no loss made, but in what different position does that place my hon. friend? He stood in a position to make profits until the change took place, and where, if loss occurred, the Union Trust Company or the Independent Order of Foresters sustained the loss. I come down to 1905. Things were getting rather interesting in this year or year and a half in the Union Trust Company. Mr. Stevenson, the vice-president, was asking some very unpleasant questions, and was forcing the directors of the Union Trust Company to take a very different course from that which they had been taking in the past. In October or the early part of November, 1905, it was virtually decided by the managers of the Foresters to change the position in which these advances stood; instead of being in the position of stockholders in the land company, they would surrender their stock and take a mortgage, and it is true that after the 28th of November, the Trust Company did have a mortgage on all the lands of the Great West Land Company for the advances they had made. My hon. friend cannot show anything in the evidence to the contrary of what I have stated. There is a transaction, however, to which I must refer, in connection with the transfer of this stock. To my mind it places my hon. friend in a position which I do not say is wrong, but where it is up to him to explain the transaction as it occurred. On the 7th of November there was a meeting of the directors of the Trust Company, and they discussed, cursorily I should say from the minutes, the propriety of surrendering the stock which they held for their advances and taking a mortgage for the amount. On the 13th of November another meeting of the directors of the Trust Company was held, and it is stated in the minutes that the same directors were present at this meeting as were present at the meeting of the 7th of November. Again on the 28th of November a third meeting was held in which the form of mortgage and form of assignment were brought up and were ratified by the directors. Now, it is a fact that at every meeting of the directors of the Union Trust Company from the organization of the company down to the 13th of November, 1905, a book had been kept on the table and had been signed by the directors. This was the first order of business. I have examined that book. It was among the exhibits. I have it here, and it is open to any hon. gentleman who wishes to examine it; and I state that down to the meeting of the 13th of November no meeting of the directors was held at which at least four directors did not sign that book. It may be true, as stated in the evidence, that if a director came in late, he signed it later on, but, so far as that book is concerned, it was signed by every director present at the time the meeting took place. I find on referring to this book that there are no records whatever of a meeting having been held on the 13th of November nor on the 28th of November, although it is true that the minute book of the directors shows that a meeting did take place and that certain business was transacted at that time, namely, the surrender, not only of the stock which they held in the Great Northwest Land Company, and the taking of the mortgage, but the giving up of the bonus stock, the one hundred shares which they got from Dr. Oronhyateka. I do not wish to cast any reflections upon anybody; I am not going to give any opinions of my own as to what took place or what did not take place at those meetings. I merely state the fact that this book contains no record whatever of the directors who were present at those meetings, whereas every other meeting of the directors of the Trust Company held in the four or five years of its existence was reported in this book by the directors present signing their names. There is another thing it might perhaps lead to.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I interrupt my hon. friend to ask him a question? For what purpose has he introduced this matter so far, unless he wishes this House to infer something? Does he consider himself in a position to make an inference, in so many words, and state it on his own responsibility?

Mr. CARVELL. I would prefer giving the inference my hon. friend drew. I refer you to page 2628 of the evidence. The hon. member had been examined at length upon this book, and had given his version of it, and this is what took place between Mr. Shepley and the hon. gentleman. Let me read it, because my hon. friend has asked me what inference I would draw. I draw no inference, but am willing to give

the House the inference my hon. friend himself drew:

Q. Now then the other point, Mr. Foster?—A. The other point is this: It was, as I gave in my testimony, the rule to have that attendance book signed before we went on with the business and it was done in nearly every case. But two things might happen. It might be signed by a part of the directors at the beginning, and others coming in later might either sign it before they went out or they might not sign it until a day or a week or maybe not until the next meeting. A blank would be left and maybe a pencil mark or something like that and they would get their names in. But to argue that because the names were not put down in the book, there could therefore be no meeting, seems to me to go against the doctrine of possibility entirely.

I want to give the benefit of the whole thing to my hon. friend, and therefore I shall read his explanation:

Q. Have you understood that anything was being argued at all? We are just trying to get at the facts, you know?—A. I cannot help but see the conclusions that are absolutely come to from the evidence given in that way. Any person outside simply comes to this conclusion, 'ah, there was no meeting, therefore there was a concocted meeting.'

I wish to give the version of other gentlemen who were present at this meeting. It was stated in one of these minutes that at the meeting of the 13th a resolution was moved by Mr. Stephenson and another resolution, seconded by Mr. McGillivray, and that a resolution was moved at the meeting of the 28th by the Hon. G. W. Ross, and seconded, I think, by Mr. John I. Davidson, and I just wish to refer briefly to the evidence of some of the gentlemen on that question. The evidence of Mr. Stephenson will be found on page 145 of the Insurance Report, and I shall not take up time by reading it. I shall, however, refer briefly to the evidence of Mr. Davidson, because he was a man who attended nearly every meeting of the directors and took pride in the fact that he was always present and signed the book. On pages 2602 and 2603 Mr. Davidson gave the following evidence:

Q. What do you remember to have heard during that discussion with regard to the bonus stock?—A. My recollection is the bonus stock was never discussed.

Q. Your recollection is the bonus stock was never discussed?—A. I may be entirely wrong.

Q. You have no recollection of its being discussed?—A. No.

Q. Don't you think you would recall it if such an important thing as that were discussed?—A. I would think so, but the idea of its not belonging to the Trust Company has never entered my head.

Q. Then do you remember this little book?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that what you mean by the directors' meeting book?—A. Yes.

Q. What was the custom with regard to your signing your names in this book?—A. The directors present signed every minute.

Q. Have you any doubt about that at all?—A. No, none.

Q. And if you do not find your name here, you do not expect to find a minute in the minute book?—A. No.

Q. Are you clear about that?—A. Quite.

Q. Then I show you the book first, and I think that it is our own admirable signature at the top?—A. Yes, I thought you could not read it.

Q. I have seen it a good many times recently. November 7, 1905, 10.30 a.m., and the and the first signature is John I. Davidson, and the next meeting in the book appears to be December 26, 1905?—A. Yes.

And I see your signature there as well?—A. Yes.

Q. Was there any meeting of directors between those two dates?—A. I should say not.

Q. There is a record in the regular minutes of the Union Trust Company, what is said to have been a meeting of the board of directors, at which the same directors were present as at the meeting of the 7th, yourself among other things, it was resolved that the Union Trust Company, when taking the mortgage for its advances, should give up its bonus stock. I tell you that appears upon the minutes?—A. Who moved the resolution?

Q. It is attributed to Mr. Stephenson. Do you remember any such meeting or any such resolution?—A. Giving up the bonus stock?

Q. Yes?—A. No, I do not. Who seconded that resolution?

Q. It is said to have been on the 13th November, although there is no signature to correspond with it in the directors' meeting book?—A. Who seconded it?

Q. It is said to have been seconded by Mr. McGillivray?—A. I have no recollection of it.

Q. You have no recollection of any such meeting?—A. If the name is not in that book, I cannot understand how a meeting could have been held.

Then later on, in the next column, page 2603, I find this statement:

Q. What do you think? Having regard to all these circumstances, can you say with certainty, having regard to the fact that you do not find your signature in the attendance book and having regard to the fact that that subject was never brought to your attention, have you any doubt there never was any such meeting?—A. I do not think there would be any minutes in the book unless there was a meeting, but the minutes would be signed of course.

Q. No, the minutes are not signed. That is all you can tell me about it?—A. The minutes have always been signed, and the attendance always has been entered in the book as far as my recollection goes.

That is the evidence of Mr. Davidson. I shall not trouble the House with the evidence of Mr. Ross or Mr. Stephenson. They are just as clear and emphatic that there could not have been a resolution. Mr. Stephenson is asked if he could have moved the resolution they say he did and was brought back the second time; and, after thinking the matter over, he said he had given it mature consideration and was satisfied he could not.

Mr. FOSTER. What my hon. friend is trying to prove is this, that a certain agreement founded on certain resolutions, covering a mortgage, covering the giving back of two different lots of stock, such as have been detailed by my hon. friend, who has done me the courtesy of allowing me this interruption—he has read the evidence of Colonel John I. Davidson to the effect that he had no recollection of any such resolution or any such stock being given up, or any proposal to give it up, or any mortgage agreement by which it was given up—am I correct in that?

Mr. CARVELL. Practically so.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite correct. Now, I hold in my hand the very instrument itself, the very instrument which Mr. Shepley fingered, which the commission should have looked at, and that very instrument details every particular, and it is signed at the end by John I. Davidson as chairman.

Mr. BENNETT. Take it back now.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a sample.

An hon. MEMBER. Back out.

Mr. CARVELL. Back out? Why that is not in the evidence. What are my hon. friends talking about, I am discussing this thing from the evidence, I do not know what documents my hon. friend may have in his pocket.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must allow me, that is not manly, if he will allow me the expression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not parliamentry to get out of it that way. What document have I in my pocket? I give him my word as a member of parliament—and he will take it—that the document I have in my pocket is the document which Mr. Shepley and the commission had before them, the document signed by Col. Davidson himself as chairman of the meeting which finally passed those resolutions and that mortgage and made that transfer of stock, the very instrument with not only the signature of Col. Davidson, but the signature of Mr. Van Dusen as chairman of the shareholders meeting of the Great West Land Company, both of them side by side, the very instrument which Mr. Shepley had in his own hand, which he saw and fingered but as to which neither he nor the commission give the least indication in the evidence that they called and asked for or the report they founded on on that, that the document bore the very signature of the very man who swore that he had no recollection of it.

Mr. CARVELL. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough now to answer a question or two? Is the hon. gentleman referring to the minutes of the next meeting of the directors of the company, that will be some time about the 4th or 5th of December?

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the meeting, Sir.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend had only given me a little notice I could have furnished that, I think, from the evidence.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh no, you could not.

Mr. CARVELL. Could I not?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh no, it is not there.

Mr. CARVELL. Well, I will show you what is here. There are here the minutes of a meeting of directors held on the 30th day of December, 1905. Is that the document to which my hon. friend refers?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the shareholders meeting but he is going to find it in the evidence. Go on.

Mr. CARVELL. I want to be fair with the hon. gentleman. I had the evidence of the directors, of course if that is not the document, I cannot say anything about it, because it is not in the evidence, and my hon. friend is at liberty to make any use of it he likes.

Mr. FOSTER. You will find it in the exhibits if you look it up.

Mr. CARVELL. As my hon. friend seems to doubt the evidence of Mr. Davidson I will be under the necessity of taking a little more time in order to call another gentleman to the box and that is Mr. Elliott G. Stevenson. Mr. Stevenson had given his version of this transaction a day or two prior to this and he had been fairly positive that he could not have moved this resolution, and could not have been present, that no such transaction could have taken place as was related in the minutes of the meeting. But to make it doubly sure he was recalled on the 17th November, 1906. We find at page 3106 of the evidence:

Q. Have you given further consideration to the question of the meetings that were held when certain bonused stocks were directed to be returned to the syndicate composed of Foster, Wilson and McGillivray?—A. I have read very carefully all that has been said on that subject with a view of refreshing my recollection. I have recalled the circumstances of that day and I can only say that after going all over it I am confirmed in the view that I originally had, that I never understood that any stock was being turned over for the mortgage or on account of that transaction except the stock representing the cash advances, and that the bonus stock was never included or considered or thought of. My recollection in that respect is just in accord with Colonel Davidson's and Mr. Ross's.

Q. Would you say as to the possibility of any such resolution being made by you formally or informally at any meeting?—A. It is absolutely impossible. If I had written any such resolution as is said I certainly would have recalled it, because I would have had the matter in mind.

Q. And you say that no such a resolution was prepared by you?—A. I say that no such a resolution was prepared or offered by me.

I do not know where my hon. friend could ask for more explicit evidence than that. I do not know anything about Mr. Stevenson; my hon. friend knows more about him than I do. My hon. friend knows whether he is a gentleman whose evidence should be taken in any court in this country, and my hon. friend knows whether he is a gentleman whose word will be taken by the people of the Dominion of Canada when this matter comes to be threshed out. I shall not trouble the House by reading the evidence of the Hon. Geo. W. Ross which is on exactly the same lines as that of Mr. Stevenson and Col. Davidson.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh no. If my hon friend will allow me, Mr. Ross's evidence differs in one very important particular from that of the others and it is in this particular. Col Davidson in all honesty, I am not saying that was not his opinion or that he did not honestly hold that opinion, and I am not saying that Mr. Stevenson's was not an honest opinion honestly held according to his belief and recollection, but there was this difference between the evidence of Mr. Ross and the evidence of Col. Davidson and Mr. Stevenson. The evidence of Col. Davidson and Mr. Stevenson would go to the conclusion that if there were not in the signature-book on a certain day the signature of the directors that that would be for him proof that no meeting had been held, because the general rule was that the first thing to be done was for those present to sign the directors' signature-book; but when the Hon. Geo. W. Ross was questioned, whilst he had no recollection of the stock and no recollection of the meeting, when he was asked that question: 'Would you take it that there was no meeting from the fact that there were no signatures in the signature-book,' he differed from the others in saying that he could not at all say that, that there might have been a meeting and it might be possible that the signatures had not been taken in the signature-book, there being of course two books as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. CARVELL. I am sorry I am taking up so much time but I am under the necessity of reading the evidence of Mr. Ross and I think the House will agree that my hon. friend has not correctly interpreted the intention which Mr. Ross intended to convey.

Mr. FOSTER. That is my recollection of it.

Mr. CARVELL. At page 2615 we have:

Q. There is a minute on page 25 of the minutes of the meeting of the 28th November at 3 p.m., at which the following gentlemen are recorded as being present:—Mr. Ross, Mr. Foster, Mr. Wilson, Col. Davidson and Mr. McGillivray, and after a statement that the minutes were read and approved, the minutes proceed, 'The solicitor of the company, pursuant to the instructions of the board at its meeting of November 7, read the agreement and mortgage between the Union Trust Company and the Great West Land Company. After some discussion it was moved by the Hon. G. W. Ross, seconded by Col. Davidson, that the form of agreement,' (reads resolution.) 'And that the proper amount be filled in by the general manager.' Do you remember that agreement being placed before the board and discussed?—A. I do not remember it.

Q. Do you remember moving such a resolution?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you think you would have forgotten if so important a matter as that was discussed at a meeting so recent as the 28th November?—A. Is that the agreement in which the surrender of stock was provided for?

Q. Yes?—A. Yes, I think I would remember it.

There is the evidence of the three gentlemen. I want to be fair and to state that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that not only is this not true but that the matter was discussed and that he rather advised against it, that he thought it was not a wise move but that the company should not give up the bonus stock. I leave it for the country at large, I leave it for every person who reads this evidence, and I presume and hope it will be read all over the Dominion of Canada—to say whether the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and Mr. Wilson on the one side are right, or the three gentlemen I have named, the Hon. Geo. W. Ross, Mr. Stevenson and Col. Davidson are correct in their recollection of the transaction.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I am troubling my hon. friend, but I fear he did not catch the point and has consequently read a part of the evidence to which I was not alluding.

Mr. CARVELL. I thought so, yes, I thought that.

Mr. FOSTER. But wait one minute. The point I was discussing was as to whether there was or was not a directors' meeting based upon evidence that there were not signatures in the directors' signature book. That is what I was talking about, and I stated that whilst Col. Davidson's evidence led to the conclusion that if there were no signatures in the signature-book there would have been no meeting held on that day, when Mr. Ross was questioned on that point he did not go so far; he said he would not say that because there were no signatures in the signature-book that therefore there was no meeting of the directors. That is the point I wish to make.

Mr. CARVELL. I understand the hon. gentleman's point, and there may be evidence to bear out his contention. But Mr. Ross is very positive that he did not move the resolution which is credited to him.

Now, Sir, I have discussed the transactions of the Union Trust Company with

regard to these land propositions so far as I think it necessary to do so. I would not be addressing this House to-night were it not for some references made to me by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and I crave the pardon of the House for being compelled to refer to that hon. gentleman. That hon. gentleman felt, the moment this matter was brought up, that the burden was on him to raise a row with somebody. I very innocently, as I thought, referred to this question when I was addressing the House on the 21st of February, I think, regarding the transactions of the Robins Land Company, and I said that I did not know it was a crime for a person to buy property in Canada at one price and sell it at another; that I would have been willing to leave the matter to the determination of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and I went so far as to say that I would not mind putting the member for East Simcoe in the box, and he at once wanted to know if I was making a charge against him. Nothing had taken place until the 21st day of February, when the hon. gentleman was discussing the question raised by the member for King's in the matter referred to here as the 'explosion' by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and my hon. friend was attacked with one of those violent brain storms with which he is afflicted on certain occasions. Being attacked with this malady, of course he had to attack somebody else, and instead of attacking the parties to whom he evidently intended to refer, he made the mistake of attacking the innocent member for Carleton, N.B., a man who had not made any charges against him, who did not have any charges to make against him. On a former occasion I told the hon. gentleman that if he would have patience he would probably hear the western lands transaction discussed to his satisfaction. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope my hon. friend is satisfied, I hope he is satisfied with the discussion that has taken place here during the last three or four weeks. I am bound to say that I was fair enough to say to the hon. member on the 21st of February that of the three members mentioned, the least blame could be laid to him of any of them. I think that was fair, but he was not magnanimous enough to appreciate it; and, in my absence, on the 8th of March, he was attacked with another violent brain storm, and he repeated the same charges against me, calling me a coward, I think he called me a braggadocio, and wanted to know if I was going to stand up in this House and make charges against him. I told him on a previous occasion that when an opportunity arrived I would not hesitate to discuss this matter as I viewed it, and I would leave the House to decide whether I was right or wrong. I have done that. I was not the cause of the trouble, I was not the agent to buy the land for him, I was not responsible for buying the land, and if he did not get a fair deal I am not responsible for it. The hon. gentleman need not pour out his vials of wrath upon me, because I had nothing to do with it. I have not any charge to make against him, as I said before. The hon. gentleman started out with something he was not equal to, he started in to buy land, and if he had not had good assistance he never would have got the land. He did not do anything about getting it, he did not do anything toward reselling it, he did not finance it, he had to go to New Brunswick to get a man to finance it for him.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman makes a statement that he knows is utterly at variance with the facts. Every dollar I put up in that concern was my own money, and I never got a single cent from any one else.

Mr. CARVELL. I did not say it was not his own money, I believe it was his own money. What I said was that he had not the ability to buy this land himself, he had not the ability to finance this land himself. He put up the magnificent sum of $6,200, and my hon. friend from King's had to finance about $50,000 during the first four months of the transaction. He put up nothing but his $6,000, and he got it back. I have nothing to say against the hon. gentleman. It would be useless to talk about him. If it is any benefit to him to stand up here and call people cowards and ask if they have any charges to make against him, then he is welcome to it, and I have not a word to say more about it. I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, for having taken up three or four minutes of the time of this House in discussing the hon. gentleman, and I promise you that never again, so long as I have a seat here, will I ever bother my head or take up the time of this House in discussing the hon. member for East Simcoe.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have presented this case before you. I think it is fair for members of this House and people of this country to discuss the transactions of the hon. member for North Toronto regarding his handling of these trust funds. I must say that I cannot vote for the resolution presented by the member for Labelle, and for these reasons: The hon. member for Labelle wishes a committee appointed to investigate, in the first place, as I understand it, the transactions of four gentlemen whose names have been mentioned here with regard to their connection with insurance and trust funds. My answer to that is that these matters have been discussed and have been investigated by a better tribunal, I think, than could be possibly obtained in this House, by a tribunal possessing no more ability than a committee of members of this House, but a

tribunal which had the time at their disposal necessary to make a thorough investigation. That tribunal has reported the results of their investigation, and we have dealt with them this afternoon. Now, as to the other matters, the hon. member for Labelle wishes a committee appointed to discuss the private affairs of different members of this House. In the first place, I beg to dissent from that proposition in its entirety, I do not think that is a proper matter for investigation. In the second place, the hon. member for Labelle has refused to take the responsibility of making a charge, because he says that neither the members of the Liberal party nor of the Conservative party are going to make a scapegoat of him. Therefore, if we appointed a commission the member for Labelle would not be prepared to come forward with his charges. The commission would probably meet together and appoint a chairman, appoint a secretary, and ask somebody to come on with a charge. Nobody would come on with a charge, and the matter would fall to the ground. Therefore, it seems to me it would be utterly futile to carry out the suggestion of the member for Labelle, and for these reasons I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Does the hon. member suppose that either the member for Labelle or myself, as seconder of the motion, know what is in the mind of the hon. member for King's?

Mr. CARVELL. Well, I am not in a position to answer what my hon. friend for Labelle and my hon. friend for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) have in their minds, I am not a mind reader.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, the motion which has been placed in your hands by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is certainly the most extraordinary which, in the course of a long parliamentary life, I have ever seen, it is certainly unique in its character. It is to be observed in the first place that my hon. friend has chosen to bring this motion in the shape of an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply. It was open to my hon. friend to bring his motion in the shape of a substantive one which could have been met upon its merits and in all its aspects. My hon. friend is aware that by the method which he has adopted discussion is circumscribed and that there is not free scope to amend or present the different aspects of his motion. According to the rules of this House the motion has to be taken in its entirety, voted up or voted down, and it is not susceptible of any amendment. If there be in that motion truth and falsehood the truth has to be rejected with the falsehood or the falsehood has to be accepted with the truth. If there is in it that which is proper or improper the same rule will apply; it will have to be accepted whether proper or improper or rejected whether proper or improper. Therefore, it is, to say the least, an extraordinary proceeding on the part of my hon. friend, at the outset professing to be so anxious to have a fair inquiry into this matter, to limit the scope of the discussion as he has done.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend has told us something about his motive. His motive, as he has told us in bringing this motion to the attention of the House, is to clear the atmosphere in which we live, is to ascertain where are the honest men and where are the dishonest men. I can only say to my hon. friend from Labelle that every man in this House is an honest man, that every man in this House has a right to walk with his head erect, that every man in this House has the right to his character until that character has been taken away from him, not by insinuations, not by the tittle-tattle of the street, but upon a charge made by some one who has the courage to make such a charge. It will not do to say that there are rumours. Of course there are and there may be rumours, but since when in a British parliament and under British institutions have rumours been a matter of investigation? If there are rumours against me, or against any of my colleagues, it is open to any man to take up these rumours and to bring them forward in the shape of a charge which I can meet, to which I can oppose my denial or in regard to which I can offer my explanation. But, Sir, it is absolutely unprecedented in any British parliament that the House of Commons has ever investigated or has ordered one of its committees to investigate rumours. The House of Commons has never, either in this country or in the mother country, ordered an investigation except upon a charge which the man against whom it is levelled can face and to which he can give an answer. That is the position, however, which my hon. friend has taken in this motion of his. Let me call his attention—because I believe he has written this in a hurry—to the conclusion of his motion:

> That the government should therefore ask the House to constitute a special committee to conduct a strict and impartial inquiry as to whether any ministers of the Crown or members of parliament have improperly made use of their positions as such for their private gain or have otherwise been guilty of personal misconduct under such circumstances or of such a character as to justify the intervention and censure of this House.

Against whom is this levelled? It is levelled against the 214 members of the House of Commons. It is open to anybody to appear before this committee and to make a charge against any member of this House, against the hon. member for Labelle himself. He, strong in his fortitude

and in his rectitude, may say that he would not object, but I do object that the privileges of the members should be invaded unless there is cause for the invasion. I do object that the rules and regulations under which parliamentary life has been carried on should be discarded. Let us appoint a committee to investigate and who is to be the accuser? Anybody may be the accuser and nobody may be the accuser. Let this committee be granted and what shall be the evidence? Anything may be evidence and nothing may be evidence. There is nothing substantial. But this committee would be a committee of inquiry at random, to be disposed of nobody knows how, to be guided by nobody knows whom and to come to a conclusion nobody knows where. The hon. gentleman tells us that he would not take the responsibility of conducting the investigation. He tells us that he is not going to be made a scapegoat in this matter, but he says that it is the duty of the Prime Minister to take that responsibility. It is the duty of the Prime Minister certainly to see that every charge which is brought against a member is investigated, and if my hon. friend from Labelle will bring such an accusation against anybody certainly he will have the fullest opportunity to make it good. But, I protest against the idea that the House of Commons is to be turned into an inquisition. The House of Commons is not an inquisition. The House of Commons is the guardian of its own honour and it is its duty to see that every member shall have fair play and justice. My hon. friend has stated that there is a saw-off between the two sides of this House. Although I refer to this again I would have supposed that there would not have been any necessity to do so in the face of the denial twice repeated of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that there has been no saw-off at all. I would have expected after the denial of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, twice repeated, that the hon. member for Labelle would not have undertaken to-day as he has done before to assert that there has been a saw-off.

Mr. BOURASSA. What I stated to-day was that there has been a saw-off between the hon. member for King's and the right hon. Prime Minister. I did not say that there had been a saw-off between both parties.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If that be the distinction all I can say to my hon. friend from Labelle is, and I think it will be corroborated by the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) that he and I have not exchanged a word during the present session. I met him once or twice to say good-day and that is all. There never has been any communication between the hon. member for King's and myself. For what reason should I choose to have a saw-off in this matter? Because it has pleased the hon. member for Labelle to levy some insinuations against certain colleagues of mine? I shall come to that presently and I shall tell him that I have no reason to fear any investigation and that there is no occasion for my resorting to any saw-off. The hon. member said more. He accused me of having had a saw-off with the hon. member for King's but he went a little farther—I took a note of his words at the time—and he said that I had taken the opposition under my 'maternal' care.

Well, Sir, had I been accused of taking the opposition under my 'paternal' care that would have been bad enough, but to be accused of taking them under my 'maternal' care is a good deal more than I can appreciate. The opposition does not need any care from me; the opposition is able to take care of itself; but, I have this to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa), that in the position which I occupy, entrusted as I am under our parliamentary system of government with grave and important duties, and having the responsibility of being leader of the House, I owe justice and I owe fair play to every member of the House, no matter on which side he may sit. I have had to give a good deal of thought to the different aspects of this question. My hon. friend has thrice brought it to the attention of the House, and though I am a pretty busy man otherwise I have had to give a good deal of attention to the discussions we have had upon this subject. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) wanted to have an investigation, as the result of certain words spoken by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) on the 21st of February last. I had to see what was to be done, and what my duty was under such circumstances, and when the question first arose I stated in the House that we should wait until we had the report of the Insurance Commission. When we did get that report, I stated then that we should have a discussion upon it before the session closed. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) is more lucky than I am, since he has been able to read the whole evidence and the report of the commission. I have not read the evidence. I have glanced through the report; I afterwards took it up to read it when I had more leisure so as to form my own conclusion, and, if I am to speak my own mind at the present moment, I must declare that I am not prepared to say what the conclusion I have come to is; and what action should be taken by the government upon this report. I had hoped that long ere this we would be able to have the discussion, but we have not been idle in this House in the meantime, and I hope still that we may have a discussion warranted by the report, before the session closes.

But, my hon. friend (Mr. Bourssa) goes further, and he says in the first part of his motion :

That the report of the Royal Commission on Life Insurance and the evidence connected therewith have made public various transactions in which members of this House participated, namely, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler), the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), the hon. member for Prince, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) ;

That such transactions have been commented upon, by several organs of public opinion, in terms reflecting upon the honour, the integrity and the independenc of the above-named gentlemen.

Now, I would have been glad, and the House would have been glad to have had the conclusion of my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) upon this report. I followed his speech very closely and I noticed that he avoided telling us what was his own conclusion. He told us of the conclusion arrived at by newspapers, and he told us what was reported on the street, but he did not tell us what his own views were. I can tell my hon. friend that I have nothing to withdraw from what I said upon a former occasion, and to which the hon. gentleman took exception. I then said in the House :

The commission have reported that in their judgment there was necessity for legislation, and they have submitted a blank Bill for the consideration of the House, which is now in the hands of hon. members. Beyond this they did not report, they made no report against anybody.

I meant of course, that they made no report against any member of parliament, and I have nothing to withdraw from that statement. The commission have made certain statements, but they have not made a report against this member of the House or that member of the House, on which this House could base a motion. I may have my own views, I may agree with the findings and some one else may disagree from them ; my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) disagrees from some of the findings, and he has given his reasons, but I am not prepared at this moment to agree or disagree with the hon. gentleman. This will come later on, but for the present I have to say that I have nothing to retract what I said on a former occasion, when I stated that in my humble judgment the report has not concluded against any member of the House. For my part, I cannot see there is any reason to have any further investigation upon the facts disclosed by the commission. The evidence appears to me to be as complete as could be taken under the circumstances, and I do not know that another investigation would add to our knowledge of the facts that have been disclosed by that evidence. Therefore, I do not know that the House, should in justice to itself, agree to the conclusion of my hon. friend from Labelle.

I now pass to another part of the motion. The hon. gentleman states that we should have an investigation into certain private matters which have been in circulation in this House, he says, and in the streets and elsewhere, against certain parties. I have stated on a former occasion that the hon. member for King's, N.B., did not name any body, and that he has made no charges against any one. My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) told me to-day, that I was mistaken in that, and that this hon. member for King's had named Mr. Hyman Minister of Public Works, when he used the words 'he would give the reason why Hyman resigned.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to perform at this moment a rather painful duty, but it is a duty which I must discharge in justice to myself and in justice to my colleague the Minister of Public Works, and when I have made the explanation the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) will understand why I would not be anxious to saw-off with the member for King's. There have been a great many rumours against my colleague, Mr. Hyman, there is no use to deny it. There have been rumours in this House that he was shamming disease and that he was not really sick. I believe that idea has been dispelled and that it is no longer entertained by any body. I believe that every body knows that when Mr. Hyman left the House he was in very bad health and was a very sick man indeed. But that was not the only rumour. The atmosphere was thick with rumours, and last fall, about September or October, a certain rumour came to me and I spoke to a mutual friend who is now in this House and hears my words, and I said to him : I have been a friend of Hyman for many years ; you are still more a friend of his than I am ; you are more intimate with him than I am ; I have heard this and you have heard it also : Go to him and tell him he must let me know what truth there is in this. That rumour was in connection with a certain person. My friend went to Mr. Hyman and Mr. Hyman sent me word that there was not a word of truth in that rumour. I have to take the House and the country into my confidence ; I wish it were otherwise. This statement made by the Minister of Public Works at that time has since been corroborated by a telegram which was read in the committee some few weeks ago, and which was sent by Mr. Hyman to Mr. Duffield, in which he says :

Any statement or insinuation that my resignation either as member or minister was prompted by other motives than those contained in my letter to Sir Wilfrid Laurier are absolutely untrue.

When I had Mr. Hyman's own word about the matter, then, when he offered me his resignation for reasons with which the House is familiar, I concluded that I would not accept his resignation and therefore, knowing what I believe to be the truth, there was no reason whatever why I should consent to a saw-off with the member for King's. The hon. gentleman Mr. Fowler) told us that if attacked he would do this and he would do that. That is his own concern, and at the present moment I have nothing to say to it. But that is not all. There are other rumours also, and if I understood my hon. friend from Labelle aright he wants us to investigate these rumours. Now, it is not a very agreeable task on the floor of parliament to have to comment upon such statements as we heard this afternoon. But this afternoon the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) speaking of my duty to the House, speaking of my duty to the public, speaking of my duty to the government, told me that I was bound to take cognizance of certain rumours that were going around the streets. He told us, among other things, that ministers of the Crown—I took a note of his words at the time, have gone into hotels with women of ill-repute, and then the hon. member (Mr. Bourassa) said that if any body knows that he should come forward with the proof, or words to that effect. Then the hon. gentleman said : If I had the proof I would bring it forward.

These are the very words made use of : 'If I had the proof I would bring it.' All I have to say to my hon. friend is, if he has not the proof, why does he mention it at all? The rumours which have been floating in the air at last fell into the gutter, and the hon. gentleman gropes in the gutter and brings those rumours into the House. Is it to investigate things of that kind that my hon. friend asks for a committee to be appointed? Is the House of Commons to investigate charges of that kind? The House of Commons can investigate charges of corruption in a public man, but I never yet knew that the House of Commons in England or in this country made itself a police court to investigate charges of this character. The hon. gentleman, however, has taken it upon himself to bring this matter to the attention of the House and, teaching me my duty, he has given me the example of Mr. Gladstone in the case of Sir Charles Dilke, and I suppose it was the same in the case of Mr. Charles Parnell. It is true that on a certain occasion Mr. Gladstone advised the friends of Parnell to compel him to withdraw from parliamentary life, but when was this? It was when the offences of Parnell had become public; when they were the subject of a judgment of a court; it was at a time when his offences were no longer a private affair, but had become a public scandal. Well, Sir, if there was anything of that kind against a friend or colleague of mine, it would be my duty to do as Mr. Gladstone did, but am I to be told that I must make myself a detective, to go about looking for private offences in order to take action upon them? Sir, if a matter of that kind came to my notice I would do as I did when I heard Mr. Hyman's name mentioned in connection with certain matters. As a member of the government, as his leader, I thought it my duty to call his attention to what was reported of him, but I do not know that I am called upon to act upon rumours and the tittle tattle of the streets. I am bound to act only upon facts, and when these facts are brought to my knowledge, I think I shall have the courage to do my duty to my friends, to my colleagues, to my party, and, if I may say so, to my country. It is unprecedented to have a motion such as we have had to-day brought to the attention of the House of Commons. If the hon. member for Labelle or any one else has charges to make against myself or against any of my colleagues he is welcome to make them. Let him do it in a parliamentary manner; let him formulate his charges and an investigation shall take place immediately. Let him substantiate anything that he has in his mind and that he thinks ought to be investigated and to-morrow the investigation shall be granted, even if it should cause the session to last three months longer. But, Sir, I protest, in the name of parliamentary life, in the name of parliamentary dignity, against the speech that was made this afternoon by the hon. member for Labelle. Public life has its duties and its responsibilities, and it has perhaps more to suffer than to enjoy; but, after all, there is one thing which we should, on one side of the House or on the other, always endeavour to maintain, that is to say, that in our daily conflicts we should fight fair and square, and never strike below the belt.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the Prime Minister, as leader of the House, should not have seen fit to arise in his place after the hon. member for Labelle had concluded his address and place before the House the position which he thought the House should assume in view of the speech which has been made and the resolution which has been moved. Instead of that, it was very evident to us who were observing the right hon. gentleman with the expectation that he would arise, that he made a certain signal to my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) and my hon. friend from Carleton arose in his place and did that duty which I suppose had been allotted to him—made an

attack upon my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in connection with that inquisitorial commission which has performed certain work assigned to it by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. It is to be regretted that the Prime Minister adopted this course and waited till after eight o'clock while that attack was going on—an attack calculated and designed to injure the reputation of my hon. friend from North Toronto if it should not be answered. Sir, tactics of that kind may be according to the view of the Prime Minister as to what is just and right towards hon. members on this side of the House. He professes a great desire for justice and fair-play, but they are not exactly in accordance with my idea of what is justice and fair-play. The right hon. gentleman has used some strong language with regard to my hon. friend from Labelle. I am not here to speak for that hon. gentleman. In certain of the criticisms which the Prime Minister has passed upon him I would be perhaps inclined to concur to some extent, but the Prime Minister must bear in mind that he himself stated in this House on the 21st day of February that the matters referred to deserve the attention of the House, and he then gave his pledge to the House that they should be investigated before the close of the session. Said the Prime Minister :

> I do not think it is fair to attack the private conduct of any man in this House unless it has become such a matter of public scandal that the presence of that man should not be tolerated in an assembly like this. I will not discuss that feature at present. I have not made up my mind that at this moment the time has come for the House to take any action upon the matter which has been brought to its attention. But that the session cannot pass without this matter being brought to the attention of the House goes without saying.

Well, the right hon. gentleman has not indicated in his speech to-night in what way this matter is to be further brought to the attention of the House. Let us look for a moment at what the circumstances are, and also at the resolution of my hon. friend from Labelle. The Prime Minister has taken the position I have just now indicated. He found fault in the first place with my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) because my hon. friend brought this motion to the attention of the House by way of an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply. But I cannot believe that if the right hon. gentleman had desired the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) to bring this matter to the attention of the House as a question of privilege, the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) would not have been willing to adopt that course. Why did not the right hon. gentleman, as leader of the House, suggest to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) what I think would have been the proper course, namely, that instead of bringing this motion by way of amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply he should have brought it forward as a question of privilege.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Better ask my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am willing to put the question to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), if I am to be referred to him for an answer to a question which I think might be properly answered by the minister. Might I then ask my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) why he did not bring this matter up as a question of privilege?

Mr. BOURASSA. Of course, I do not want to give any reply that might be regarded as a breach of confidence. If my right hon. friend will allow me to repeat the two conversations which took place between us, I am ready to do so, but not otherwise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection.

Mr. BOURASSA. The first time I went to the right hon. gentleman I suggested that this resolution should be brought. as a matter of privilege, on a motion to adjourn the House. He suggested that it should be brought in in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply. Later on he asked me if I would not bring it as a motion of privilege, but I adhered to the first suggestion made by him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As my hon. friend has given his version, I may give mine. I suggested to him, when he asked me whether he would bring it as a motion to adjourn, that that would never do, but that he should bring it as a motion to which we could move an amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not prepared to settle any difference between the two gentlemen, but it seems to me that if I had occupied the position of the First Minister I would at once have suggested to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that a matter of this gravity should be brought forward as a matter of privilege, and that to all intents and purposes, it is one proper to be brought forward in that way and not brought on a motion to go into Committee of Supply.

The right hon. gentleman has referred to a statement in the resolution with regard to comments in the public press, rumours current throughout the country, and the condition of public opinion. I am very much disposed to agree with him as to the value to be attached to such comments; but there is something more in the resolution than that, there is reference made to

matters which the right hon. gentleman himself has declared must occupy the attention of the House before its adjournment. If I took precisely the view which my right hon. friend takes of this resolution, I would be inclined entirely to concur with him, but I do not understand the resolution in that way. The resolution is that the government should ask the House to constitute a special committee to conduct a strict and impartial inquiry as to whether any ministers of the Crown or members of parliament have improperly made use of their position as such for their private gain, or have otherwise been guilty of personal misconduct, under such circumstances or of such character as to justify the intervention and censure of this House. I entirely agree with the Prime Minister that it would never do for parliament to constitute itself into an inquisition with respect to the private conduct either of members of parliament or ministers of the Crown. But I also agree with what has been said by the Prime Minister, and by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as well, that private conduct may be of such a character as to amount to public scandal, which would call for the intervention of the Prime Minister himself. There is no doubt about that. The Prime Minister himself is, in the first place, the guardian of the honour of parliament. But he is something more than that. He is the guardian of the honour of his cabinet as a whole. He has to select his colleagues. He can go to the Governor General at any time and ask that the resignation of any member of his cabinet shall be required. Of course, it would be only in an extraordinary case that he would take a stand of that kind by reason of the private conduct of any member of his cabinet, and I am not for one moment suggesting that I know of anything which should induce him to take action of that kind. I am not making any insinuations, but merely laying down what I consider a broad public principle as to the duty imposed upon the Prime Minister in the first place as regards members of the House, and in the second place as regards members of his cabinet.

The right hon. gentleman understands this resolution to be a roving commission. I do not so understand it. If I had been proposing the resolution with regard to this particular matter, I would not have framed it exactly as my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has done. But I do understand the resolution he has submitted to the House to be one which, in the end, requires charges to be made before any investigation can be held. In the paragraph of the resolution which follows that quoted by the First Minister, we have this :

That any charges that may be preferred against any member of the government or this House should be formulated before that committee, and that members of this House or other persons who have material or data at their disposal with reference thereto should divulge them to that committee.

The right hon. the First Minister has referred to rumours, rumours around the corridors of this House, rumours in the public press, rumours circulating throughout the land. Therefore, it seems to me we should have a tribunal appointed before which any of those charges could be made, and before which any man who has anything to say against any member of this House, or of the cabinet, should present himself or for ever after hold his peace. It does not seem to me, therefore, that this resolution has the far-reaching character suggested by the right hon. gentleman.

The right hon. gentleman says that this would amount to an inquisition. Let me tell him that the inquisition proposed by the hon. mmber for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), even if it had all the characteristics which the First Minister suggests, would not be one-tenth as cruel and ruthless and unsparing as that inquisition which he sent out and which investigated the private affairs of hon. gentlemen on this side. Any man who went before a committee of this House would have the right to appear by counsel and be heard, but my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had no right to employ counsel or to be heard. He perhaps could employ counsel, but the counsel whom he employed were not permitted to cross-examine witnesses, or to adduce evidence on his behalf, if I understand the proceedings correctly. My hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) whose name was brought into that connection was not permitted to cross-examine witnesses by counsel. What does the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) think of an inquisition of that kind, degenerating in the end to nothing more than a political inquisition as he knows, and no one knows it better than he does.

Mr. FOSTER. Except the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does he think of an inquisition of that kind ? He talks about justice, and fair play to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Why, Mr. Speaker, the aim was not only to get at the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Lefurgey)—the idea was to get at the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). That was the main object and attempt of certain developments which took place before that commission, there is no doubt about that. When the right hon. gentleman tells us that he shrinks from the cruelty and injustice and inquisitorial power which could be exercised by a

tribunal of this kind I ask him to reflect upon the proceedings of that commission which had for four or five weeks my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) before it without even vouchsafing to him the privilege of going upon the witness stand and telling his story, I venture to think that under the circumstances we on this side of the House at least cannot very much appreciate the high-sounding phrases uttered by the Prime Minister to-night when he has declared to us that he cannot venture to agree with my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) because the proposal would amount to a political inquisition.

My hon. friend the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) has dealt with some matters which have been discussed and considered in the report of this commission. I do not propose to attempt to answer the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is here and I venture to predict that before this session is over the member for North Toronto will put his case before the judgment of parliament and before the judgment of the people of this country and he will be prepared to stand or fall by the verdict of parliament and of the country with regard to that. I would have thought when the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) had made that attack against men—no not against men, because he was very careful not to say very much about the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler)—I should have thought that when he realized that that inquiry had been carried on against men who had not the right to be represented by counsel or to cross-examine a witness, that the instincts of British fair play——

An hon. MEMBER. He has not got any.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—and the training which he had as a lawyer, would have taught him that he should have supported the motion of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) instead of voting against it. Every reason that he gave was a reason for supporting that motion and he concluded by telling us that he could not support it because it was too wide-reaching and inquisitorial in its character, and yet he stood up here to-night and read, for the purpose of injuring the political reputation and the personal character of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the evidence and the report of a commission which did not allow that hon. gentleman to make his defence before it. That may be his idea of British fair play but it is not mine.

I would not have couched this resolution in these terms, nor would I have proposed this exact procedure, but I am prepared, inasmuch as this resolution refers to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, inasmuch as the remarks of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) have touched upon the personal character of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, inasmuch as he has expressed his view as a member of parliament that there should be an investigation—and I think he took some responsibility in adopting the course which he did, and to this I will refer later on—inasmuch as he has done this, I am not prepared to vote against this resolution. I have pledged myself to two things in this House and I propose to stand by them to the end. I have pledged myself that I have not made and that I would not make any arrangement with hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House about any matter touched upon in the discussion during the past session which have been commented on by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and I have pledged myself also that if any hon. gentleman in this House took steps to forward an inquiry touching the position of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who are my colleagues and associates, I would give my best efforts to probe the matter of that inquiry to the bottom. Therefore I am not disposed, for the sake of any parliamentary precedent, for the sake of any hair-splitting, or for the sake of anything that has been uttered by the Prime Minister, and especially in view of the construction which I put upon this resolution, I am not disposed to vote against this motion and I shall record my vote in favour of that resolution although I wish that the procedure suggested had been different and that the resolution had been couched in somewhat different terms.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). To a very considerable extent the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was devoted to a censure of the Insurance Commission. I do not think that censure was well deserved. I think the gentlemen who composed that commission are citizens of sufficient reputation throughout the country to lead my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) to believe, on reflection, that probably he has not done them full justice. I do not think there is any room to doubt that the gentlemen composing that commission entered upon their work with the desire to do that which was their proper mission. However, I do not wish to dwell on that to-night at all, but rather to suggest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) that even if the Insurance Commission acted unwisely, even if the Insurance Commission was unfair to some hon. gentlemen whose names have been drawn into the matter, even if there is good ground for the complaint of my hon. friend that this Insurance Commission did not act wisely and well, that would be the poorest kind of reason for supporting the motion that has been presented to the House by my hon. friend from Labelle. So far as an investigation into insurance affairs is concerned, I think it would be difficult

for a committee of this House in any reasonable time, even if they should sit for weeks, or for months longer than is contemplated, to conduct any full inquiry. It would not be reasonable to suppose that they could go into an extended review of the work of the Insurance Commission. Is it proposed that the witnesses should be recalled? I think a moment's reflection will show that the investigation that has taken place, be it fair or be it unfair—and I do not enter into that aspect of the question—has been a very full investigation, a much fuller investigation than could possibly be entered upon by a committee of this House. Now my hon. friend from North Toronto, although he has not spoken at length on the subject, has indicated that in his judgment the commission was unjust to him, and no doubt at his own itme and at his own convenience he will take his own means of putting his case before the House and before the public in a way that shall best commend itself to his judgment. So much then on the question of the Insurance Commission.

Now as to the other question which the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has referred to, and which is after all the main question, namely the rumours and gossip and tittle tattle of the street, I say there is no justification whatever for these matters being made the ground of a grave proposition in parliament to investigate the conduct of any man. Parliament is indeed jealous of its own honour; more than that, parliament should be jealous of the honour and reputation of every member no matter on which side of the Speaker he may sit. Parliament should be so jealous of the honour of every member that it would not permit any man to be arraigned on insinuations or innuendoes, but will demand that if any member is to be condemned he should have the opportunity of meeting his accuser; that a statement shall be made that this man had committed some wrong which renders him unfit to sit in the parliament of Canada; that a charge shall be presented to the House by some hon. member who either knows the fact or has information which he believes, and is able to present to the House in good faith; then, upon an accusation of that character, and then only, should this parliament permit any one of its members to be arraigned and subject to possible condemnation. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to consider whether we are at liberty to deal with this gossip and street rumour. My hon. friend says there is gossip in the lobbies affecting some hon. members, therefore give us a committee; the hon. member for Labelle says there are rumours in the public press affecting some hon. member, therefore give us a committee. Surely, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen on both sides must see that it is beneath the dignity of the parliament of Canada to deal gravely and seriously with such rumours and such gossip as that. I submit again that we owe it, not only to the honour of parliament as a whole, but we owe it to the honour of every individual member, that no member of this great congress of the nation shall be called upon to defend himself against gossip, rumours innuendoes and slander, but that if he is to be accused he shall be accused in an open, honourable and manly way, where he will know who his accuser is and that he shall have an opportunity of meeting him in fair and open contest.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that he has announced before and he repeats now that if anybody would take the responsibility of making an accusation against any member of this House he will undertake to assist him in an investigation. Quite right; a very correct position to take. But what is the situation to-day? Has any man made any accusation? My hon. friend from King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) has not made any accusation. He has made some suggestions which may possibly, in the minds of some persons, amount to accusations. If the hon. member for King's and Albert has in his possession information which would justify him in making an accusation against any member of this House, I take it for granted that he knows his duty, and that he will be prepared at the right time to come forward and lay his charge and let the accused answer. But there is no charge; the hon. member for King's and Albert is not prepared; at all events up to this moment he has made no charge. The member for Labelle makes no charge. He particularly declares that even if this committee be granted he will make no charge. Well, see what a farce this committee would be. A committee would be appointed, a fishing committee to investigate the private life of every member of this House—because there is no limitation in the motion of the hon. member for Labelle, his motion is that this committee shall afford an opportunity to any member who wants to come forward and assail the reputation and private life of any other member of this House. Is that a dignified position for this parliament to take? Is that dealing fairly between man and man? Is this Canadian House of Commons prepared to accept this street gossip, and say that, although no man makes an accusation, although no man stands up in this House and complains of any other, because there is gossip in the street, because there are paragraphs in the newspapers, we are gravely invited to appoint a committee of the House of Commons to inquire into the private life of every hon. member, whether he sits to the right or to the left of the Speaker?

I regret to find that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has felt it his duty to support this resolution. I feel that he, along with the right hon. the Prime Minister, are the joint guardians of the honour of this House, and in my judgment they should both feel that they owe it not only to the House as a whole but to every individual member, that private life shall be protected, and that we shall not grant a fishing inquiry of this sort unless some one is prepared to come forward and make a formal accusation. I do not say that a man's private life shall in no case be investigated ; I admit that the private life of a man may be such as to unfit him to hold a public position. But surely before we grant a committee to investigate the private life of every member of this House, we should have somebody stand up here and make an accusation in the usual way. I therefore humbly submit to this House that there is not the shadow of a ground for asking for an investigation to take place. If the member for King's and Albert feels it to be his duty to make a charge against any minister or any member of this House, he knows well the proper way to do it. If the hon. member for Labelle feels that he has information, though he may have no knowledge, if he has information which he is able to say, as he presents it to the House, that he verily believes to be true, that he is informed and believes that certain things are taking place which reflect upon the honour and the fitness of any member to occupy his seat in this House, then I take it for granted that these gentlemen will, in a proper way, and in accordance with parliamentary rules and procedure, make their accusation, and then a committee shall be granted. The right hon. the Prime Minister has said, and I scarcely need to repeat it now, that if any hon. gentleman in this House is prepared in the usual and parliamentary way, in that parliamentary way which is provided for the protection of the honour of the House and of every member in it, if any hon. member is prepared to come forward and make an accusation in such a way, then undoubtedly an investigation shall take place. The right hon. the Prime Minister has given an assurance that if such a step is taken a committee shall be promptly granted. I submit to the House that until the matter is brought forward in the way provided by the rules of parliament, this House should not lend itself to the passing of a motion calling for such an investigation as that which is contemplated by my hon. friend for Labelle.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). I seconded this motion, and so far I have seen no reason to regret it. However, I do regret one thing, and that is that I did not speak before the right hon. leader of this House, and that I did not share with my hon. friend for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) the strong condemnation which the right hon. gentleman directed against my hon. friend for Labelle. This debate, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps the most important debate that ever took place in the history of this parliament. While that may not be the opinion of the supporters of the government, it was their opinion until the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) brought them to terms. What are the facts? The hon. leader of this House and the Minister of Finance have taken such a course that I think it is well again to state the question before the House. The hon. member for Labelle has given the facts this afternoon in detail; I will give them in a nut-shell. The Royal Commission on Insurance has come to certain conclusions against certain members of this House.

But what we know is that after the inquiry of the commission the Liberal press all over Canada repeated these accusations, or at least made the report of the Insurance Commission the basis of accusations and charges against members of this House. Members of this House have repeated those accusations against their fellow members, and those accusations were repeated in articles in the press and an immediate investigation was demanded by the Liberal press. Such was the situation that a member of this House, the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) brought the matter again before the House and then the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Fowler) said : If you attack me I will attack you and in my attack I shall prove the connection of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House with wine, women and graft. Everybody knows that there was a great change. Everybody knows that there was a general hush down, everybody knows that the Liberal press which had been so fierce and savage against the hon. member for North Toronto and the hon. member for King's, N.B., quieted down and was silent and we saw these very same papers which had violently denounced these hon. gentlemen saying that there was no ground for an investigation, that there was nothing before the House. There was a general hush down. Then, my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) thought fit to bring the matter before the House. It was brought up and the two leaders of the different parties agreed that an investigation would be necessary, but not until the report of the Royal Commission on Insurance would be brought down. The report was brought down. The report was printed and distributed to the members, and then the right hon. leader of the House said that there was nothing to investigate. What are the reasons for that change ? Are these reasons to be found in the threat made by the hon. member for King's ? If so, then I

say that there is all the more ground for demanding an investigation. If the threat of the hon. member for King's to reveal certain things can create such an intense fear on the part of the ministry and on the part of the Liberal press what will be the effect of the truth when it is revealed ? It seems to me that there is every reason for an investigation when we see that the whole of the press which has been attacking members of this House and when we see that members of this House who have been saying, as the hon. member for Wright said, that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was not fit to sit in this House assuming an attitude of silence.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lavergne) will allow me I do not remember ever having made the statement that the hon. member for North Toronto was not fit to sit in this House.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Well, I remember the statement, but of course, I accept my hon. friend's denial. Perhaps I am not quoting him correctly but I remember that he said in the debate upon the address that every one was surprised to see the hon. member for North Toronto in the House.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN. That I admit having said, but not what the hon. member for Montmagny said.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Well, it is a different thing but it creates the same impression. Now, since the hon. member for King's has made this threat the hon. member for Wright has not repeated the statement that he just says he made.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN. Has the hon. member for Montmagny any insinuation to make or any inference to draw from the fact of my not having spoken since?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. What does the hon. gentleman say ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN. I am asking the hon. member for Montmagny what he means by the statement he has just made ?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I say that the hon. member for King's has made a general charge against members on this side of the House and I do not know if my hon. friend from Wright is not one of the accused. From my personal knowledge of the hon. member for Wright I would readily believe he is not one of them, but I do not know? How do I know? The hon. member for Labelle this afternoon wanted to know who were the ministers that the hon. member for King's was aiming at ? I would like to know who are the members whom the hon. member for King's is aiming at, and think, Mr. Speaker, that this very interruption of the hon. member for Wright shows that it is necessary to have an investigation to clear the atmosphere of this House. We are told that there are no charges but at the same time the tone in which we are told that seems to say : Do not search too much because you might find some charges. I want to have a committee of investigation and I want these charges to be brought before this committee or to be withdrawn by the hon. member for King's if he cannot prove them. This House is under a deep cloud and I think it is our duty to dissipate that cloud. I want to know if we are going to shrink before our duty ? We have been accused, of having connection with women, wine and graft.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I may not use the terms that have been used by the hon. member for King's, but I am sure I am expressing what he had in his mind. This matter is a very serious one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Some of my hon. friends are laughing because they feel sure now that the majority will vote down the investigation. But, I really do not know that they would take the matter as such a joke if the investigation had been accepted by the government. These charges are most serious. I do not want to intervene in the private life of any member of this House, but let us take the last charge of the hon. member for King's. Who are the grafters in this House ? The hon. gentleman says that he has the material, the data in his hand, to prove what he has said and we have on the other side the Prime Minister stating that there have been no charges made. Mr. Speaker, the charges have been made. They have been made by the hon. member for King's. That is the real issue. It is not rumours, as the hon. Minister of Finance has said, that we want to investigate. We want to investigate the charges which have been made by the hon. member for King's and either these charges are true or they are false. If they are true there is no doubt that an investigation is necessary and that the House should deal with the guilty as it thinks fit. If they are false the investigation is still more necessary to rehabilitate the House of Commons in public opinion where, I may say, it is very much degraded. Public opinion is aroused on this question. It is so much aroused that we saw the other day in the 'Toronto World' a cartoon which was most expressive. How do we know if it is true or not without an investigation ? That cartoon suggests a serious reflection on four members of this government, or three ministers and one ex-minister.

How are we to discover if these accusations are true. I submit, Sir, it is the duty of this House to dispel every doubt and every

cloud that rests on the honour of the House and on the honour of the ministers so that such dreadful cartoons as have appeared in the Toronto 'World' may never appear again. Respect for parliament is fast disappearing in this country. The press is aroused, public opinion is aroused, and yet to-night, the Prime Minister, the guardian of the honour of parliament, declares that an investigation is not necessary, that no charges are made against any members of this House and that every member of the House is an honest man. Well, Sir, the Liberal press did not say that every member of this House is an honest man until the member for King's made it shut up. Members on this side of the House do not say it of hon. members opposite, and it is not what the independent press says which has published pictures of ministers in the stocks of public opinion. But the true reason, the hidden reason, why there is not to be an inquiry is, that the Prime Minister may go to the Imperial Conference, and that his trip may not be delayed. It seems to me that prima facie the interests of Canada should be in front of imperial interests, but there is one thing that is quite sure, that is that the leader of the House could go to England and that the investigation could go on all the same. In 1897 the right hon. the Prime Minister was in London representing the first colony of the empire and doing honour to the first colony of the empire; in 1902 he was again representing Canada and doing honour to our country. But this year, if he goes to the Imperial Conference, with the shadow that is resting on the Canadian parliament, the people will see in the Prime Minister of Canada not the representative of the first colony of the empire, but the representative of a parliament where the true motives of action are wine, women, and graft.

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement just made by the hon. member is such a serious reflection upon the members of the House, that it is not in accordance with parliamentary decorum and should be withdrawn.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I bow to your ruling, Sir, and I am ready to withdraw my objection just as soon as the hon. member for King's has withdrawn his charge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member should withdraw the statement.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the rule; my words are there. We have been told that the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) is too broad, and that under it we could investigate the private life of every member of this House. I deny that. What the motion says is this:

That the government should therefore ask the House to constitute a special committee to conduct a strict and impartial inquiry as to whether any ministers of the Crown or members of parliament have improperly made use of their positions as such for their private gain or have otherwise been guilty of personal misconduct under such circumstances or of such a character as to justify the intervention and censure of this House.

There is not a single reasonable man in this House who can see in the wording of that motion any power to investigate the private life of every member of this House. It has been said that the hon. member for Labelle has made no charges. How could the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) make the charges which are yet only in the mind of the member for King's? The member for King's says he has data; he has not disclosed that data, but if this motion be granted he will be obliged to disclose it. My hon. friend from Labelle and myself are not the guardians of the honour of parliament. That duty rests with the Prime Minister and that is why the motion asks that the government should take action; and provide the investigation. By voting down this motion and preventing investigation, we are neglecting our duty which stares us in the face and which the people of the country demand we should discharge. The people of Canada have put their confidence in the present government and it is due to them that they should now know if the government is worthy of that confidence.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The motion which has been offered by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is a definite motion made to effectuate a definite purpose, and, it is not in my opinion germane to the discussion of that motion, and the decision of the House upon it, that any member of the House should branch off into a general discussion of the evidence, and exhibits, and report of the Insurance Commission. At least, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to do that, I have been kindly invited on several occasions this afternoon by the member for Labelle, to explain myself, to defend myself, to guard my honour, and he has kindly offered me this opportunity that I may avail of it to do one or all of these things. I thank the member for Labelle. I am grateful to him for his solicitude for my honour and my reputation, but I must respectfully decline, on a side issue of this kind, to make my statement or to enter into the doings, the constitution, the duties, or the results of the Insurance Commission. But, the member for Labelle may rest entirely assured that this session of parliament will not have seen its final day until I shall have taken occasion (not by a side wind, but all of itself) to make some few remarks with reference to that precious commission and with reference to its report. In order to clear the air just a little and to prevent my having to recur to this again, I may say to you Mr. Speaker, and to this House, and

to this country that without making up my mind hastily—and I am not prone to hasty judgment—I have come to the deliberate conclusion down in my heart (it will stay there as long as I live, though I live to be as old as Methuselah that one of the most diabolical attempts has been made under the shadow of that commission to asperse and if possible destroy the character of a fellow member of this House, that has ever been known in the history of governmental commissions. I, Sir, shall never change that opinion.

There is no evidence that can be brought that will make me change what my own eyes have seen, what my own eyes have read, and what my own observation has brought to me from day to day. I hope the member for Wright (Mr. E. B. Devlin) has gotten over the shock that my presence gave him in the early part of the session. I know the exquisite qualities of my hon. friend. I know that he is perfection itself, and I could not but be grieved by the pained expression I saw upon his countenance when, rising to speak—I think it was on the address—he happened to catch sight of the member for North Toronto and was shocked. Now, there has been a good deal of talk as to the origin of all this. Will you let me give you my idea of its origin? Is it not a rule of this House that no member shall say anything offensive of another member? And if Mr. Speaker, and the leaders of this House, and the members of this House, would endeavour to curb themselves—perhaps I am a little hasty, and perhaps I offend sometimes in the same direction; but if that were done, and done consecutively, and done with pressure from the chair, and with pressure from the leaders, we would have been spared a great deal of this exhibition to which we have been treated, and which I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, is not aiding the dignity of this parliament and is not entrenching it in the affections and the respect of the country whose respresentative it is. When the leader of the government so far forgets himself, as the leader of the government forgot himself to-night, in a discussion which ought to have had nothing to do with an attack upon any member of this House on account of what occurred in the commission, and deliberately stopped the course of the discussion, and relinquished the position which was his by right and by duty, to immediately follow my hon. friend from Labelle and give the House the benefit of his views with reference to this motion; and, instead of doing that, from preparation previously made, signalled to the member for Carleton, N.B., to lead an attack upon the member for North Toronto, it did not add much to that kindly spirit of fairness which we need to cultivate in this House, and without the cultivation of which we shall have numerous repetitions of scenes of this kind. From the time that commission opened its doors in Toronto in September—yes, and before that—until it closed its doors in this city, and afterwards, there has not been an hour or a day in which the pen and the tongue of slander have not been used against myself and other members of this House, for no reason under heaven than that it might help to kill a political opponent and blast the reputation of men whom, in their hearts, they respected and whom they feared as political opponents, and whom they chose to fight, brave men that they are, under the cover of an Insurance Commission. I respect the powers that be as long as they respect themselves; but three men seated on a bench and dubbed a Royal Commission on Insurance, fishing from one end of this country to the other, outside of the scope and province of what was committed to the commission, does not add to my respect for the name by which they were called, nor for the office which they were appointed to fill. From the time that commission opened its doors until it closed them, there was evident, beneath, on each side, in the centre, on the top, the wild desire to rope in members of the Liberal-Conservative party, no matter where they might have to seek them, no matter how far afield they must go for them. Under heaven, what reason was there for investigating the fact that a man, in 1903, travelling in the Northwest, bought some lands, held them, made payments on them, sold them to a company or to a syndicate, and that syndicate sold them to a company, and that company obtained a loan from the Union Trust Company, and the Union Trust Company had its stock largely subscribed by the Foresters' Insurance Company? What reason, under heaven, was there, but a political reason, which sent Mr. Shepley and Mr. Tilley, under the instructions of the Minister of Justice, travelling all over this country, trying to find out just what conversations those gentlemen had in that four or-five-times-removed transaction? Did it affect, to a single iota, the securities that the Union Trust Company held for the money it had advanced? Not in the least degree. When a purchase of land was made from Mr. Whitla, and the price was clear, and the payments were clear, and even the commission was clear—for, Mr. Speaker, nothing of that was kept under nor concealed; everything was open and above board, and passed through the books of the Union Trust Company and the books of the Foresters, every bit of it—what reason was there, when Mr. Shepley came up against that, and found who sold the lands to the syndicate, why he should spend hours in trying to find out whom Mr. Whitla got the lands from or whom he represented? One reason was, the only reason—to some people a good reason—to my mind a most petty reason—in order, if possible, to connect Mr. Roblin's name with the transaction.

These are examples, and only a few examples, of what I propose to go into to the very bottom before this House, and I invite the men who were going to muzzle me, and who talked of doing it on the streets and in the clubs of Toronto—I invite those men and all who wish to co-operate with them to prepare their ammunition, and to making their pleas, and to gather up their insinuations, and to prove themselves sturdy warriors in this prey of vultures on reputations higher than their own. I invite them to come, and I will meet them as a man face to face, and I will argue it out with them, though I never expect to make my case with the Minister of Justice, nor with the rabid partisan; but I will put a case before this House and this country that any unprejudiced man, I believe, will support me in; and no more than that can I do. I have lived too long to feel that every wasp that buzzes and stings is fatal to a man's life and inimical to his bodily existence. At the same time, wasps are not pleasant and stings are not nice. They are the lot of a public man, and I take the bitter with the sweet and the stings with the rest of it: but down in my heart there is the consciousness that the face of clay cannot put a dishonourable public act to my discredit since I entered public life in 1882. My private reputation is in my own hands and in the hands of my friends and will be judged for what it is worth. But, Sir, I have travelled a little out of the line I indicated when I got up a moment ago. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) put a conundrum to me. All these papers, he said, have been publishing hard things about you and criticising you severely and I am somewhat surprised that you should have kept silent so long. And he said that I was not silent in the Cinq Mars case but brought that young gentleman before the bar of the House for something he had written against me. True, Sir, I did, but I did it merely for the sake of example, and my life would not be worth living if I were to follow up every newspaper reporter and critic who wrote not only hard things but absolute lies about me. I would not have a moment's rest if I had to hunt down that genus from day to day and from year to year. The bar of the House would have to be five times enlarged if I were to bring before it all those guilty of such attacks. And then there is this other little circumstance to be borne in mind, with reference to these editors and writers who have been attacking me, that I doubt if I would have the constitutional right to call them to the bar of the House because they are not guilty of violating any privilege of parliament. The hon. gentleman suggested that I should appeal to the higher tribunal and said that I had made a promise to that effect. True I did make a statement of the kind once in the city of Toronto, but I did it under pressure. I had had then no experience of Royal Commissions, but my ignorance has since been completely dispelled. I know something about them now. Talk about the Czar of Russia, talk about any inquisition you can find in any community in the world, talk about absolutism anywhere, you will not find anything that compares with the Royal Insurance Commission, such as was constituted by this government and which carried out an inquiry during the last few months in this country. That commission was appointed to investigate the working of insurance socities, but its scope was self-enlarged to such an extent as to inquire into matters of every description provided the Liberal-Conservative party could be prejudiced in some way by the inquiry. You go before that Royal Commission and get the best counsel you can—and I know to my cost that counsel are very expensive—you pay them very heavy fees and then they are hampered in every possible way in conducting your case. Why, Mr. Shepley at one time seemed very much annoyed because my counsel wanted to put certain questions and said to him in so many words: Sit down, sir, you have no rights before this court. I said to the commission: That throws a rather lurid light on these proceedings. I have here my counsel but apparently he has no rights before this commission. Yes, said Mr. Shepley, he has no rights but those of courtesy. My hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), if he would stop a moment to think, if he would rid himself of the idea that he has to look at this matter as an unreasonable partisan in order to curry favour with the party he supports, would know that my case could not be favourably put before that Royal Commission with any fairness or justice, when my counsel had not the right to cross-examine or put any question save through the government or prosecuting counsel. Therefore it would make a reasonable man view with some little tenderness and some little limit of forbearance the evidence and——

Mr. CARVELL. Was not the hon. gentleman given the privilege of making out a statement at his leisure and filing it with the Royal Commission as a part of his evidence and did he not do so, and is that statement not contained in the evidence as printed?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman did ask, by the grace of the commission, and was graciously permitted to make a short statement. It was not allowable to make out statements and put them in typewritten form at your leisure, your whole case, and put it in, that was expressly forbidden, but I was allowed—and I was charged to be as short as possible—to make a final statement which will be found in the evidence but which covers a very few points

and which is short, of course, as it had to be under the circumstances on those points.

Under those circumstances before a commission with those powers, those methods and that method of procedure, I felt from day to day that I was not having fair play, and so I did at one time state that I should appeal to a higher tribunal. That tribunal is this parliament and this country whose representatives we are. To that I propose to appeal, but I propose to do it in my own way and to choose my own time.

Now, Sir, it is a grave point with me just how far private matters should be joined to the representative as a part of his representative position and brought into this House. I do not think I can agree with my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) on the point which I thought he elaborated a little this afternoon. If I were conducting a grocery business and if somebody outside caviled at the way in which I conducted it and said I was not doing it fairly, or rightly, I do not think that would be a matter that should be brought into the House of Commons on which I could be twitted, on which insinuations could be given out or on which an inquiry of any kind by parliament should be instituted. If I give light weight, if I sell adulterated goods, the laws of the country deal with me, and they are to be put in force against me. But the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) rather thought that if that grocery business under the unlimited exercise of powers by a Royal Commission, were brought up and investigated by a Royal Commission, and somethings with reference to it were put in the report of the commission that then it would become a subject which this parliament could take up and into which it could command an official inquiry in respect of me as a member of parliament in the conduct of my grocery business. I think my hon. friend from Labelle will see that he will have to do a little sifting and a little elimination ; he has to settle with himself, in the first place with reference to that commission as to how far they transcended the scope of their commission and the reasonable extent of their duties. If they went beyond that and took hold of a man's private business, which they never should have touched, I think he will agree with me that the mere fact of my affairs having been touched by the commission and so brought into the report is not any warrant why a committee of investigation should be called for in my case with respect to that. That is my position. But I go just as far as I went the other day to say that the time does arrive when private character or lack of it, is to be taken into account in a House of parliament in some way or the other. You may let the offending member or the supposed offending member, if you like, settle the score with his constituents who sent him as their representative, and the fact that he has to go back to his constituents and get a renewal of their confidence, will induce caution in that respect, or ought to ; but I think that it should go even further. The tribunal with reference to ministers is the Prime Minister himself. He calls the individuals of his cabinet, he cannot disassociate his call of a member to his cabinet from these other considerations and he should be as sensitive and as jealous of the honour of every member of his cabinet as a man of his wife, as a father of his child, and the Prime Minister of any country has in that respect the keeping of this matter and the judgment of this matter largely with himself. But the course in Great Britain is plain enough. If a representative of the people or a member of the cabinet in his outside private life, renders himself amenable to the law and is convicted by a process of the law, then the course is plain, parliament has a perfect right to purge itself of the criminal and so to make its atmosphere purer and better. But I do hold that it is a delicate proceeding to undertake to regulate the private lives of people and to do it by a partisan committee of the House of Commons. It is a very delicate and sensitive thing to undertake. Let any member take it to himself ; supposing I am called to defend my moral character and my private business character before five members of this House, three of them my political opponents and two of them my political adherents, it almost goes without saying in these days that you will have an ineffective tribunal, that you will get ineffective justice and that the investigation will probably make it worse than it was in the beginning.

Mr. BOURASSA. Has the hon. gentleman noticed that the scope of the powers of the commission would be limited by this last sentence of the substantial paragraph in the motion ?

> Of personal misconduct under such circumstances or of such a character as to justify the intervention and censure of this House.

Therefore it does not relate to private matters that do not come within this description of matters that justify the intervention and censure of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. But who is to be the judge of that ?

Mr. BOURASSA. The House.

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place I think it must be the committee.

Mr. BOURASSA. Under the authority of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, under the authority of the House, and I would rather not be sent up to a partisan committee of the House. So much with reference to that. I think we are justified in saying with the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that outside in the country there is a

great deal of thinking going on and there is a good deal of speaking that is being done, and I look upon that with respect and with hope. All of us want a House of Commons which shall be a credit to Canada in its composition, in its mental ability, in its standing and in its moral character. Our country is so good that no parliament can be too good for it, and it should be and it is a hopeful sign that the country takes cognizance of these things that are being said and affirms its belief in and its desires for the best and steadiest and brightest and strongest parliament that we can possibly have in this country. As I said before I do not propose to carry this discussion very far to-night.

I must make one remark with reference to my hon. friend from Carleton County, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) for fear I might not think of it when the discussion comes up again. Does he think that it was fair treatment to try to represent me as being in fact the sole arbiter of, the dispenser of, the disposer of, the trust funds of the Independent Order of Foresters? I do not belong to that body, I am not an officer of that court, I have not and never had one iota of influence or power as to the disposal of its funds, or the investment of is funds, in any shape or manner. It may be good party tactics, but I doubt it, for a member of this House to attempt to create the impression that I had everything to do with the disposition of the funds of the Foresters, and that the Foresters have a right to call me to account for the disposition that has been made of them. I think my hon. friend himself will see that that was not quite a fair representation of the case. That impression is abroad, does my hon. friend wish to deepen it, strengthen it? It is open to him to do it if he wishes. I have a letter in my possession now from a man whom I believe to be a well thinking and well disposed man. He lives in a distant place, he has caught the headlines of the newspapers, and he writes me a letter which is one way affecting. He had some knowledge of me years ago, but he writes to me now in this way: I am an ill man, I have a wife and two children, do you think it was right for you to squander, to dispose of, to recklessly expend and cause the loss of the money which was to go into the funds of the Independent Order of Foresters for the support of my wife and children when I die? Do you think that you can meet a just Heaven with that blood upon your conscience? That man is honest about it, he has read the headlines, he believes that I have gone through the whole of the Foresters' funds, and that there is nothing left for his wife and children when he dies. At the other end of the scale—but I am not going to say it is the highest end of the scale—is an article in 'Le Canada' which I have in my desk, published in the metropolitan city of Montreal. In almost the same sense, but in different words, it has pointed out a similar accusation, and I am branded as being the destroyer, the pilferer, the reckless dispenser, the spender and wrecker of the funds designed for widows and orphans. Now does my hon. friend from Carleton want to join hands with that sort of thing? He knows me, he knows me from my youth up, and he knows in his heart that that is not a fair characterization of me. Why join hands in that kind of warfare? It is not the best party warfare, and it will not result in the best advantage. But to my hon. friend from Carleton, and to 'Le Canada,' and to all others let me say, that if I am to be shouldered with the responsibility of having made all the investments and of having had no one to curb me, I have at least this consoling reflection, that if you take the four or five years of the management, the share I had in it, of the Union Trust Company, you have four years of constant and I believe almost unexampled prosperity in the history of trust companies in Canada. Every one of those investments which your precious commission always took care to style speculations, every one of those investments has resulted in large cash profits. To my mind they were made for that purpose, and in the firm faith that they would come to that result. I want to state this, that if the impression has got abroad that the Foresters' funds have been depleted through my management of the Union Trust Company, it is absolutely untrue. The Foresters' funds have accumulated profits of very large proportions out of every investment that was made, partly through my management, and with the concurrence of the directorate of which I formed part. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to pursue this subject further to-night, but I do intend to take the very earliest opportunity of placing my views with reference to this commission, and incidentally alongside of that, make my defence and my statement to this House and to this country, and my hon. friend from Labelle may rest assured that the session will not end until that has been done.

Mr. EMMANUEL DEVLIN (Wright). I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the question before the House, but only to refer to a remark of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne). He made an allusion in a joking way, and as I do not suppose he meant any thing serious by it, I will not take it seriously. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has upon two occasions chosen to refer to certain remarks made by me at the beginning of this session. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the speech delivered this evening by the hon. member for North Toronto. I admire his

ability, I do not know that he has a peer in this House as a debater. At the same time, I do not wish to take him as my political guide, nor do I propose to remain silent when he castigates hon. members right and left. The hon. member for North Toronto made reference to certain remarks of mine which will be found at page 117 of 'Hansard,' where I said;

Sir, Mr. Hyman won his seat; Mr. Hyman could have held his seat. And still he is not in his place to-day. Why? Because he is an honourable gentleman. Would the hon. member for North Toronto, I ask, do the same? If so, let him do it. There are many in this country who think it high time that he ask his constituents whether he still retains their confidence.

The hon. member for North Toronto seems to have felt very much aggrieved at these words. But I was then using the tu quoque argument and if the hon. gentleman will refer to page 47 of the 'Hansard' he will find that in dealing with the case of Mr. Hyman he himself said:

It is no light thing, the revelations which have been made in the London elections, taken in connection with the history of election contests in this country and with the debates in this House and the proceedings in the committees in this House—no light thing but rather a grave and serious thing which has resulted in the resignation of one of the ministers of the Crown. That is, Mr. Speaker, if he has resigned, and upon that I cannot form an opinion which is satisfactory to myself.

He goes on to say:

And if what took place showed that he had no right to his seat it shows still more that he had no right to administer one dollar of the public money of this country until he has cleared his skirts with reference to that.

Does not the hon. member for North Toronto think that Mr. Hyman has some feelings left? Does the hon. member for North Toronto think that I was out of place in standing up in this House and trying at least to defend a colleague and a sick man? If he thinks that after all the words he has used this evening or all the words he has uttered on a previous occasion that I would fail to defend a colleague or a political friend when occasion required, then I assure the hon. gentleman that he is very much mistaken.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House at any great length, but I do desire to give a reason for the vote which I am going to give to-night and also to express the view which some hon. gentleman may agree with and some may not that the motion and the speeches which have been made to-night are not relevant to the matter sought to be put at issue in this debate. But before doing that I would like to refer to one or two remarks made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in reference to the Insurance Commission. He stated that the reason or the cause of the appointment of that commission was that it might seek out and find some Conservative members of parliament for the purpose of traducing them in their private or public capacity.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has mistaken me.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY Then I have misunderstood the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. The first part of it I did not say, but I do stand sponsor for the statement that after they were in working order they were used for that purpose.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Well, I did not misunderstand the hon. gentleman, but I think he did not say what he intended.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I intended.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The impression that he sought to leave on one's mind was that the commission was appointed for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. In order that there may be no misunderstanding about it we must have regard to the facts and circumstances which occurred just prior to its appointment. The House will remember that there was a great disturbance in reference to insurance in the republic to the south of us and that a commission or committee was appointed, that an investigation took place and that transactions of a most serious nature were made known to the public. After which great clamour took place in the newspapers of Canada with the result that the insurance companies of Canada were investigated by a Royal Commission. It was for that purpose that this commission was appointed. That, I think, clears up any doubt that may have arisen in the mind of any hon. gentleman as a result of the remarks which fell from the lips of the hon. member for North Toronto.

Then, the next point I desire to refer to is the question of the rights of counsel before that commission. The hon. gentleman has correctly said that counsel were not permitted to ask any questions except through the counsel appointed by the government. That was objected to not alone by the hon. member for North Toronto on behalf of the Foresters, but by every other insurance company that appeared before the commission and like rights were meted out or allowed to each insurance company. No different right were accorded to one insurance company over another, so that all companies and all parties who were being investigated were accorded the same treat-

ment by the commission. Then, I would like to ask the hon. member for North Toronto why it was that he did not make the announcement, which I was pleased to hear him make to-night, and which is the attitude I have taken when discussing this matter with members of this House, that the report of the Royal Commission on Insurance was one that dealt entirely with insurance and that in so far as it affected any individual or private person in the Dominion of Canada it was to be taken as correct pro confesso until it was attacked by him or on his behalf. I submit to the hon. gentleman that we should take that position. In so far as it appertains entirely to the question of insurance we will deal with that when we deal with the Insurance Bill, which, I think everybody agrees, cannot be dealt with at this session. If it attacks any person improperly in his public or private capacity, then his remedy is to bring that evidence up here, make an attack upon the findings of the commission and defend himself by adducing further evidence if he can in opposition to the report of the commission. If that is a fair statement of the situation, and I think the hon. member for North Toronto will agree with me that it is, then why and wherefore is all this discussion by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) to-day? Where does it lead us to? What result does he seek to attain? Up to the present moment or until the hon. member for North Toronto spoke, save the demand of the hon. member for East Simcoe for an investigation in answering those who had spoken, the findings are taken as the judgment of the Royal Commission. If you attack them all, well and good, but surely this House does not require any further investigation to determine anything in regard to the evidence which was heard by that Royal Commission which has now been laid on the table of the House. What result is expected to be attained. Although we are told by the hon. gentleman who has spoken in this House that the facts as found are not correct, let us assume for the purpose of this argument that they are correct; what can this House do? He says that there are things in that report which make it impossible for a man to sit in this House. Is that correct? Is that the real situation? Can we expel any member of this House by reason of the facts found in the Royal Commission's report? If we cannot, wherefore an investigation? What is the investigation for? What is the result that we can hope to attain by such an investigation? I am at a loss to understand it. I cannot understand it. I think this has been surrounded by a maze and a haze by the hon. member for Labelle in his speeches and by the press during the discussion which we have had during the past two months in regard to the matter. If you could say that on the findings of this commission you could expel a member from this House there might be something in it, but I do not understand such to be the law. We have an Act which prevents members of parliament from doing certain things. If the independence of Parliament Act has been contravened then this House should take notice of it. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) says we should have a standing tribunal for the purpose of investigating such matters. We have; beyond a shadow of a doubt we have. If that Act has been contravened, if any member has been guilty of corruption we have a standing tribunal. The Committee on Privileges and Elections is ready at any time to take up such a question, because it is constituted for that purpose among other things. Therefore, in so far as any act of corruption or any other act in contravention of the independence of parliament is established we have a standing tribunal ready to investigate that matter. Now, if what has been found or what has been declared does not contravene the independence of Parliament Act, what does it contravene? What is the innuendo or insinuation alleged against any member of this House? Is it that he has misappropriated funds? If he has the tribunal by which he should be held is not in this House. We have our constituted courts for the investigation of these matters both in a criminal and a civil way. If any hon. member has been guilty of misappropriating funds or embezzlement there is a tribunal to deal with that question. The question can be tried either in our criminal or civil courts. If they have been guilty of such an offence the civil courts are open to those who lost money to recover it; if on the other hand a criminal offence has been committed, then the criminal courts should be resorted to. If any law affecting the honour and the right of a member to sit in this House has been infringed, then let that be pointed out, and let the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If the jurisdiction to deal with it does not rest in that committee then it does not rest anywhere in this parliament, and it must go outside the House to the civil or criminal courts. As to the report of the Insurance Commission, it is my view now and it has always been my view, that there is nothing in that report which concerns the honour of this House, in the sense which is sought to be attached to it. If it can be proven that any member has contravened the Independence of Parliament Act, then let us have an investigation before the Privileges and Elections Committee, which is the tribunal specially constituted for that very purpose. The argument on that branch of the subject, applies equally well to the allegation with reference to, wine, women, and

graft. I take it that a charge of graft amounts to an absolute charge of corruption, and if proven it would disqualify the member against whom it is proven, from sitting in this House. It is a serious charge indeed. But, has any one ever heard of a British subject being taken before a tribunal without some definite charge being made against him which he is given an opportunity to answer? Be it the most trivial offence or be it the gravest, British fair play and British justice protects the man charged; first he is indicted, then he is brought before a grand jury, and if a true bill be found he is tried. But to-day, we are asked to grant a committee to investigate allegations, without a single man being named, and without any pretense of a charge. If there is a charge of corruption against any member, let that member be named and let the charge be stated, and let the trial come before the Privileges and Elections Committee. If my argument be sound then if there is any charge of graft, that is the way to deal with it. I do not know quite what is meant by the reference to wine and women, but I assume, from the discussion that it means an allegation of immorality. If any hon. member has transgressed in that respect he is amenable to the laws of the country, and surely we have lived too long under British institutions to say that under British law there is not a remedy to right such an evil, if it exists. If any man has been guilty of an offence against the civil law or against the criminal law outside of this House, is there not a properly constituted tribunal to try him and to punish him if he is guilty? Has any one ever heard of a parliamentary committee being appointed to investigate such insinuations as have been made in this House? I think not. I agree with the hon. member for North Toronto, and I have been saying it for some time, that this kind of discussion does not tend to enhance the reputation of the Canadian House of Commons throughout this country or throughout the world. Never were my feelings more hurt than to-night, when the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) said that our Prime Minister having on former occasions gone to England with honour to represent the premier colony, he would this year go to represent, what the hon. member was pleased to call, wine, women and graft. Things have come to a pretty pass, if, to gain any kind of political kudos, or in order to put ones self in prominence before the country, such speeches have to be made as that which we hear from the member for Montmagny. This country will not countenance such a thing; no Britisher will listen to them, without reproving such remarks made by a member of parliament to be telegraphed throughout the world. Now, suppose we investigated to our hearts content all that this motion calls for, what would be the result? Suppose you find that five men in this House are of the most dissolute habits, where is your remedy? After you have had your investigation and washed your dirty linen, could you expel these men or any one of them? No, you certainly could not. But suppose parliament should expel such a man, and he returns to his constituents and is re-elected, what can you do about it? The tribunal which must decide in the end is the member's own constituents. Bradlaugh refused to take oath in the British House of Commons; he was expelled on more than one occasion, he went back to his electors and was re-elected each time and presented himself at the bar of the House and finally he had to be admitted to his seat. And so it is, that should you expel a man, he goes back to his constituents and his constituents pronounce upon his case in the end. It seems to me that we have been wasting much time uselessly over this matter. It seems to me that no matter how much investigation we have in this House in respect to these matters which I have alluded to, it is the people of the constituency who must decide as to whom they desire to represent them in this House of Commons. And to the people it is my opinion perfectly safe to leave it.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo) before the question is put I want to say a word——

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order; the hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not recollect that the hon. member has spoken.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I rise to a point of order in connection with this resolution:

The resolution states:

> That on the 19th of February last the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler), addressing the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo, stated: 'We will show your connection with Mr. Hill.'

I have already categorically denied in this House, that I have had any connection with Mr. Hill which would affect my independence as a member of parliament, or, that I have had any connection with Mr. Hill directly or indirectly, or with the Great Northern Railway Company. I now express the hope that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) will take advantage of the earliest opportunity to withdraw any imputation which may be contained in that statement. I will leave that to the hon. member for King's. But, Mr. Speaker, having denied that charge from my seat in the House, you have ruled to-day that the matter cannot be discussed nor referred to. I now find that this statement of the member for King's is resurrected and placed in a resolution submitted to this

House. I take this point that I having denied this statement the House is bound to accept that denial, and if it does accept it, the statement cannot be resurrected in a resolution submitted to this House, and to that extent this resolution is out of order, and I would like to have that statement expunged from it.

Mr. BOURASSA. Might I, on the question of order, give this explanation, that the statement made in the resolution does not at all imply that the House should concur in the statement of the hon. member for King's, but that a committee of inquiry should be appointed, before which the hon. member for King's should make good the statement which he has not withdrawn. There is nothing in the resolution going in the direction of implicating the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo. It simply puts before the House a statement which has been made, and which has been denied, but which has not been withdrawn, and therefore it is among those statements which should be investigated by the House.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to make this point clear, as far as I am personally concerned, it is of no moment to me; but I want to establish this fact, that neither the hon. member for Labelle nor any other member has a right to submit such a resolution to the House unless he does it on his own responsibility as a member. He has no more right to do this than he has to pick up the gossip of the street and fling it at members of the House. My point is that if the hon. member for Labelle is going to move this resolution in this particular form, he must expunge from it any reference to myself, unless he assumes responsibility for that reference.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, the hon. member complains that the statement made against him, which is quoted in the resolution, is false, and that he has already denied it. It is evident that the statement, not having being withdrawn, should remain in the resolution, because it is one of the reasons stated why the investigation should take place. Since the statement has not been withdrawn, it remains before the House with the hon. gentleman's denial, and it is for the committee of investigation to find out where the truth is.

Mr. SPROULE. I disagree with the hon. gentleman entirely. When a statement is made in this House, and it is emphatically denied by the member to whom it refers, it is the duty of every member of the House to accept that denial, and it is not competent for any member of the House afterwards to repeat the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand the matter, the statement was originally made by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler). It was categorically denied by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross). That denial, under the practice of the House, is accepted, and the statement cannot subsequently be renewed. It can no more, it seems to me, be renewed in the words of a resolution offered to the House than it can be in the speech of a member addressing the House. I think, to that extent, the resolution is out of order.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have no objection to withdraw those words.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take up the time of the House more than for a very few minutes; but I wish to say that I think that any man or number of men who attack the reputation of any public man, or any number of public men, without having a reasonable justification for the attack, do a great injury and a great wrong—not only a wrong to the person attacked, but a great public wrong, because when you lead the great public to have less respect for the lawmakers of the country you at the same time cause them to have less respect for the laws of the country. Graft and immorality in high places, if it exists, is made an excuse for graft and immorality all along the line; but if, as some of the speakers who have addressed the House today would lead us to believe, it is the current belief in this country that the men constituting the Canadian House of Commons are not at least as honest, as honourable and as patriotic as the people who have sent them here, I believe that for that belief there is no foundation whatever. I at all times and in every place, whether speaking to one man or to a number of men, have made the statement and endeavoured to emphasize it, as it was my honest opinion, that the 214 men who compose the Canadian House of Commons are, as a body of men, equal in honour, in probity and in integrity to any equal number of men that you will find congregated together for any purpose in any part of this Dominion, nor can any political capital be made by any attempt to blacken the reputation of the men upon either side of the House alone, for if men are led to believe that evil exists they will conclude that the bad is not confined to one side, but is general. If the people of this country are prone to believe that the character of the men composing this House is not as good as it ought to be, what is the matter and who are to blame? I think the press of the country is somewhat to blame if that belief exists to any general extent. I do not blame the press in general. I think, as a rule, the press of this country endeavours to be fair; but there are some newspapers, some editors and some reporters who, for some reason, are not careful as to what they say with regard to the character and the reputation of public men.

Actuated sometimes by bitter partisanship, at other times it may be by personal malice, at other times through a greater or less degree of ignorance, and again it may be simply through a desire to be smart, newspapers say with regard to public men that which has a more evil result than is intended by the men who pen the words. I remember during the first session of the present parliament a newspaper published in the city of Toronto had in its columns what purported to be a letter from its reporter at Ottawa, in which it was stated that the corridors of the House of Commons were so filled with women of evil character that it was difficult for one to walk through the halls and corridors of the House, and that the amount of strong drink consumed by the members at Ottawa was something astonishing. That was a libel which no newspaper man should have written and which no newspaper should have published. Again, a short time ago, I read in a newspaper in reference to the death of two members, one on one side and one on the other side of politics, men respected and loved by all the members of the House, whose death we regarded with regret and sorrow, a remark one finds it difficult to account for.

Commenting upon the number of deaths in the House of Commons, that newspaper wondered whether it was light work and high living which caused the deaths of so many of them. That was a statement in which there was doubtless no intentional malice. It was simply a foolish statement made with the idea of saying something smart. Again sometimes preachers and moralists, for some purpose or another—and for what pupose I can scarcely conceive—make statements they should not and which reflect discredit on members of the House and public men generally. It was stated in the press the other day that a minister somewhere in western Ontario, speaking of parliament and of the conduct of members of parliament, said that at the opening of the session all the evil and immoral women in the country flocked to the capital. I hope that that is not true. I would be sorry to think that any minister of the gospel would make any statement so utterly unjustifiable and without foundation. But I would ask whether, even in the opinion of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, we should appoint a committee to investigate every idle, foolish and foundationless newspaper and other rumour and report? Members of the House of Commons themselves are, some of them, largely to blame for that belief which is said to exist in the country. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), speaking in this House on the 21st February last, appealed for sympathy in language to which no one could bring objection. He said:

There are some gentlemen on the other side of the House who seem to think that this is a very laughable affair. But to a man who has a conscience, and human feeling, who has not lost all sensitiveness, who has friends and values them, who has dear ones and loves them, it is not all the nicest and sweetest of conditions that he has to pass day by day through accusations veiled and insinuations made and has simply to pass them off at one side and take the bitter with the sweet in the public life he has chosen as his career.

No one can find fault with that appeal of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), but, as he has said to-night, he has sometimes been guilty himself. Speaking in this House last session, he was scarcely fair, when he made a bitter attack on the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). That hon. gentleman was absent but he had the privilege, and availed himself of the privilege, of defending himself afterwards. But the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) at the same time attacked Mr. Preston and Mr. Smart, who had not the privilege of replying and could not make the reply they might have if they had been members of the House. He should have remembered that these men too have feelings and have those who are near and dear to them.

As regards the insurance matters with which the hon. gentleman's name has been connected, I quite agree with him and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that the investigations of the Insurance Commission are not a subject which should be made a matter of inquiry by any committee of this House. I do think that the hon. gentleman, now that he has had time for reflection and looks back upon his action and that of his associates in connection with the Union Trust Company and the Independent Order of Foresters, will agree in thinking that it would not be wise if our laws were so made and continued as to permit managers handling trust funds to handle them as he did those of the Foresters. It seems to me that the real outcome of the insurance investigation must be this, that our laws may be so amended as to prevent a recurrence of that sort of thing. The hon. gentleman has sought to make a little capital by posing as a martyr. I do not think he has any right to seek to excite sympathy in that respect. He is endeavouring to convey the impression that the insurance commission was made use of for the purpose of blackening his reputation and destroying his character.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do you not think so yourself?

Mr. MILLER. No, and I will tell you why. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) found a statement in the report of that commission which he considered a

reflection on Senator Cox. Well, every body knows Senator Cox to be a leading Liberal. The report therefore criticises not only the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), a Conservative, but Senator Cox who is a Liberal. And I have a letter here from an insurance company complaining of unfair treatment by that commission, yet no one connected with that company is known as a prominent politician on the one side or the other. But of course, every one who has been adversely criticised by that commission feels that he has been unfairly used. On that same day that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) made his appeal for sympathy, the 21st of February, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), said :

Hon. members opposite may laugh, but I have some feelings and so have those who are near and dear to me.

But that hon. gentleman last session we found making attacks upon whom and for what? Upon the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Conmee) because his son-in-law happened to be connected with a company which had a government contract. He also attacked the member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant becaues a brother of his had bought twenty-eight acres of Indian land at $5 an acre from the government. He also made charges against the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Campbell) because the company with which he was connected had put in the lowest tender for the supply of flour to the penitentiaries, and had been awarded the contract. The hon. member for Labelle himself (Mr. Bourassa) has not been sinless in this respect but has done his share in a general way towards discrediting members of this House. Speaking in 1896 —and his remarks will be found on page 3010 of 'Hansard,' he said :

If both political parties in this parliament are really desirous, not of lowering the dignity of parliament, but of raising the level of morality and the standard of independence in this House, they should make an agreement that every member going out of this parliament shall not receive one cent from the electoral fund of either party to carry on his election. This will mean a large economy to this country because we have to face the facts as they are, and we know very well that the money which is spent in election by both parties does not fall from the heavens. It is subscribed by people who expect to be repaid and it is repaid by the country in the end.

Sir, the question is sometimes asked : How is it that there is so little independence of conduct in the parliament of Canada ? The root of that question lies in the fact that most of the members of the House, except the wealthiest ones—and sometimes even the wealthiest ones, acting in this respect, as they do in respect to the indemnity, are not the last to go to the committee to get their funds —are under a kind of moral pledge, as our code of political morality would put it, of supporting their party tooth and nail under any kind of circumstances, because their past elections have depended and their future elections will depend on the funds which are given to them by their party.

And in response the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) said :

I get nothing from any such fund.

Now, Sir, I charge this that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) had no business to rise and that he had not the facts to warrant him in rising and saying that most of the members of the House on either side had their election expenses paid or partially paid by funds subscribed by either one party or the other. As an effect of that statement we have found repeated more than once in the Toronto 'World' the statement of the hon. member for Labelle. (Mr. Bourassa) that that comment was made and that nothing was said in reply except by the worthy editor of the Toronto 'World.' All around me are members on the Reform side,—and for all I know the same thing applies to members on the other side—every cent of whose election expenses were paid out of their own pockets and not contributed to out of any party fund whatever, I was astonished and astounded this afternoon when the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) referred to a report received from some gossiping source that some one connected with this parliament had been turned out of a hotel because of disreputable and immoral conduct with which two or three women were connected. I think it should be beneath the dignity of any member of this House who is not prepared to produce evidence, to say that he has heard some miserable gossiping story of that kind. Any member should be ashamed to repeat such a story within the walls of the House or elsewhere. I have always thought that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was at least sincere ; I have always respected him as a man who desired to be sincere and I trust he will not, by continuing the conduct that he has pursued in the last few days, justify people in putting him in the same class with that other man who many long years ago in a public way and public place is said to have exclaimed : God I thank Thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican.

One word as to the utterance of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler). That hon. member said that there are two legitimate lines of defence : one is to prove the charge that is made against him to have no foundation in fact and the other to attack the other fellow. My hon. friend from King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) follows the second line of defence, that is to attack the other fellow. It seems to me it would have been better had he taken the other ground, the higher and better ground of proving there is

no basis for the charge made against him. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) has practically said: I have information that will incriminate certain members of this House, but I have my price; if you will be quiet, if you will not investigate certain matters that are threatened to be investigated, then I will keep silent and not say anything at all and not give out the information I possess. He should withdraw his charges or make them definite. Now, Sir, it seems to me that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), if to-night he votes as his words indicate he will, is making a very, very cheap bid for a little temporary handclapping and temporary popularity. If he had the notion or the idea of voting for the resolution before he heard the speech of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) I cannot see how he can still have that idea and still intend to vote for that resolution. What does my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) say. He says: The other day there was a picture in a Toronto paper of four men in the stocks and unless we have a committee we cannot tell whether that picture be true. Are we to have parliamentary committees to investigate pictures and say whether they are true? What is a cartoon in a newspaper? The very brazen impudence of the cartoon—generally good natured, but still brazen—is the life, is the spice of the cartoon. I may say that a little while after that cartoon appeared in the Toronto 'World,' I saw another cartoon in the same paper showing the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in very scanty attire, in the neighbourhood of a bath tub. Well, if the hon. member for Montmagny has his committee appointed to investigate the four men in the stocks, might not some other man ask for some other committee to investigate that cartoon, and where will our committees of investigation end? Another important point, the resolution moves for a committee to investigate the character of any member of the House against whom any person may bring a charge. I would like to know what members in the House are going to form that committee? Pick out your members where you will, five, six, nine, twelve or fifteen and constitute your committee and the very hour your committee is appointed some one brings a charge, maybe without any foundation at all, against one, two or three members of that committee. Then who will constitute your committee?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MILLER. I have said all I intend to say, and am quite willing to let the matter go.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I had intended to make some remarks on this famous investigation on this so-called Insurance Commission, the head of which was Judge MacTavish, county judge of Carleton. I may say, in passing, that Judge McTavish is not unknown in the province of Ontario as being a gentleman well adapted for commissions. Those who come from Ontario will remember that he was on the famous West Elgin commission, and I do not think the Ross government had any cause to complain of the part he played in it. On another occasion he was tacked on by this government to an inquiry that had been threatened into certain elections in Ontario and lastly, but not least, he was tacked on as the head and front of this commission. However, at this late hour I do not intend to go into the evidence and of the unwarranted manner in which my name was dragged before the commission by the commissioners or the counsel, Mr. Shepley. There will be another opportunity, and I do hope and trust that, as aspersions have been cast on gentlemen on this side of the House, the government or some gentlemen on that side will assist us in having a full and fair investigation so that at least we will have the satisfaction of knowing that all the statements made by some gentlemen throughout the country and on which they have harked back to-night with great docility are of no value and that that great moral editor, the moral editor of the 'Globe' will, in that unctuous manner that characterizes all his utterances, take back all that he has said and that if the majority defeat this resolution he will declare that all that has been said by gentlemen on that side of the House is utterly untrue and needs no investigation.

House divided on amendment Mr. Bourassa.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Bennett,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Bourassa,
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Gunn,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Leonard,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, S.),
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Robitaille,
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
White,
Wilmot,

Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Wright (Muskoka).—55

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beland,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Cyr,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin (Wright),
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Hall,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid).
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Logan,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St Mary's),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Power,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—109.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Ratz,	Clare,
Lemieux,	Bergeron,
Sifton,	Osler,
Belcourt,	Forget,
Dyment,	Seagram,
Talbot,	Pringle,
Johnston,	Haggart,
Knowles,	McLaren,
Guthrie,	Lewis,
Grant,	Christie,
McIntyre (Perth),	Marshall,
Pickup,	Armstrong,
Lovell,	Ganong,
Parmelee.	Worthington.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) have not voted.

Mr. BERGERON. I am paired with the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am paired with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) have not voted.

Mr. FOSTER. As my name was mentioned in the resolution, I thought it proper not to exercise my right of a vote.

Mr. FOWLER. As the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has done me the honour to put my name in the resolution, I did not vote.

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

Progress reported.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow? I suppose an opportunity will be given for bringing up the matter which I mentioned the other day?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up a few minor Bills.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 27, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT OF AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE—NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. MONK. In connection with the fifth report of the Committee on Agriculture and

Colonization which has been presented, I desire to move :

That the fifth report of the Select Standing Committee of Agriculture and Colonization be taken into consideration on Thursday, the fourth day of April next, and that it be the first order of that day.

In this motion I have particular reference to the refusal of the witness, Mr. Beddoe, to answer certain questions put to him in connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MONK. When the report of the committee is taken into consideration, as stated in the above motion, I beg to give notice that I shall move as follows :

That this government has entered into certain agreements with a syndicate or association of persons known as the North Atlantic Trading Company, for carrying on an immigration propaganda in continental Europe, said agreements beginning in 1899 ;

That large sums of money have been from time to time paid by the government of Canada to the said North Atlantic Trading Company under the said agreements and considerable amounts are still pending between the government and the said company ;

That C. H. Beddoe, accountant of the Department of the Interior, a witness examined before the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, during the present session, as appears by the report of the said committee, was officially sent to Europe by the Department of the Interior, upon the refusal of the Audit Department to sanction the payment of some claims of the said Trading Company, in order that the said Beddoe should examine and audit the accounts of the said company and ascertain if the said company had expended in immigration propaganda the amounts it was bound to expend, under its contracts with the government ;

That the said accountant, having proceeded to Europe and made his report upon the said audit and being examined before the said committee, has refused to answer the questions put to him, concerning : 1. The names of the agents and sub-agents of the North Atlantic Trading Company in Europe, mentioned in his audit report as having received money, in execution of the contract ; and 2. The names of the printers to whom moneys are alleged to have been paid by the said company in execution of said contract, the whole as mentioned in report of audit ;

That the said accountant offers as a reason for his said refusal a promise made by him to the officials of the said North Atlantic Trading Company to the effect that he would keep said names secret ;

That it is and has always been the undoubted right and privilege of this House of Commons to have all the information which it may desire regarding public matters of any kind and description, coming within the jurisdiction of parliament, and the refusal of the witness to answer under the present circumstances constitutes a breach of such privilege ;

That the said C. H. Beddoe be summoned to appear at the bar of this honourable House according to the law and usage of parliament, on..... at four o'clock in the afternoon, to answer such questions as may be put to him by Mr. Speaker or other members of this House and receive such injunctions, orders and monitions as to this honourable House may seem fit.

Mr. MONK.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 142) to incorporate the Abitibi and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Logan.

FEES REMITTED.

Mr. LOGAN moved :

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, the charge of $100 paid on Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the United Baptist Womens' Missionary Union of the maritime provinces, be refunded.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 143) to amend the Immigration Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

Mr. OLIVER. In the Act of last session, it has been found that adequate provision is not made for dealing with stowaways and this Bill will remedy that defect. It has also been found that in dealing with the deportation of those of the criminal classes, the existing law does not provide a due form in which the process is to be carried out. This Bill provides for that.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a first time.

QUESTIONS.

MR. J. C. CHAPAIS.

Mr. LAPOINTE asked :

1. Is Mr. J. C. Chapais, of St. Denis de Kamouraska, in the employ of the Department of Agriculture ?
2. What is the nature of his duties ?
3. What is his salary ?
4. On February 16 last did the said J. C. Chapais perform his duties as employee of the said department
5. If so, what did he do, and in what locality?
6. Did the department pay any sum to the said J. C. Chapais for his services on the said date of February 16, 1907 ?
7. Did the department pay any sum for travelling expenses to the said J. C. Chapais for February 15, 16 and 17, 1907 ?
8. Did the said J. C. Chapais send in any account for travelling expenses for the said dates ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Yes.

2. Mr. Chapais is the Assistant Dairy Commissioner. He gives advice to farmers and others by correspondence, addresses farmers' meetings throughout the province of Quebec and lectures at St. Hyacinthe Dairy School.

3. $1,500 per annum.

4 and 5. Mr. Chapais was summoned by subpœna to attend Court at Rivière du Loup on the 16th of February as a witness in the case of Raymond vs. the St. Denis School Commissioners, and spent the whole day at that place.

6. Mr. Chapais was paid his full salary for the month of February, 1907.

7. Yes, the travelling expenses from St. Hyacinthe to St. Denis in the performance of his regular duties on the 15th of February.

8. Only for the expenditure mentioned in No. 7.

MANITOBA LAND DEEDS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. Is the government in possession of any deed from the heirs of Lord Selkirk to the Hudson Bay Company, for the residue of Lord Selkirk's estate, about the year 1835 ?

2. Are the maps and plans of the Peter Fidler survey of 1814 and 1817, and the Kempt survey of 1822, in the possession of the government and accessible to the public ?

3. What means are within reach of the people of Canada to trace the grants of land made prior to 1835, and to connect them with the present system of allotment in Manitoba ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1 and 2. Not in the archives branch.

3. A systematic search is being made by the government for all papers bearing on land grants in Canada and already many plans and papers have been found. The records at the head office of the Hudson Bay Company in London, and the documents taken to Scotland by Lord Selkirk, are being transcribed for the government. Copies of these documents may possibly furnish the information desired.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. CLEMENTS —by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. How many miles of Grand Trunk Pacific has been constructed ?

2. What is the mileage in actual operation ?

3. Where are the terminals of any lines being operated?

4. Are the box cars constructed by the Grand Trunk Pacific used on the Grand Trunk Pacific lines or on Grand Trunk Railway lines?

5. If used by the Grand Trunk Railway lines, what consideration is paid by the Grand Trunk Railway for their use to the Grand Trunk Pacific, or to the government?

6. Does the government guarantee apply to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific rolling stock?

7. If so, has the government permitted the Grand Trunk Railway to use Grand Trunk Pacific rolling stock for the benefit of the Grand Trunk Railway, without remuneration?

8. What authority has the Grand Trunk Railway to use the cars of the Grand Trunk Pacific?

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

1. No portion of the line has been completed.

2. None in regular service.

3. None.

4. The Grand Trunk Pacific are purchasing cars in order to be ready for the opening of the railway, and for this purpose will require a large number ; orders have been distributed among the car manufacturing plants to the extent of their capacity. The capacity of the car works of the country is approximately 5,000 a year and the estimated requirements of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is 20,000, so that in order to secure the work in Canada, it is needful that the orders should be distributed over a period of years. They are not being used on the Grand Trunk Pacific, as the road is not yet in operation, but are being used on the Grand Trunk and such lines as it interchanges business with.

5. Per diem rates according to car service rules.

6. No.

7. No.

8. Agreement between the companies.

W. T. R. PRESTON AND SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has the government yet obtained information to enable it to answer the question re W. T. R. Preston, appearing in 'Hansard' on the 14th of February last under my name ?

2. Has it been ascertained that Mr. Preston contributed the letters referred to ?

3. What action has the government taken in the matter ?

4. If not yet advised, what is the cause of the delay ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The government has received copies of the London 'Daily Express,' dated Monday, February 11, in which occur the words quoted in the question of February 14, asked by Mr. Lennox, to which reference is made in this question. The words are as follows : 'South Africa can more readily support millions of population between Table Mountain and the Zambesi than Canada between Winnipeg and the Rocky Mountains.' These words occur in the context, which is as follows :

Taken as a whole, the climate of South Africa is one of the most wonderful in the world; the soil is equally an amazement and a marvel in its fertility. The reading of history establishes the fact that there once roamed throughout the veldt of British South Africa enormous herds of animal life. As late as thirty years ago (and his statement is made on the authority of an eye-witness) the nor-

thern veldt of the Transvaal and Orange Free State was at times literally black with the native deer of this country. This may be referred to as an analogy of the conditions in South Africa, in respect to animal life a few decades ago, with that part of western Canada lying between Winnipeg and the Rocky mountains, which now takes rank with the most valuable agricultural land in the world.

If, as is thus established, the veldt between Table mountain and the Zambesi, furnished sustenance for millions of animal life, it is fair to assume, if no other reason can be adduced, that the country is capable of supporting population. The Dutch settlers have proved, in the moderate extent to which they have carried out farm operations, that a return unequalled in other colonies can be readily had here for a very moderate expenditure of farm labour.

Despite commercial depression, there is a spirit of hopefulness in the people. Colonists are seldom otherwise than optimistic. But on every hand there is a demand for a policy that will bring permanence to commercial conditions, and which is wisely taking the form of a call for an addition to the agricultural population.

Judging from the experience of Canada and New South Wales, that appears to offer the only reliable remedy to the discouraging commercial situation. The study of the conditions throughout the world proves that no country can hope to flourish on only one industry and more especially if it is of a mining character. To expect South Africa to prosper because millions of value in the products of the mines are exported annually is contrary to all economic laws. The development of the agricultural possibilities of South Africa is more important than all the mining opportunities that may be capable of development on the continent. Wealth derived from the cultivation of the soil in any country invariably remains a permanent asset.

South Africa can more readily support millions of population in its agricultural possibilities between Table mountain and the Zambesi than Canada can between Winnipeg and the Rocky mountains. Established facts are the proof of what Canada can do on this point. Agricultural development and intensification in farm culture will create new markets, and bring in its train the establishment of manufacturing industries, without which no country can hope to have attained the full measure of its strength or power.

In promoting agricultural settlement, natural and climatic difficulties may have to be overcome in certain districts, but science has mastered these elsewhere. Prejudices may have to be allayed incident to the introduction of a new agricultural population, but statesmanship and patriotism can solve that difficulty.

The whites of South Africa may abandon all hope of solving the native problems on proper lines, or even of maintaining their influence with the native population, unless there is considerable addition to their own forces. To fail in their responsibilities on this point is to abandon duties that have become national in their character and magnitude.

British statesmen and British capitalists are alike interested in every phase of this South African question. They all have much at stake in the future of this country. Every colony would welcome South Africa joining in the march of material prosperity that has marked colonial development and government in the other British possessions during recent years.

But to reach that point, South Africa, with the co-operation of such forces as may be enlisted at the seat of the empire, must bend never-failing energies to the full development of her agricultural resources and possibilities, and to secure an increase to the European rural population of the continent. To attain that end is worthy of the best efforts of empire building.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister has not answered the third question.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. In view of the terms contained in the letter, the government does not consider that any action is necessary in the matter.

Mr. LENNOX. May I ask the minister if he has read the whole of the letter ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I read about half of it, but I read the part that pertains to this matter.

RELATIONS OF CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not Mr. Bryce, the British Ambassador at Washington, is conducting any negotiations through the British government between this government and the government of the United States respecting any matters that have been under discussion in the past concerning the relations of Canada and the United States ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no doubt that His Majesty's ambassador at Washington is at the present time, and has been since his arrival on this continent, discussing with the United States government many questions affecting Canada. No official discussion or negotiations are taking place at this moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no correspondence ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no correspondence. Mr. Bryce is here himself to-day.

THE NOVA SCOTIA JUDICIARY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Justice the fact that I have a further letter from a prominent member of the Nova Scotia bar, stating that on acount of the resignation of Sir Robert Weatherbee, the late Chief Justice, the same condition of inconvenience has arisen in that province as lately obtained. It is only fair to say that this is in part due to the fact that the new judge, Mr. Justice Drysdale, has not been sworn in,

or if he has, his firm is engaged in a great many of the cases that are coming up for consideration in the court. But that inconvenience would be obviated if another judge were appointed almost immediately. I understand that the criminal session of the Supreme court of Halifax is now engaging the attention of Mr. Justice Meagher. That leaves only three judges to deal with the work of appeal and the chambers, outside of Mr. Justice Drysdale.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I have not previously heard anything of the condition of things described by my hon. friend.

CHARGES AGAINST MEMBERS.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to give notice to the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler)—and I am giving him long enough so that he may be able to take cognizance of it—that on Thursday next I shall bring up as a question of privilege the accusations made by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) and shall move a substantive motion in order to invite the hon. gentleman to substantiate his accusations or withdraw them.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would prefer, if it were equally convenient to my hon. friend and the House, that he say Wednesday instead of Thursday.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have no objection, but I want a vote and Wednesday is not convenient because, if the discussion is not ended at six o'clock, we cannot go on with it as the House does not sit that night.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I intend to move on Tuesday that the House will have morning sittings and that Wednesday be subject to the rule of evening sittings as well as the other days.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Would it be out of the way to invite the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), if he makes a motion with reference to the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) that he should include himself in that motion and put himself alongside the hon. member for King's? He should also include the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne).

Mr. BOURASSA. My hon. friend is free to bring in any motion with reference to myself and bring up any statement of mine, and if he can make his motion good, I shall be glad to uphold him.

CORRECTION OF 'HANSARD.'

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I rise to a question of privilege. In the unrevised 'Hansard,' at page 5460, I am reported as having used these words: 'Some of the fathers of confederation wanted legislative union—one government for all the provinces. I think they were right.' What I really said is, 'I think they were wrong.' I corrected 'Hansard for the revised edition, but having received letters asking explanation; I think I should put the matter right.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We all accept the explanation.

CUSTOM DUTIES.

Bill (No. 134) respecting the duties of customs—Mr. Fielding—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) or Customs (Mr. Paterson) whether or not they have been able to gather and bring down for the information of the House certain matters about which I made inquiry in connection with the item relating to agriculture?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I intimated at the time that some of the questions would be difficult to reply to, but that as far as possible I would get the information. I have gathered the information and will send the hon. gentleman a memo of it.

On section 3,

Mr. FIELDING. This is no change in the subsidy but the Department of Justice thought it a better form of drafting to serve precisely the same purpose.

On section 16,

Mr. FIELDING. I move to strike out the words '12th February' and insert '31st March' in the twelfth line. Since the date was fixed in these resolutions there have been some changes and we have taken the last day of March as the most convenient.

Amendment agreed to.

On schedule (c)—prohibited goods—section 1209.

Mr. FIELDING. I move to insert the words 'or in any other British country. This is the provision under which the imitation of British goods of well known brands is prohibited. The amendment is designed to include not only goods from Great Britain, but also goods from any British colony.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If there is no objection, I would prefer to have the Bill remain in committee. It probably could not be read the third time to-day in any case.

Mr. FIELDING. Or, the Bill could be reported and allowed to stand for third reading. That might suit the hon. gentleman's (Mr. R. L. Borden's) purpose as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would rather have it remain in committee. I do not think any time would be lost.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Unless there are any strong reasons against it, the Department of Customs would be glad to have this Bill finished, so far as the House of Commons is concerned. to-day. We are to have an adjournment for nearly a week. But when the Bill passes the Commons, considering that this is a matter which the other House will not be likely to change in any degree, the Customs Department will venture to have the Bill printed. Requests are pouring in, and have been pouring in from the business community, asking for copies of the tariff, and asking for information as to the rates on specified articles. This multiplies correspondence. It will be a great saving of time and labour if we could send printed copies of the Bill. If there were any questions I could answer now—if that would answer the purpose—I would be glad to answer them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hardly think that would cover it. But, unless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) mistrusts the majority behind the government I think he can consider the Bill passed just as much as though it had advanced this stage.

Mr. PATERSON. It means printing thousands of copies, and I do not like to take that responsibility without being sure that there will be no further changes. The opposition have been able to effect changes in the Bill already, and there is no saying what they may do yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I appreciate the complimentary mood in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) finds himself to-day. Still I would prefer to have the Bill remain in committee unless the hon. gentleman is very strongly opposed to that course.

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, I must yield. I have placed before the committee how urgent it is in the interest of the business community that progress should be made. My only object is to meet their wishes.

Mr. BERGERON. The Bill cannot pass its third reading to-day anyhow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not wish to delay the business; but I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) would be just as safe in going on and doing his printing now as he would be if the Bill were to pass the committee and stand for third reading.

Mr. PATERSON. If, the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) can assure me of that—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Just as safe. For, if it stands for third reading, we can move to have it sent back to committee again.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, I mean the third reading and all. It might as well remain in committee if you do not give us the third reading.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We could not do that.

Mr. PATERSON. Then it might as well stay in committee.

Progress reported.

WINNIPEG TERMINALS — CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved second reading of Bill (No. 128) An Act respecting the Winnipeg Terminals of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. He said: I do not know whether it is usual to discuss such Bills as this on the second reading. If any explanation is desired I shall be glad to give it.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Are the powers of municipalities guarded?

Mr. EMMERSON. This does not affect municipalities.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Is there not a plan referred to in the Bill that should be laid on the table?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a plan in connection with the agreement. I may say that the Bill is to confirm an agreement between the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific whereby certain lands bounded by Main and Water streets and the Assiniboine and Red Rivers which are most conveniently situated for terminals, are to be used by these companies jointly under a terminal company in which both shall be interested. Part of these lands is held by the Canadian Northern on lease from the Northern Pacific with option of purchase. In view of the fact that the whole property is covered by various issues of bonds and debentures of the Canadian Northern and their predecessors, it is not competent for that company to convey the land in fee simple and in lieu of that they have conveyed to the Grand Trunk Pacific and to the government, in common with themselves, in equal shares, possession of these lands and the right to use the same for terminal purposes for a term of 999 years. The Grand Trunk Pacific and the government are to be assured the use and possession under this Act, confirming the agreement. This is notwithstanding the issue of any bonds or debentures.

The idea is that the present buildings are to be removed and the new terminals constructed according to certain plans which are annexed to the agreement and which I can have here in the committee quite readily. The Canadian Northern are to do this work

under a superintendent of construction who is to be appointed by the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific subject to the approval and removal at the instance of the government. Prior to that, and during the time when the Grand Trunk Pacific is lessee of the eastern division of the Transcontinental, the Canadian Northern own and enjoy a half interest in the terminals and the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government own the other half interest. If and when the Grand Trunk Pacific ceases to be the lessee of the eastern division, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government shall each enjoy independently a one-third undivided interest in the terminals. While the Grand Trunk Pacific is the lessee of the eastern division the terminals will be operated by a so-called Terminals Board, composed of two persons, one appointed by each of these railway companies. If and when the Grand Trunk Pacific ceases to be the lessee of the eastern division of the Transcontinental line, the Terminal Board shall be composed of four persons, two to be appointed by the Canadian Northern and one each by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government.

The compensation to be payable is regulated as follows: First the lands are to be put in at a fixed valuation of $2,625,000, upon which interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum will be payable, the Canadian Northern assuming one-half of this interest and the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government together contributing the other half. The Grand Trunk Pacific and the government together will pay to the Canadian Northern in equal shares annually one-half of 4 per cent on the above sum of $2,625,000. This is prior to and during the time when the Grand Trunk Pacific is lessee of the eastern division. I have stated that this fixed valuation of $2,625,000 is to bear interest at 4 per cent, one-half of which is to be paid by the Canadian Northern and the other half by the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Upon the cost of all improvements to be made on the lands bought in the first instance and from time to time as further improvements are determined upon, there is to be paid an interest of 4½ per cent. That is to say the original valuation agreed on by the company will bear a rate of interest at 4 per cent, but upon all expenditures subsequently made for improvements there is to be paid interest at the rate of 4½ per cent.

Mr. HAGGART. Why have the government to pay anything of that?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because the government owns and has the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. But it leases it to the railway, does it not?

Mr. EMMERSON. But it is part of the original expenditure. The government itself would necessarily require as a part of that railway terminals and it is a part of the capital expenditure in connection with the eastern division. For that period of time it is an interest charge and is to be borne by the government itself, but after a certain period it becomes wholly payable by the Grand Trunk Pacific. This valuation and this interest becomes for a time a part of the capital invested in the eastern division, upon which the Grand Trunk Pacific are to pay a rental in the shape of interest.

If and when the Grand Trunk Pacific ceases to be the lessee of the eastern division the compensation provided for, as I have described, shall be borne as follows: The Canadian Northern, one-third; the Grand Trunk Pacific, one-third; and the government the remaining one-third. As the provisions in clause 20 of the agreement of the 29th of July, 1903, the schedule in chapter 91 of the statutes of that year, are scarcely applicable to leasehold properties of the description comprised in the agreement, terms analagous to those contained in clause 20 have been adopted.

That is to say, first, that under clause 20, the interest upon the cost of construction, prior to the execution of the lease, is borne by the government and charged to capital account; second, for the first seven years of the lease the interest is borne by the government absolutely without being charged to capital account; and third, for the next three years interest is borne by the government and charged to capital account to the extent that the net earnings of the Grand Trunk Pacific fall short of three per cent. Under the Winnipeg terminals agreement the portion of the compensation payable by the government prior to the execution of the lease will be charged to capital account. After the first seven years the compensation will be payable by the government absolutely without being charged to capital account and for the next three years the compensation will be payable by the government and charged to capital account in the same proportion as the government contributes for the balance of the eastern division. While the Grand Trunk Pacific is the lessee of the eastern division, the expenses of the maintenance and operation of the terminals are to be borne by the two railway companies on a wheelage basis and naturally thereafter, if the eastern division of the transcontinental railway were operated by the government itself, or at any time that it is so operated, then the government would become a partner in the transaction and pay its one-third of the cost of maintenance and operation on a wheelage basis, the same as the two companies now, under this agreement, divide equally be-

tween them this burden of cost. The agreement provides for this arrangement because the Act as originally framed would not apply to leasehold property. By reason and as a result of the conditions it was impossible to secure terminals in fee simple. The Canadian Northern itself only had a leasehold of a portion of the property and that leasehold is encumbered by every issue of bonds or debentures by the Canadian Northern Railway, so that it is impossible to free the property from that encumbrance. Therefore a valuation is agreed upon, an interest charge is fixed and the payment of that interest is apportioned and the division made as respects the interest whereby you are following a course analogous to that laid down in section 20 of the agreement of 1903, bearing date the 29th July of that year. It will be seen that ample provision is made in this Bill protecting future contingencies as respects the eastern division, protecting the government, should it be called upon at any time to enter in, take possession of the eastern division and operate it itself apart from any lease which has been entered into with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,—agreement in schedule confirmed.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understand the explanation of the minister correctly this is for the purpose of enabling the government to do with a leasehold property that which they could do under the Act that they have at present with a freehold property.

Mr. EMMERSON. In its relationship with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. HAGGART. In reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific. If this were a leasehold property under the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Act we would have the power to make an expenditure for this purpose ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If it were a fee simple.

Mr. HAGGART. If it were a fee simple. The only part of the explanation which I am not clear about is this : There is to be an account kept as to the user of the terminals by the government portion of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk portion ; that is the western portion. How are you to distinguish between the user of the terminals by the eastern portion and the western portion when they are both operated and all the trains are owned by one company—the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no necessity for that. This Bill makes provision for the procuring of the terminals originally, and as to the terminals as they now are there is a fixed valuation upon which an interest charge is made at the rate of four per cent. The payment of that interest is made by one-half thereof being contributed by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the other half by the government as a part of its eastern division. The terminals must necessarily be completed and there must be expenditures in addition to the present status of those terminals in connection with their completion. The completion work is to be carried on by the Canadian Northern, as provided in the agreement, under a superintendent of construction who shall be selected by these companies, and the selection of that man is subject to the approval of the government, and all the expenditures made in the construction shall bear an interest charge of 4½ per cent, half being met by the Canadian Northern and the other half by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government conjointly. The Bill provides as to the accounts against which these expenditures are to be chargeable. After they are completed and the lines are in operation the subsequent cost of maintenance and operation is not a matter of interest to the government or chargeable in any way to the government so long as the lease to the Grand Trunk Pacific is in operation. The very moment the government is obliged to operate the eastern division, then the government becomes a one-third partner with a one-third interest and is responsible for one-third of the cost of maintenance and operation to be apportioned on a wheelage basis.

Mr. HAGGART. The user is to be paid on a wheelage basis, and if the Canadian Northern uses twice as much as the others do, it pays twice as much.

Mr. EMMERSON. But the government does not pay anything for user while the lease is in operation.

Mr. HAGGART. If the government should take possession of the eastern division how are you to apportion the amount as between the western division and the eastern division of the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On a wheelage basis.

Mr. HAGGART. It does not contemplate the government being in possession of the eastern section and the Grand Trunk Pacific operating the other section. It might occur that the government would be operating the two sections at the same time.

Mr. EMMERSON. It might be that the government would operate the eastern division and the Grand Trunk Pacific the western division, and if so there would be no difficulty in imposing one-half the cost of maintenance between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific on a wheelage basis. If the government had to acquire the eastern division and operate it, and at the same time the western division, the Grand Trunk Pacific would cease to have any interest and the government would be

subrogated to the position of the Grand Trunk Pacific, absolutely and wholly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister speaks of compensation upon a one-third wheelage basis ; I do not understand that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I used the expression one-third in the sense that each partner has a one-third interest and has to pay on a wheelage basis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These terminals are to be built on land acquired by the Canadian Northern, and the government is to pay interest at the rate of four per cent?

Mr. EMMERSON. The land is now there, and that, together with the expenditure already made is given a value of $2,625,000. One-half the interest thereon at four per cent is paid by the Canadian Northern, and the other half at four per cent is to be divided equally, the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific paying each one-fourth.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then there is to be further expenditure for extending these terminals and the same proportions are to be maintained, but there is to be a different rate of interest ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, four and a half per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no provision made for further improvements or extensions beyond those now contemplated.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The construction is to be carried out by this board and the maintenance is to be assessed by this board upon the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the government.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not upon the government, until they are obliged to take the eastern division.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the government has to undertake the operation of the eastern division, the government is to come in upon the same basis so far as maintenance is concerned, and the government would have to bear the increased proportion of the cost of construction by paying interest upon one-third of the total cost, instead of one-fourth as at present. I agree with the minister that it would not necessarily follow that if the government were obliged to undertake the operation of the eastern division, they would also be obliged to undertake the operation of the western division. In fact, the government, under the agreement which I regarded as extraordinary, are only able to operate the western division as mortgagees in possession, and I suppose the working out of the agreement would be in this way : That the government operating as mortgagees in possession, would, pro hac vice take the place of the Grand Trunk Pacific and, therefore, so far as the maintenance of that part of the road is concerned, would be responsible as mortgagees in possession for exactly that proportion of the cost of construction and the cost of maintenance upon a wheelage basis, as the Grand Trunk Pacific themselves would be responsible for, if they continued to operate the western division. This agreement is a very long document, and some of us have not had an opportunity to investigate it to any extent. Can the minister assure us that the explanation he has already given to the committee is full and complete, so far as all the material provisions of the agreement are concerned ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think I have gone over, perhaps imperfectly, all the salient clauses of the agreement. The site selected is certainly, beyond all question, in the interest both of the railways and of the whole country, the best that could be secured at Winnipeg ; and the agreement, as I read it, not only meets the views of the railway companies themselves, but meets the views of the public at large, and it also protects the country in so far as its reversionary interest in these railways is concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the minister one question ? So far as the cost of construction is concerned, the Grand Trunk Pacific will pay interest upon one-fourth and the government will pay interest upon one-fourth, that is, under present conditions ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And that will continue during the lease by the Grand Trunk Pacific of the eastern division unless the government should be obliged to take over the operation of that division ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, as I understand, the government will pay interest at four per cent on one-third ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How are the remaining two-thirds to be distributed in that case ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is wrong to say one-third. It is one-fourth because the Canadian Northern is in every instance chargeable with the payment of one-half. If, and when the government becomes interested in the operation of the eastern division, the terminal board is to be constituted, with two representatives of the Canadian Northern interest and one representative each of the Grand Trunk Pacific interest and the government interest ; and while the Canadian Northern is to have one-half interest in the representation, it is to continue to pay half the interest on the expenditure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not yet understand it; I suppose it is because I have not read the agreement. The Canadian Northern has paid out $2,600,000, and it will pay out something more before these terminals are completed. Of that amount the Grand Trunk Pacific will pay interest on one-fourth and the government will pay interest on one-fourth, that is, during the currency of the lease to the Grand Trunk Pacific. What difference arises when the government takes over the operation of the eastern division? That is what I do not understand.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no difference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There are two different things. One is the cost of construction and the other is the maintenance. As I understand, the maintenance is dealt with altogether on a wheelage basis, and we can leave that out; but so far as the cost of construction is concerned, I understood the minister to say that some new condition would arise as to the government's proportion whenever the government took over the eastern division, and I wanted to know just what the difference would be.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will repeat what I stated in the first instance, to make it clear. Upon the cost of all the improvements to be made both in the first instance and from time to time as further improvements are determined upon, four and a half per cent of interest is to be paid, the Canadian Northern assuming one-half of that interest and the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government together assuming the other half. This is prior to and during the time that the Grand Trunk Pacific is the lessee of the eastern division. If and when the Grand Trunk Pacific ceases to be the lessee of the eastern division, this compensation, which means interest, shall be divided equally between the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern and the government.

Mr. BARKER. As I understand the hon. minister, the interest charges are to be borne in the proportion of fifty per cent by the Canadian Northern and fifty per cent by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government combined. Is that not so?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. If that be so, why should there be a change in the division because there is a division of interests between the Grand Trunk Railway and the government? If the Canadian Northern are to bear one-half, why should the fact that a change takes place as between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific make any difference in what the Canadian Northern have to pay?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because there are three separate interests instead of two as before.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. BARKER. Let me put it this way. We are dealing only with the question of interest, and it does not make the slightest difference whether the interest is four or four and a half per cent. The minister says the Canadian Northern bear one-half the interest and that the other two divide the remaining half between them. Is not that so?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Suppose those two change their relations to each other, why should that make any difference to the Canadian Northern?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because in that instance the Grand Trunk Pacific have ceased to be interested in the eastern division.

Mr. BARKER. But the price was not changed in the least.

Mr. EMMERSON. But the user is most materially.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Canadian Northern has the same benefit in both cases.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Canadian Northern have one-third interest, the Grand Trunk Pacific have one-third and the other has one-third. And as each has an equal interest in the use of the terminals, each has equal ownership, and should pay equal interest on the expenditure made in furnishing that accommodation.

Mr. BARKER. Let me put it in another way. The Canadian Northern own a portion of the property which imposes upon them fifty per cent of the interest. The other two parties own the rest of the property. The Canadian Northern will always retain its own, why should it pay less than its original share? The Grand Trunk Railway and the government together own one line and the Canadian Northern own another. The two divide the whole interest between them. Why should any change in the ownership of one of the lines affect the other?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because then the relationship is entirely changed. Up to that moment there have been two independent companies operating.

Mr. BARKER. Two lines.

Mr. EMMERSON. When this comes about and each pays one-third, you have three independent companies operating the terminal.

Mr. LANCASTER. What worse off is the Canadian Northern than before?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because there is another element which comes in and which should contribute.

Mr. BARKER. But the railways remain precisely the same.

Mr. EMMERSON. There would be a difference as to the user where three companies are interested instead of only two.

Mr. HAGGART. Under the original arrangement the government would be paying $25,000 per year on the purchase money of the terminals alone, without any expenditure at all for improvements. Under the changed relations, it will be paying $33,000 a year.

Mr. EMMERSON. And properly so because it gets an additional advantage. It gets accommodation which previously was not required. There would have to be separate offices. The Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, and the government, in connection with its eastern division, would each require its portion, and to that extent the Canadian Northern would have to relinquish a part of its user. That would take away from its one-half the use of those terminals.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the hon. gentleman sure that is in the agreement? I do not think it is.

Mr. EMMERSON. You will find it in the agreement.

Mr. HAGGART. What clause?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not familiar with the clauses.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman is not, I do not think anybody else is.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am familiar with what the clauses contain, but as to the numbers I have no more time than my hon. friend to charge my memory with the numbers of the clauses. Whenever the eastern division would be operated by the government itself, it would have one-third user. Previous to that it would have no user at all, and the Grand Trunk Pacific would have one-half user and the Canadian Northern one-half user. But when the government became interested in the operation of the eastern division, then the position was entirely changed, and each would have one-third user. Under those circumstances it was certainly only fair and reasonable that there should be an equal division as to the original cost of furnishing the accommodation necessary. As to the wheelage and the extent of the use of the yard and the tracks, there is a division made on a wheelage basis, which is customary and in accordance with the agreements entered into between railway companies all over this continent. To-morrow if the Intercolonial Railway were to give one-half user in its terminal at Halifax to the Grand Trunk Pacific, in so far as the original expenditure is concerned, the Grand Trunk Pacific should pay one-half; but if the Canadian Pacific Railway came in and enjoyed one-third the user, it seems to me that the Canadian Pacific Railway should pay one-third and the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Intercolonial Railway each one-third.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think the case put by the minister is an analogous one. There are two through lines in this case, the Canadian Northern and the government, and the Grand Trunk Pacific. Let us suppose that each of these through lines is 1,000 miles long, and that midway is a station, say Winnipeg. The companies owning one of the through lines divide and control 500 miles each. Why should each of those lines, with only 500 miles pay as much as the Canadian Northern, with 1,000 miles?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because each requires just as much room in the station for ticket-selling, advertising and other facilities, whether it realizes the same profit or not. When you come down to the bringing in of trains and the use of tracks, they pay only in proportion to the use they make of the facilities.

Mr. BARKER. I can understand that, if the two companies dividing their property were to require separate offices and so on, there might be an allowance for that. But when you are considering the interest upon the capital cost, surely the Canadian Northern, which retains half its whole traffic will not be injuriously affected by combination of the Grand Trunk Railway and the government parts of the road. But that the Canadian Northern should make money out of the division of the property between the Canadian Northern and the government is what I do not see. Perhaps there should be a charge made against the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific for dual offices for their portion of the business, but that is a very different thing from dividing the whole interest on the capital cost.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would ask the minister if he is aware of any contract which was entered into between the Canadian Northern which is one of the parties to this agreement and the city council of Winnipeg in reference to what is called the Broadway site, and whether this Bill at all interferes with that agreement?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no personal knowledge of that matter. The negotiations were carried on by the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific together with the commissioners of the Transcontinental line, and these details did not come under my personal supervision. I am therefore, not familiar with the names of the properties, nor do I know, except in a general way, the location and extent of the property.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I just wondered whether this contract would over-ride or interfere with the contract entered into between the city of Winnipeg and the Canadian Northern. I understood that the site was

purchased from the Hudson Bay Company with the condition that the depot would be put on what is called the Broadway site. I know that a great deal of influence has been brought to bear by the Grand Trunk Pacific in favour of what is called the Water Street site.

Mr. EMMERSON. Personally, I am not familiar with that matter. I would refer my hon. friend to section 13 of the Bill, which is the compensation clause. The property is divided into halves while there are two independent lines operating their railways, but it is divided into thirds when there are three independent concerns operating the railways.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not understand that. What does it refer to ?

Mr. EMMERSON. To the rentals for the terminals practically. That is to say, so far as these rentals are payable apart from the use of the yards and tracks and the movement of cars and trains. In the use of the terminals themselves, that is of the freight sheds, baggage rooms, passenger accommodation and so on, the division is into three so long as there are three concerns operating the road, but into two when there are only two concerns operating the road.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the cost is $2,000,000. The government and the Grand Trunk Pacific jointly pay 50 per cent of the interest and the Canadian Northern pays the other 50 per cent. But if either the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Northern buys out the other they would pay 63⅔ per cent instead of 50 per cent.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I stated, while there are two companies really enjoying the rights and all the privileges the rental is divided equally; when a third company comes in and there is another sub-division then the rental is divided into thirds, and in my judgment properly so. Outside and beyond the station itself there is the use of tracks, the wear and tear and the use of the yards and all the incidentals in connection therewith, and in the operation of that station in that respect, and in that respect alone, the division of cost is upon a wheelage basis.

Mr. SPROULE. In the event of there being two companies instead of the one, which had been paying 50 per cent of the interest, will these two, when they commence to pay 66 per cent of the interest, receive more office room or other consideration?

Mr. EMMERSON. Necessarily so, otherwise the railways could not be operated as separate systems.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will there be more building done to create room or will the Canadian Northern give up some of the room it is occupying ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

Mr. EMMERSON. Necessarily the Grand Trunk Pacific would demand room and the Canadian Northern would have to furnish it.

Mr. HAGGART. What will this improvement cost the government a year ? There is the interest of $24,000; what is the calculation of the cost of the improvements to be made on the terminals?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the information under my hand as to what the total cost will be.

Mr. BARKER. Taking the 4 per cent upon the present property which is agreed to be taken at $2,625,000, let us see how that will work out in order to compensate the Canadian Northern for the division between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific. The total interest upon the $2,625,000 will be $105,000 per annum. So long as the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific are working together the government will pay $26,250, the Grand Trunk Pacific will pay $26,250 and the Canadian Northern will pay $52,500 a year. The hon. gentleman says that if the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific divide their interests there will be additional offices. I suppose there will be ticket offices and baggage rooms, but no doubt under modern arrangements the general passenger station and all that will be common under any circumstances.

Mr. EMMERSON. But each railway will have its independent connections.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, but what does the hon. gentleman think? He is allowing the Canadian Northern because of that division between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government a difference in favour of the Canadian Northern of $17,500 a year. Does he mean to assert that that change, involving some additional separate offices, baggage rooms, ticket offices and some freight rooms, should be worth $17,500 a year?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Canadian Northern has to-day certain exclusive privileges in Winnipeg. There are no other facilities at all equal to these facilities there, and the Grand Trunk Pacific is granted by this company the right to one-half the enjoyment of all these advantages at a certain rate. If the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway wishes to set up business there on an independent basis, operating its line independently of the others, with independent connections, and it requires accommodation, is the Canadian Northern to be expected to give them a sufficient user for their purposes when there are two companies for the same rate as they are charging when the companies are operating jointly? It seems to me not

an extravagant basis to say that the three shall each contribute an equal amount.

On section 2—restaurants, hotel, &c.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the policy of the government as to going into the hotel business?

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume that is under very grave and very serious consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is provided in clause 13 that unless the government give written notice it becomes interested in the hotel and restaurant. I suppose it must have been under consideration.

Mr. EMMERSON. While provision is made in this Bill for the future taking over of the road, certainly the Department of Railways has not thought that it was so imminent that provision in detail should be made now for that future contingency.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You might turn that over to the Department of Inland Revenue.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to say a few words in connection with the approaching colonial conference. I observe that the papers as brought down do not contain any correspondence between this government, or the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and Mr. Deakin. That correspondence has already been referred to in the public press. The Prime Minister has told us in response to a question by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that the correspondence related to matters other than those which had been alluded to in the public press.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not with Mr. Deakin but with Sir Joseph Ward.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, the right hon. gentleman is correct. It does not seem to be included in the official correspondence. Is there any explanation of that?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I stated that I have had no correspondence, private or public, with the government of New Zealand with regard to the subject which was mentioned by the hon. member for Labelle, that is in reference to the colonial conference. The only correspondence that I have had with the government of New Zealand is upon purely formal matters and not at all in connection with this subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, if my right hon. friend has the return before him and will refer to page 20, he will observe that in the despatch of Lord Elgin, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, under date of December 6, 1906, paragraph 3, is as follows:

> In connection with the penultimate paragraph of the second resolution I may draw attention to my despatch No. 31, of January 19, and its inclosure.

I thought that despatch No. 31 was not included in the correspondence, but my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster points out to me that it is. It is altogether out of its place. I might say in this connection that the return is brought down in very bad arrangement. There does not seem to be any arrangement at all. I have pointed out to the government on previous occasions that with little more care these returns might be brought down in such form that we would not have to spend so much time upon them. There is absolutely no arrangement whatever of the correspondence or of the documents which are included in this return. I searched through this return from one end to the other without noticing the particular document to which my hon. friend has called my attention, simply because it was not in its proper place.

Now, coming to the general subject, it seems a little curious that this country has made no suggestions or proposals whatever. The men at the head of affairs in other dominions of His Majesty seem to be of a somewhat different type because they have brought forward matters of very great interest which are to be discussed at the conference and which are included in the agenda proposed by Lord Elgin. I might allude to some of these for a moment. The Australian proposals which are to be found on pages 20 and 22 include the following: 1. Imperial council; 2. Preferential trade and international relations; 4. Imperial defence; 8. Islands of the Pacific. That comprises the general subject of the interests of the empire in the Pacific. 9. Emigration. New Zealand's proposals are to be found on pages 24 and 25. Amongst them are: 2. Preferential trade; 4. Naturalization; 9 Preferential trade between self-governing dependencies. Looking for a moment at the first Australian proposal, and I shall allude to all of these only very briefly, it is as follows:

> That it is desirable to establish an imperial council, to consist of representatives of Great Britain and the self-governing colonies, chosen ex-officio from their existing administrations.

That part of the Australian proposal seems to be very much in line with the only matter brought by this government to the attention of the imperial government, that being the constitution of the council

and the representation of each colony. It continuous as follows :

That the objects of such council shall be to discuss at regular conferences matters of common imperial interest, and to establish a system by which members of the council shall be kept informed during the periods between the conferences in regard to matters which have been or may be subjects for discussion.

That there shall be a permanent secretarial staff charged with the duty of obtaining information for the use of the council, of attending to the execution of its resolutions, and of conducting correspondence on matters relating to its affairs.

That the expenses of such a staff shall be borne by the countries represented on the council in proportion to their populations.

There does not seem to me to be very much one way or the other for comment in regard to the name. In so far as my personal preference is concerned, if there were any change in the name, I would be inclined to think that the proposal by this administration of the expression 'Imperial Conference' would perhaps be better than the one which has been suggested ; but the main point which arises in connection with this proposal is that the conference, or council, or whatever it may be called, is to be a council for discussion only and that useful discussion might be facilitated by the establishment of a permanent secretarial staff which shall be charged with the duty of collecting and collaborating information for the information of the council. We should have the views of the government upon this particular proposition which, although it does not seem to involve any very far reaching consequences, nevertheless is of material import in so far as the future usefulness of the council is concerned. The next proposal of the Australian government is of more importance and certainly would very considerably attract the attention of the people of this country. It is as follows :

That the following resolutions, which were adopted by the conference of 1902, be reaffirmed :

1. That this conference recognizes that the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and His Majesty's dominions beyond the seas would stimulate and facilitate mutual commercial intercourse, and would, by promoting the development of the resources and industries of the several parts, strengthen the empire.

2. That this conference recognizes that, in the present circumstances of the colonies, it is not practicable to adopt a general system of free trade as between the mother country and the British dominions beyond the seas.

3. That with a view, however, to promoting the increase of trade within the empire, it is desirable that those colonies which have not already adopted such a policy, should, as far as their circumstances permit, give substantial preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the United Kingdom.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

That is the resolution which was unanimously passed by the conference of 1902 upon the initiative of the government of Canada. It represents the views of the Canadian government as put forward at that time by the Prime Minister and his colleagues. It would be interesting to know what the position of the government will be on that particular subject at the approaching conference. We have not had an altogether consistent course of opinion from the government and its representatives on that question.

In 1897 the right hon. gentleman took the position before the British people and he expressed himself very strongly on it—that Canada did not desire any preference for her goods on the British market ; that Canada was as he expressed it, cursed by a system of protection which he did not desire to see inflicted upon the people of the motherland ; and he declared emphatically that the preference which had been accorded to British products on Canadian markets was given without the hope or the desire that there should be any preference in return. But, the resolution initiated by the Canadian government in 1902 expressed an entirely different policy. The Canadian government even went further, and they added to the resolution which had been initiated and moved by them, the following statement :

While urging that the benefits of the preference were such as to entitle Canada to the desired exemption from the duties on food products in the United Kingdom——

These of course have since been abolished.

—the Canadian ministers state that within certain limitations they were prepared to consider the request of Mr. Chamberlain for further concessions in return for the desired preference in the markets of the United Kingdom.

Then further on they say :

But the Canadian ministers point out that the Canadian tariff was by no means prohibitive; that large quantities of goods were imported, and that a great proportion of these came from foreign countries. In any lines in which it appeared that the goods would be manufactured in Great Britain, it might be possible to so readjust some duties as to give an additional advantage to the British manufacturer and thus turn over to him a volume of trade which at present is held by the manufacturers of foreign countries. The Canadian ministers state that if they could be assured that the imperial government would accept the principle of preferential trade generally, and particularly grant to the food products of Canada in the United Kingdom exemption from duties now levied or hereafter imposed, they, the Canadian ministers, would be prepared to go further into the subject and endeavour to give the British manufacturer some increased advantage over his foreign competitors in the markets of Canada. Meanwhile the Canadian ministers determine to present to the con-

ference a resolution affirming the principle of preferential trade and the desirability of its adoption by the colonies generally, and also expressing the opinion of the Prime Ministers of the colonies, that His Majesty's government should reciprocate by granting preferential terms to the products of the colonies in the markets of the mother country.

Then they went on to use very strong and very expressive words as follows :

If after using every effort to bring about such a readjustment of the fiscal policy of the empire, the Canadian government should find that the principle of preferential trade is not acceptable to the colonies generally or the mother country, then Canada should be free to take such action as may be deemed necessary in the presence of such conditions.

Now, since that time we have had no statement by the government of Canada that they have withdrawn from the position which they assumed at that conference. In fact, the attitude of the government, was emphasized in the following session, 1903, by the Minister of Finance, who in making his budget speech used language still more forcible than that which I have quoted from the memorandum of the Canadian ministers. But, later on, the Minister of Agriculture undertook to deal with this subject, and I will quote a reference to his language which has been made in the British House of Commons. The Minister of Agriculture sometimes, as minister of state, discusses farming. On this particular occasion, as a farmer, he undertook to discuss matters of state, and he declared that speaking as a farmer and not as a Minister of Agriculture, the Canadian famers desired no preference in the British market. His words have been recently quoted in the British House of Commons by Mr. Lloyd George, a member of the British government. The subject of preferential trade within the empire was under discussion in the British House of Commons, and Mr. Lloyd George was speaking on behalf of the imperial government, and he quoted Mr. Fisher's remarks as follows :

The object, Mr. Fisher remarked, was to give Canadian food products an advantage in the English market. If any people were to make such a demand it would be the Canadian farmers who were producing and selling these products, but I say as Minister of Agriculture——

That is the way in which Mr. Fisher's remarks were reported in this country, but he afterwards corrected them in this House and declared that he did not use the expression 'I say as Minister of Agriculture.'

But, I say as Minister of Agriculture, that the Canadian farmers are not interested in that question, and have made no such demand. In this I represent the feeling of the Canadian farmers. We farmers of Canada, Mr. Fisher continued, want no preference in the English market. Why is it that we as farmers want no preference ? England, under existing conditions, takes and absorbs everything in the nature of food products that we can send. She opens her ports to us——

And she opens them to every other nation in the world just in the same way.

She opens her ports to us so we are able to sell everything there that we have to sell, and sell it at a profitable price. If we do not send more it is because the productive capacity of the agricultural population of Canada is not able to produce it. There has been no check in the export of these articles to England. The farmers of Canada are not worrying about preference for their food products, and if they are not worrying there is no necessity for other people to worry (cheers).

Mr. Lloyd George then says :

The farmers of Canada do not worry about it; they don't want this preference ; they are satisfied with the market that is made for them.

Then some reference is made to a discussion in this House and Mr. Howard Vincent, M.P. said that the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture was challenged in the Canadian House of Commons. To this Mr. Lloyd George replied :

His opinion was challenged in the House of Commons. Well, you have got a rump of protectionists there who are continually trying to worry the Prime Minister.

I do not stop to consider the delicacy of the expression of Mr. Lloyd George, of whom I know very little except that he is a member of the British government. I would be inclined to think that he is an individual who does not very carefully weigh his language, and that his language on this occasion was not very well chosen, nor very dignified coming from a member of the British government.

My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has told us that he is a British Liberal. Well, I do not profess to be either a British Liberal or a British Conservative. I would not stand here as the champion or the advocate or the follower of any political party in the British islands. These are matters of domestic economy. The people of the British islands must settle all their domestic matters themselves, as we in Canada propose to settle all domestic matters for ourselves. I would not be prepared to express the slightest preference that the government of Mr. Balfour or the government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman should be in power in the British islands, and I would not have expected that any member of the British government, having a due regard for the responsibilities of his office and for the delicacy of his position with regard to political parties in this country, would have seen fit to make use of the somewhat reckless and extravagant expressions which seem to have fallen from the lips of Mr. Lloyd-George, who on this occasion displayed not only a remark-

able pettiness of outlook, but a most deplorable ignorance of political conditions in this country. If Mr. Lloyd-George had been well informed of the principles on which the tariff of Canada has been framed and brought down to parliament at the present session, he would have known that every item in that tariff, so far as it concerns Canadian industries, has been expressly defended by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance upon the principles of protection, and he would have known that, however much the Prime Minister of Canada may pose as a free trader in Great Britain, he does not pose as a free trader in Canada when he is considering the question of a tariff for the people of this country. However, the remarks of Mr. Lloyd-George are not worthy perhaps of too much consideration. He obviously did not understand the attitude of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, because he thought that hon. gentleman was speaking as such, whereas the Minister of Agriculture has informed us that he was speaking merely as a farmer, and I do not know whether he makes the worst breaks when as Minister of Agriculture he is discussing farming or when as a farmer he is discussing matters of State.

The subsequent paragraphs contained in the resolution proposed by the government and the commonwealth of Australia might well merit the consideration of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and might well deserve a word of explanation as to his policy when he comes to address this House. The government of Australia proposed that the following resolutions be added to those I have already quoted :

> That it is desirable that the preferential treatment accorded by the colonies to the products and manufactures of the United Kingdom be also granted to the products and manufactures of other self-governing colonies.

What is the attitude of this government to that ? I think we have a right to know and to have the explanation of the Prime Minister. There is this other paragraph in the same resolution :

> That it is desirable that the United Kingdom grant preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the colonies.

My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said the other evening that so far as that particular matter is concerned, it is hopeless to expect any action by the government of Great Britain as at present constituted. That may or may not be. It is entirely a matter for the people of Great Britain as to whether or not they shall embark upon a policy of that kind. We can only express our own opinion as to its benefit to the various dominions of the empire, and we must leave to them, as they must leave to us, absolute and uncontrolled freedom of action in the matter. But with relation to what has been proposed by the government of Australia, we must not forget that there has been a suggestion in the public press—and I think it has been supported by the correspondence brought down to this House—to this effect, that the government of this country, by failing to reply to a communication from the government of Australia when its recent tariff was being prepared, and before it was brought down, has lost an opportunity of securing preferential trade relations between the Dominion of Canada and that Commonwealth of Australia. It is obvious that the policy of the Australian commonwealth is along these lines, from the terms of the resolution which I have already quoted. If the situation, so far as the mother country is concerned, is hopeless, it is not hopeless so far as the other dominions of the empire are concerned ; it is not hopeless so far as the Commonwealth of Australia is concerned. What position does the right hon. gentleman propose to take at the ensuing conference in regard to that particular matter?

The subject of imperial defence is also suggested by the commonwealth of Australia, in the following resolution :

> That it is desirable that the colonies should be represented on the imperial council of defence.
>
> That the colonies be authorized to refer to that council for advice any local questions in regard to which expert assistance is deemed desirable.
>
> That the provisions of the Naval Defence Agreement, 1902, be reconsidered.

The last sentence relates only to matters of interest to the colonies of Australia and New Zealand ; the others relate to matters in which this country has more or less interest. The Minister of Militia and Defence is a member of the imperial council of defence, as I understand. This resolution suggests that all the self-governing colonies should be represented on that council, and that they should 'be authorized to refer to that council for advice any local questions in regard to which expert advice is deemed desirable.' The government has given its sanction to a portion of that resolution ; what is its attitude as to its general scope and terms ?

The next matter suggested by Australia is with regard to imperial interests in the Pacific. There is no doubt that the construction of the Panama canal will be of great importance not only to the people of the United States but to the people of Canada as well. We have vast interests not only upon the Atlantic but upon the Pacific, and the enormous and ever increasing trade of the orient makes our interests in the Pacific of vital importance both to Australia and to Canada. The resolution as proposed by Australia seems rather to be concerned with

Australasian interests; but the subject having been brought forward, it seems right that the government of this country, if in a position to do so, should announce to the parliament and people of Canada what policy, if any, they intend to propose to the colonial conference in regard to that particular matter.

The government of this country has not seen fit to propose the question of immigration to that conference. One would have supposed that having regard to the enormous areas of fertile land in our northwest, this subject would have occurred to them as one proper to be discussed at the approaching colonial conference, especially from the point of view that immigration from the United Kingdom should be directed to the British dominions over the seas rather than to foreign countries. That is the way in which the matter has presented itself to the government of Australia. Paragraph 9 of their resolution is as follows:

> That it is desirable to encourage British emigrants to proceed to British colonies rather than to foreign countries.
>
> That the imperial government be requested to co-operate with any colonies desiring immigrants in assisting suitable persons to emigrate.

The answer may be made that we are already encouraging in some measure immigration from the British Isles. It does not seem to me that in the past we have given as much encouragement to immigration from those isles as we should have done. Our efforts have been too much directed to the continent of Europe and not sufficiently to the motherland. It is desirable to secure the co-operation of the British government, and I think that the proposal put forward by the government of Australia is one which merits the consideration of this government and a statement of its policy to this House. Then there is a subject brought forward by New Zealand which merits some consideration. I refer to number 9 of the proposed New Zealand resolutions:

> Preferential trade between self-governing dependencies—That all doubts should be removed as to the right of self-governing dependencies to make reciprocal and preferential fiscal agreements with each other and with the United Kingdom, and further, that such right should not be fettered by imperial treaties or conventions without their concurrence.

That is a proposal which would hardly be regarded as debatable in this country. On both sides I think we would be prepared to conclude that the proposal of New Zealand is eminently proper. It is also eminently proper that we should have a statement from the First Minister as to the views of his government in that regard.

At page 18 of the report of the proceedings of the intercolonial conference of 1902 I find this:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier informed me (that is the First Lord of the Admiralty) that His Majesty's government of the Dominion of Canada are contemplating the establishment of a local naval force in the waters of Canada, but that they are not able to make any offer of assistance analogous to those enumerated above.

I am not in so good a position as my right hon. friend to know how far this promise has been carried out. In what position is the establishment of a local naval force in the waters of Canada at present? What progress has been made along that line? Is the force under the control of the Minister of Militia (Sir F. Borden) or of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur)? To what extent, if at all, has the proposal or promise made by the First Minister to the British government at that time been since carried out?

And if I might be permitted to allude to just one more subject, it is this. What will be the attitude of the Canadian government with reference to the cattle embargo? If one might be allowed to use the choice and delicate expression employed by Mr. Lloyd George, I might be justified in declaring that there seems to be a little rump of protectionists on the other side who prevent the removal of this embargo. We have a declaration to that effect from my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who has stated unequivocally in this House that that embargo is maintained, not because of any possibility or probability of disease in Canadian cattle, or by reason of any danger which could possibly result from the introduction of Canadian cattle into the mother country, but as a protective measure in aid of certain agricultural interests in the mother country. As I have said before, that is an eminently proper thing for the British government to do if they see fit. They have the absolute right to protect their agricultural interests by an embargo, by protective duties, by any other fair and reasonable means. But I do not think it is quite fair to the agricultural interests or the people of this country that protection should be afforded by an embargo which casts discredit throughout the world upon the condition of Canadian cattle. And it would be eminently proper for my right hon. friend, when he attends this conference, to present the matter in that light to the British government. I do not think I am presenting it in any stronger light than did my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). It is perfectly proper for the British government to afford that protection to their own interests by any fair and reasonable means, but it is not perhaps quite in accord with fair play that they should adopt the means of placing an embargo upon Canadian cattle and of basing that embargo upon the theory that Canadian cattle, if admitted into the mother country, are liable to spread disease through British herds. I trust therefore

that my right hon. friend the First Minister will give us the attitude which this government intends to take with respect to that particular matter.

In conclusion let me once more express the hope that in that conference which meets on the 15th of April next, Canada may not be unrepresented, but that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will be present, ready to take part in its deliberations, and thus give Canada that voice it should have in the councils of the empire. My hon. friend will remember that years ago he said to the British people: Call us to your councils. He shakes his head, but if I am correct in the quotation it would seem most unfortunate that having extended that invitation to the British government: 'Call us to your councils,' and that call having been made, my right hon. friend should be so derelict to his duty as to remain on this side of the water.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I find nothing to complain of in the general observations with which my hon. friend has favoured the House. He has not been very critical, and on the whole has rather sought information than given any himself. If I understood aright his introductory remarks, he rather complained that the government of Canada had no suggestions whatever to offer with regard to the matters to be discussed by that conference. I do not know how far this may be a cause for criticism. It seems to me rather a cause for rejoicing that the relations between Canada and the mother country are so happy that we see no particular ground for improvement, at least in the immediate future. We are satisfied with our lot as it is; we are satisfied with the measure of legislative independence which we enjoy; we are satisfied with being a part of the British empire, and are ready to go to London to perform the task which is sought of us. And we go not by the way of making any suggestions ourselves but rather receiving suggestions which may be made to us either by the home government or the sister colonies.

My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) in his opening remarks, referred particularly to the proposed creation of what would be called the imperial council. He has alluded, and alluded favourably to one part of the answer which he made, that part in which he declined to agree to the change of name and insist rather on the terms 'Imperial Conference' for the periodical meeting to take place, rather than 'Imperial Council.' With regard to the creation of this new council, as a permanent organization in London, to be known by a certain name—whether it is called an imperial council, or an imperial conference does not matter much—my hon. friend has not commented very extensively, if at all, upon the attitude which we have taken. We have informed the authorities that we do not view with any favour the creation of such a council. I may, perhaps be allowed to quote the language in which we expressed our doubts in this respect:

> As regards the second suggestion of His Majesty's government, the committee are sensible that such a commission would greatly facilitate the work of the conference, and at the same time enhance the dignity and importance of that assembly. They cannot, however, wholly divest themselves of the idea that such a commission might conceivably interfere with the working of responsible government. While for this reason the committee would not at present be prepared to adopt the proposal for the appointment of a permanent commission, they feel that such a proposal emanating from His Majesty's government, should be very fully inquired into, and the Canadian representatives at the next conference, whenever it may be held, would be ready to join the representatives of the sister colonies in giving the whole matter their most careful consideration.

At this moment, I have no more to say than is conveyed in the language which is just read. I may say, and say quite plainly, that I do not view with favour the creation of such a body. It has been said that its object would be to collect information and make suggestions—it would have no more power than simply that of learning and suggesting. But in this there might be involved elements which would tend in the very reverse direction of promoting the happy relations which now exist between the colonial governments and the home government. It is easily conceivable at all events to my mind, that if this commission were appointed to sit in London, it might pass resolutions or make suggestions which would be embarrassing to the governments interested. It is conceivable as a proper thing, an eminently proper thing, that there should be inaugurated a body to which suggestions can be made, to which information can be conveyed. That goes without saying, and nobody can dissent from it. But it seems to me that we have such a body at the present time in the Colonial Office. And the Colonial Office is responsible to the British parliament, and matters dealt with by the Colonial Office are brought to the attention of the colonial ministers who are responsible to their respective parliaments. At present our relations with the Colonial Office are most happy. There was a time, and not in the far distant past, when the name of Downing street was a term of execration in the colonies and particularly in Canada. Happily these things are done with. At present, Downing street is not an object of terror for them; and the term 'Downing street' has passed away from the language of political discussion. Whether the Colonial Office is presided over by Mr. Chamberlain, by Mr. Lyttelton or by Lord Elgin, I bear testimony and cheerful testimony, that the efforts of the Colonial Office have always been in the direction

of meeting, as far as possible, the wishes of the colonial governments. So far, I agree with the observation which has been made by my hon. friend that we here have no part to take in the politics of Great Britain. Whether the government of Mr. Balfour is in office or the government of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is in office, the government represents the British people, and our relations with the British government are most friendly. But, coming back for a moment to the idea of the council that is proposed, it is not clear to me that it would improve our relations with the empire to deal with such a council instead of dealing through the Colonial Office as it has been carried on under the present regime—that is the regime which has existed since the institution in Canada of representative government. If this were a commission composed of officials, I should fear that all the faddists, all the men of one idea, all the men whose business it is to solve problems behind their desks and in the quiet of their offices, might reach conclusions which would come to the interested governments in the form of resolutions which might prove embarrassing to those governments. We have problems enough in every colony. If communications are to be made, if new ideas are to be developed and acted upon, the initiative, I submit, should come from the respective governments which compose the British empire. For these reasons, we do not view with favour, at present, the creation of the new council. But, we do not intend to pretend to speak ex-cathedra ; we have not said that our opinion on this subject is final and not to be reviewed. We have stated, on the contrary, that it would be our duty, as well as our pleasure, to receive the suggestions of the colonial conference which is to open in a few days. These are the views of the Canadian government on the subject. We made no representations and no suggestions, when these were invited, for the reason that I have already stated, that our relations with the empire are happy and we have no grievances. The only question in which we are interested, and the only question we intend to bring before the conference is the question which absorbed the most of the time of the last conference—the trade question. And upon the trade question we have nothing new to offer. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has stated that the resolution adopted by the British conference in 1902, was adopted at the suggestion of the Canadian ministers. It is embodied in the blue-book, and was quoted a moment ago by my hon. friend—I need not repeat it. Such as our policy was in 1902 such it is in 1907. We have given to the British people a preference under our tariff.. This we have done for our benefit and for the benefit of the relations which exist between us and the mother country. But we have stated, that, if it suits the British people to reciprocate, we shall be prepared to discuss the question and to go a step further than we yet have gone. Now, we have nothing to say upon this point. This policy which we have suggested, has not met with favour in Britain. Well, Sir, it is not for us at this moment, and not for me on behalf of the Canadian people, to press this matter on the British people. It is for the British people to make up their minds whether the policy is acceptable to them and would be for their benefit. All I have to say, and in this I am sure I voice the views of every hon. gentleman in this House, is that the British empire can be maintained and can rest only upon the idea that every one of the nations which compose it must be allowed to determine for itself what is best for that nation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It suits us in this country to be tinged with protection more than perhaps I would like to have. I am sorry to have to make that admission. It does not suit the British people to be tinged in the same way. Their tariff is very different from our tariff ; our tariff is based largely upon customs duties and excise duties. This is the only method that we have in this country of raising the revenue. The British tariff is founded upon an entirely different basis. Well, we would not accept the idea that the British public should force upon us their own fiscal views and no more would they tolerate the idea that we should force upon them our own fiscal views, and therefore the only way in which the British empire can be maintained upon its present foundation is by allowing to every nation composing it the measure of liberty that it has and also the free choice of the fiscal policy which it is to maintain. For my part I may say frankly that if I had my own view, if I were asked what would be the ideal condition within the British empire, the policy would tend to build the British empire upon an even stronger basis than it is at present, if that were possible, it would be to have a universal system of free trade between all the parts that compose the British empire. This would be my view, but such a system is not possible at the present time, we could not carry that into effect in this country nor could it be carried out in Great Britain, and therefore all that we can do is to show the way, to point the goal, and let time develop it later on.

My hon. friend has desired my view upon the question of imperial defence. This is a delicate subject. I have nothing more to say, as I am about to sail for England to attend the conference of 1907, than what I said on a similar occasion five years ago upon the floor of parliament, that upon this delicate question for my part I do not know or believe that the relations which exist at the present time can be improved, and in

so far as I have anything to do with the politics of this country and in so far as I am to represent the views of this country, I think I must adhere to the view I expressed five years ago that for no consideration would Canada be induced to be drawn into the vortex of European militarism.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The conditions which prevail to-day in Europe are deplorable to a degree. The condition which prevails in Europe is an armed peace, almost as intolerable as war itself. This cannot last for ever; it seems to me the date is not far distant when these nations, the wisest, the most advanced, the most civilized in the world, will recognize the folly that has been carried on for centuries and will come back to a more humane system such as we have on this continent. Therefore upon this point the attitude which we intend to maintain is exactly the same as that which we took in 1902.

To the subject of immigration we do not allude and we do not think there is any necessity of alluding to it. We have a good policy of immigration; it has borne its fruits and I am glad to say that, thanks to our efforts, our immigration from the British Isles to this country is increasing. It was larger last year than the year before and larger this year than last year. I believe that in this respect there is nothing to improve, nothing more to be done than to continue the system that we have hitherto pursued.

With regard to preferential trade between the self-governing colonies of the empire, which is an article put forward by the government of Australia in these words:

> That it is desirable that the preferential treatment accorded by the colonies to the products and manufactures of the United Kingdom be also granted to the products and manufactures of other self-governing colonies.

We have already two years ago made an exactly similar proposal to the government of Australia. In a despatch which has been brought down this session and laid upon the table of the House we offered to extend to them exactly the preference which we gave to Great Britain. The government of Australia has not thought it advisable to respond yet to our demand. There has been, I admit, some delay in the official correspondence but there has been no delay whatever in the negotiations between the Australian government and ourselves; our agents in Australia have been conferring with the Australian government, but up to this time to no purpose. The correspondence which was brought down a few weeks ago has shown that between Mr. Deakin and myself it has been agreed that we should meet in London and take up the subject with the view and hope of bringing it to a satisfactory conclusion. Whatever may be the views of our fellow subjects of Australia on this question I do not yet know, but if their views are the same as ours, there will be no trouble whatever in coming to a conclusion because what we have offered, as I stated, is exactly what is in the resolution which we want to discuss, that is to say that the same preference which is given to the motherland should also be extended to the other colonies. We are prepared to do this and if the government of Australia will reciprocate the matter is altogether in their hands.

The government of Australia go on and say also—and my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has particularly desired the view of the government upon this:

> That it is desirable that the United Kingdom grant preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the colonies.

My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has asked what is the view of the government upon this? I have already stated our views. This matter, Mr. Speaker, is not in our hands. It is not a matter which I would think it proper to force upon the government of Great Britain; it must be left altogether to the judgment and the will of the people of Great Britain. If the people of Great Britain are prepared to extend to us preferential treatment for the products and manufactures of the colonies, we have already stated that we are prepared to meet them and to go one step deeper into the preferential system and to discuss what more we can do in order to meet that view. The answer must come from them and I repeat that it would be unseemly on our part, not to use a stronger expression, to try to force the views of the colonial governments upon the people of the motherland.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As I understand the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) he adheres to the resolution of 1902 in its entirety?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have stated already that we have nothing to change upon that; our resolution is exactly the same to-day as it was in 1902.

I do not know that I have much more to say to my hon. friend, I have answered frankly and without any equivocation all the questions he has asked me. There remains only the question of the cattle embargo. This does not seem to me a proper subject for the colonial conference which is to open in London on the 15th of April. It is a question between the government of Great Britain and the government of Canada; it is a subject the discussion of which has been going on now for years, and if I may be allowed to use an expression to which my hon. friend took some exception a moment ago, when he referred to the words of Mr. Lloyd George, I may say that there is in Great Britain a little rump of protectionists who prevent the removal of the cattle embargo. The non-removal of

the cattle embargo cannot be ascribed to the reason which has been given, that is to say that there is disease in our cattle, because it is perfectly well known that our cattle are free from any blemish. There must be some other reasons. Whether that is reason which I have given or not I do not know; I suspect it, but I have to say to my hon. friend that we shall not discontinue the efforts which we have been making and which were made before us, the efforts which have been made for the last fifteen years, to obtain the removal of what we believe to be an unjust restriction upon our trade.

Now, I have nothing more to say upon this subject. I have only to say to my hon. friend, that, as I stated the other day, it was a matter of deep concern to me what should be my duty—whether my duty should keep me here or whether my duty should take me to the other side. But, taking it all in all, I think there can be no doubt that I should try to meet the wishes of the House which were so kindly expressed by the hon. gentleman himself in allowing no duty to keep me here, but to perform my poor part in the conference which will open on the 15th of April, and in which we certainly take a deep interest. I do not know whether or not the conference will result in very much practical business, but at all events, even if there was not much accomplished by this conference there is always something done and even if there was nothing done I think it is something that we may all be proud of as British subjects that so many nations, coming from all parts of the earth, all owing the same allegiance to the British sovereign, meet together to discuss in a friendly and brotherly spirit the relations which make up the happy condition which is now the lot of the empire to which we have the honour to belong. I have to thank my hon. friend himself for the kind words he has spoken upon this subject, and further for his offer made privately and publicly to facilitate the business of the House in order that nothing may detain me, and for this I have, with all my heart, to offer him my sincere thanks.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all will agree on both sides of the House with the sentiment with which the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has ended his interesting remarks. We congratulate ourselves and congratulate the country upon the fact that he has found it possible to make arrangements to attend that conference. As was stated in this House the other day it would have been a deplorable circumstance that that conference should be opened and should be permitted to carry on its proceedings without a representative from Canada being present and without the premier as that representative. The premier started out with the idea that he had not committed himself to any subjects or in fact made any suggestions because of the happy state of the relations existing between Canada and the mother country, the idea being that everything was in such a condition, the relations were so happy that there was no need for any particular action. I think that can be carried a little too far. When a man is thoroughly self-satisfied with himself and his surroundings he has about ceased to make progress and he is about beginning upon the road to decadence. I would not have the Prime Minister and his government fall into the idea that everything is all that it should be and that therefore there should be no stimulus, no hope and no ambition and even no trial for better things than those which exist to-day. It is true that there are no grievances particularly between Canada and the mother country, but it is also true that there is a host of common interests, a host of interests which bind not only ourselves and the mother country, but ourselves and the sister colonies, that these interests are in a nascent state, that they can be cultivated and it does not do for us to sit down and say: There is nothing particular for us to do; we are in a happy state in so far as our conditions are concerned now. The whole world is progressing. Every nationality on the face of the earth is putting forth superhuman efforts to-day in the great competition for excellence and for progress and the country that sits down, pluming itself upon the fact that it is in a happy condition of circumstances and casts no eye out to the future in this great competition of nations as to what shall be done, the provision that shall be made and the paths that shall be chosen, the particular way in which they shall be followed, the aggregations of strength, interest and sympathy, that, massed together will make the journey all the more easy and make the outcome of the journey all the more successful, will be left behind in the race. So, I mildly protest against the Prime Minister falling into a state of desuetude on account of the fact that there are no grievances, as expressed by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), between Canada and the motherland to-day. Now, we come to the objection of my right hon. friend to the word 'council'; or 'commission,'—was it? I think it was the commission that my hon. friend chiefly discussed. If I may be allowed a remark, what struck me when I read this correspondence was the almost over-caution of the government of Canada, the almost over caution of the Prime Minister himself. He was so cautious that he had no suggestions to make, he was so cautious that it took him many months to answer communications, he was so cautious that there had to come a rush telegram from Lord Elgin praying that he and his office there might have

word as to the despatches which had been sent long before. He is so cautious that even when he suggested that the term imperial council had better not be continued and that a better term would be 'imperial conference,' he straightway hastens to add a codicil to it: Please do not consider that I am suggesting it, but it is a thing that may be brought up in council when we meet together. This over-caution is not indicative of my hon. friend under other conditions. When Canada was to be launched into the great undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, time could not wait. My right hon. friend could not wait. It would make no difference as to whether there had been surveys or not in that vast undiscovered region that he proposed to traverse with a line of rails, if nothing else could be got in reference to that whole country but the diary of some old priest, of fifty or a hundred years ago, who saw a rose growing somewhere up around a lake there in the month of June, under the strenuous conditions then existing that would be sufficient to found a line of railway upon between this and the Pacific coast with its attendant millions of expense. Take the rose and the priest's definition and description of it and go on with our railway for the tides of time do not wait and we must hurry this thing along. No caution there! Not even as much caution as we thought there ought to be, but when great imperial interests, and I use that word as to the common interests which subsist between ourselves as a member of the great empire to which we belong and correlated with the other colonies whom we look upon as sister nations, whose growth we congratulate ourselves upon because it adds to our own strength and our own future progress and growth and makes our common country and common heritage greater and stronger and fuller in its development—when that is the only question my right hon. friend lies down in front of an excessive caution and dares not even suggest that the term be 'imperial conference' without immediately adding something to say: Please do not take that as a suggestion from us; that can be considered; we will take it up when we meet together.

What can be the objection to an intelligence bureau. Is it possible that we can know too much about our varied resources in all parts of the empire? The Prime Ministers meet, there have been three meetings already and there is to be another; it is impossible for these ministers to make original researches on the various questions that come before the conference. No man wishes to discuss a question there unless he is equipped with information. It is of the greatest importance that the prime ministers from every quarter of the empire should have at their command an efficient body which would collate the information of the empire on all these subjects, and put it in concise form so that when these great chiefs come to deliberate they may have that information close at hand, and be able to avail of it. In the name of common sense what objection can there be to that? The British government says they want it, that they will furnish the office and that each colony can furnish an official. The expense of it would be but a feather's weight as compared with the benefit that would be derived. How necessary is it that you shall have trained experts from all quarters of the empire who will make up for you the facts necessary to enable you to discuss such questions as come up at these conferences. That is all there is in this intelligence bureau. Do not call it anything of a council if you please; it is nothing but a bureau, as I understand it, which will put in convenient form that information which is absolutely necessary for carrying on the consultative and deliberative work of the conference. I should suppose that is a thing about which no caution is needed, and that all the colonies might readily say that they would contribute their quota to such an extremely useful work. I am just as jealous of the rights of Canada as my right hon. friend. I am just as jealous as he is of the right of every one of the constituent parts of the empire to have its own affairs under its own management, and to be solved by its own sovereign will. When the right hon. gentleman talks about us forcing Great Britain to a trade policy, or Great Britain forcing us to a trade policy, he is talking about something which cannot be. At this date, no one proposes to allow any one else to force it to do anything, and it is cheap talk to say here in Canada that we are not going to let Great Britain take from us a single iota of our self governing power. Great Britain does not propose to do anything of the kind. My right hon. friend has said that we view Downing street with very different feelings from what we did fifty years ago. Yes, and the converse is absolutely true; Downing street views us with very different feelings from what it did fifty years ago or thirty years ago. But that feeling is mutual and it has arisen through the interchange of fellowship, intellectual and physical, and commerce. We know each other better, we respect each others rights as we never did before, and there is no need to talk about 'forcing' one way or the other. But there is a force which is greater than armaments, naval or military—it is the force of applied common sense; it is the force of earnest discussion and of deep persuasion; it is centreing the interests of the minds of all parts of our country upon what may be to the advantage of all. And this inner force, and the working of common sense, and reason, and persuasion, we can apply to Great Britain as Great Britain apply it to us. I have a perfect right to go to Manchester or to London and to stand among my fellow subjects of the same King, and to argue with them and to persuade them to seek a more ex-

cellent way by which the blood of the mother should go to the child, and the blood of the child shall flow towards the mother; and, that instead of giving the best of our sons and the best of our products to alien climes, when changes are sought as change will always be sought, it is better that the mother country should seek its exploitation in the dominions beyond the sea than that she should look to alien nations. Let my right hon. friend ask himself whether there is not a practical field for him in this matter of trade and of immigration.

It is too bad that a member of the British government should have such a view of us protectionists on this side of the House as to designate us with that somewhat offensive name of a 'rump.' But my right hon. friend can put that right; he can tell Mr. Lloyd George, privately if he likes, that the 'rump' has grown into the whole carcase; that the whole body from the head to the tail is now protectionist in this Dominion of Canada and in this Dominion parliament. Just a word from the Prime Minister will prevent Mr. Lloyd George from using such an offensive term towards the protectionists of the olden time, for it does not appear that Mr. Lloyd George has yet found out that protectionism has affected the whole lump, and that the Liberal party in Canada is part of a coalescent body which stands for protection. Of course, sometimes our ministers do not declare for protectionism on the public platform; of course although they stand for protection in the tariff items they sometimes disclaim protection, just as the Minister of Customs does who is a protectionist but who does not like to avow it, and just as the Minister of Finance, who sometimes says he is a free trader but who is yet a protectionist all the way through.

And another thing could be done. If, as my right hon. friend thinks, we have been prevented from having the cattle embargo raised because of the rump of protectionists in the British parliament. Now, after the sweeping victory of a few months ago, with the Radicals and the Labourites and the Campbellites all in one vast mass, with an overbearing majority which has no truck with the heresies of protection—with this supreme power in the British House of Commons—my right hon. friend, with his persuasive powers, can just say to them: Here is a chance for Radicalism and Labourism of the true type to prove itself ready, triumphantly over that little rump of protectionists, to give to the Canadian cow her proper place on the markets and on the green fields of the old country.

With reference to immigration, have we not been wasting our financial powers? What better subject could my right hon. friend take up? What better thing could he bring back from that conference than to be able to state in the next parliament of Canada: We have practically made an arrangement by which the British government and ourselves will co-operate in the exchange of labour, the exchange of bodily material, the exchange of citizenship, when it must move itself from the old country, that it may move to Canada and find a place for its development on our broad acres. The British government and the British people, in vast organizations scattered all through the country, are earnestly studying and solving the question of getting employment for their labour; and one way to get it is to put that labour into other countries under happier conditions. If it be an object to relieve the congestion there, and if it be an object to us to have it relieved by planting it on our shores, there is a mutual exchange; and I have always held that a co-operation between the British government and British agencies and our government in the matter of immigration could give us many hundreds of thousands of sturdy and strong men, born to our institutions, born under our flag, not requiring a generation or more to understand the genius of our government and the working of our institutions—that they could by this co-operative effort be saved to the empire; because whether they be in London or in Ottawa, whether they be on the fields of England or on the prairies of the west, there is no loss, but there may be great gain from the change for the British empire as a whole. Better there, ten thousand times, than adding to the richness and the strength of foreign and alien nations.

With reference to the matter of defence, I noticed that my right hon. friend skipped over the question of a naval reserve. Was it so small that he did not see it and consequently did not mention it? I am afraid it looks a good deal like that. There is one sense in which my right hon. friend is absolutely right. We do not want to be drawn into the vortex of European militarism. That is a good sentiment. Look at it and study its vastness; look at its iron weight on the necks of the peasantry and the labouring men of those continental countries, and to a certain extent in Great Britain itself, and gather from that the lesson as we may, it is an evil and it ought to be remedied. Grant that as you may, the whole history of the race rises up on the other side and declares that the country and the people that is not able fairly to defend itself loses in the long run. If we have what is worth having, we have what is worth defending; and it is a long way between the inflated and heavy militarism of European countries and a just measure and system of training and defence for the yeomanry of Canada, so that the country they are so proud of and the homes they love so well may have the system as well as the courage, may have the plan and method as well as the desire, that if ever they are threatened they have at least a fair capacity to defend their country and

their homes. Do not let my right hon. friend suppose as his statement seemed to indicate, that we are happy on this continent because we have no military preparations. Take the history of the United States for the last fifteen years. That history is double-sided. On the one side, the United States has at last thrown off its continental insularity, so to speak—that is a contradiction of terms, but let it pass; it has become imperialized; it has broken the confines of its old doctrine and its old territory; and to-day you find the flag of the United States from the Philippines to Cuba, reaching into the Pacific and into the Atlantic, with the feeling among these people and the consequent duty involved, that they have become a world power. Once that has been done, to my mind there is no retraction; there is no drawing back, but a reaching out farther and farther. The other point in the United States history is that they have been in the last fifteen years making preparations, and actually carrying them out, for a navy which will not be second to many in the world when all these plans are fulfilled. We in Canada have no navy; we in Canada have a small armament. But to the south of us there is a great people of eighty millions who are building progressively, with plans well laid and to be carried out in the future, and who are fitting themselves to become a first-class naval power and one of the best of the first-class naval powers. Now, it seems to me but common sense that we hold abroad to the sturdy, strong arms of six millions of Canadians here, destined to be many millions more by and by, the same in Australia, the same in South Africa—a mixture of English and Boer—and the same in other quarters of the world—that instead of each one of these either lying utterly defenceless or trying to become a sufficient provider for its defence against the world, it is common sense and wisdom for all of them to combine and to put their moral force, as well as their physical force, a naval and military force into one great aggregation which shall command respect because it is powerful, and command no less respect because while being powerful it is thoughtful and not aggressive. There is a difference between the aggressiveness of a people and the staid, calm, able preparation for defending their rights, giving themselves confidence that a certain amount of power is necessary to give. Are we doing that in this country, and can we not, by co-operation, without any one of these countries losing an iota of its own independence and its own proper regard for its rights—can we not, by pooling our issues, with the whole strength and wisdom of the empire in all its parts, frame a system of co-operation by which, with least cost to any part, the greatest efficiency for the whole shall be brought about? These are questions which we must think over. Happy as we are in Canada, we would soon stagnate if our horizon were not a little broader than simply our own happiness and our lack of grievances; but stretching before us is a condition which gives an inspiration, which calls to every young man in Canada and the British world over for action and thought and impulse and endeavour towards the progress and the prosperity and the linking together for both progress and prosperity of Anglo-Saxon, British hands the wide world over—for trade, for commerce, for protection, for defence, for the conquest of evil within, for the standing up for the rights of the best civilization and the freest civilization, and holding up the standard of that for the world as a whole.

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

Lachine canal—rebuilding slope walls, $90,-350.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is a continuation of the work undertaken some seven years ago. The walls are old and tumbling down. They were built about thirty years ago. The sum asked is to build 2,000 lineal feet. The walls are partly of stone and partly of concrete. It is all contract work. The contractors are Heney, Miller, Quinlan and Robertson.

Mr. HAGGART. What will it take to finish?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total estimated cost is $235,000.

Soulanges canal—Manny's gate bars, $8,250.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is an apparatus which consists of two interlocking steel beams placed against the upper side of the gates, which secures them against being broken. Moreover both leaves of the gate being strongly locked together cannot be carried away. The apparatus has been given a trial on the Carillon and Grenville canals and proved satisfactory. There are five locks and each costs $1,500.

Bridge at Clement's gully, $12,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a bridge crossing the public road. The present bridge was built of timber by the department and is no longer safe. It is proposed to put in a steel bridge.

Soulanges canal improvements, $16,080.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for widening the bank, putting up mooring posts, isolated cabins, water supply, fire protection, blacksmith shop, &c.

Chambly canal—improvements at St. John harbour, $25,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. At times the harbour is so packed with boats that there is

difficulty for a new tow to come in or get out. Serious delays and damages have already occurred. The proposed improvements are for enlarging the area by building crib work and dredging. Total cost $50,000. All given by contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much has the cost increased of maintaining that canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. The same proportion as in others. Increasing the wages of employees, increase in the cost of material.

Mr. J. D. REID. The other day I drew the minister's attention to the fact that he had increased from $265,000 to $860,000 the amount required for maintaining and operating the canals.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is largely due to improvements, increasing the number of lights, increasing the wages, and the increased cost of material.

Mr. J. D. REID. Take the St. Lawrence canals—for instance, the Williamsburg canal —there is no great increase there——

Mr. EMMERSON. Except in the wages.

Mr. J. D. REID. The wages have doubled —from about $17,000 to about $34,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. There have been no additions to the staff.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why, there are twice as many men as there were in 1896 though the number of locks has not been increased.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am comparing the present time with 1904. If my hon. friend wishes to go back to that time, I must look up the information.

Mr. J. D. REID. Take the Farran's Point canal. It is a mile long and has one lock. The number of men on it has been doubled. The Williamsburg canal has two locks, the same as before, and the number of men has been doubled. The cost for men and for supplies is very much more than was required on the canal formerly. It seems simply an outrage that there should be such an expenditure. There is another point I would draw the minister's attention to. The Minister of Customs and the Minister of Railways and Canals must have decided to appoint the same man as collector of canal tolls on the Williamsburg canal paying him $1,000 a year, and as collector of customs at Cardinal. I suppose I am right in saying that the collector of canal tolls is supposed to be in his office all day. Am I right in that?

Mr. EMMERSON. He is supposed to be there, when required, but I would not expect him to always remain in his office any more than I would expect a member of this House to remain always in his seat in this Chamber.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows that the canal tolls office is at the head of the canal. Now, in order not to detain vessels he should be there.

Mr. EMMERSON. Whenever he is required for a vessel he is supposed to be there.

Mr. J. D. REID. Paying him such a salary, I suppose he is expected to be on duty, all day at least. But this gentleman also occupies the position of collector of customs at Cardinal. His office as collector of customs is a mile and a half away from his office as collector of canal tolls. To receive entries from parties who cross the river, he is supposed to be in his customs house all day. I would like the Minister of Railways and Canals to tell me how this gentleman is supposed to be in two places at once, for he certainly occupies two offices and is paid two salaries?

Mr. EMMERSON. One official was selected to attend to the customs house work and the canal work, thereby lessening the expense. The salary of the customs officer at that point was a very small one, and it would be difficult to find any one to do the work for that salary. I have not in mind the particular circumstances of this case, but I know that in a number of cases on the canals these offices have been given to the same man. I remember that difficulties have arisen when we were dispensing with the services of some of the collectors because the Customs Department found that they were called upon to increase the salaries of their officials, as they were deprived of the contribution which we had made. There has been no unusual expenditure as compared with 1903, except a gradual increase in the wages of the employees.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, and in supplies.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and in supplies as well. But that is due to the general increased cost of supplies which has affected the administration of the public works of Canada, the Intercolonial Railway and the canals, through greater cost of material for operation and construction. But supplies are purchased by annual advertisement calling for tender, and, in every instance, the lowest tender is accepted. I should fancy that there would be a considerable increase in the cost of operation as compared with 1896. That is partly due to the increase in the size of the vessels.

Mr. J. D. REID. It does not take more men to open a gate for a big vessel than for a small one.

Mr. EMMERSON. But the opening of the gate is not all their work. There is more labour in protecting the gates from the vessels.

Mr. BERGERON. In what way ? Does the minister have his men protect the gates from the vessels by pushing on the boats?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, but more lines are required and more men to man them.

Mr. J. D. REID. The boat supplies the men.

Mr. EMMERSON. In some instances, but you must have additional men on the locks.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs how the officer at Cardinal is on duty all day to receive entries while he is supposed to be on duty a mile and a half away to give passes to boats ?

Mr. PATERSON. He must be earning his money.

Mr. J. D. REID. How is it done ?

Mr. PATERSON. I hear no complaints so far as the management of the customs office is concerned. It may be that he has regular hours that the business community know of.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the boats may come at any minute to the head of the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no doubt that he attends to his canal duties.

Mr. PATERSON. He attends to his customs duties.

Mr. EMMERSON. He is doing his work very faithfully. Perhaps by the aid of the telephone system he can tell when a boat is coming and arrange accordingly.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is never there.

Mr. BERGERON. How many men are employed on the Soulanges canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the number of men on the locks but I can get the information.

Mr. BERGERON. Since the system of working the locks by electricity has been inaugurated fewer men should be required.

Quebec canals—to purchase cement, $55,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will that be bought by tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. All by public tender. I beg to move that this be reduced to $15,000. It was thought that by purchasing large quantities, sufficient for a year's requirements, there would be a considerable saving. The reason that the estimate for this large quantity was made was that certain works were contemplated by the superintending engineer, but on being referred to the department they were cut out by the deputy minister, and therefore the larger amount will not be required and we shall only ask for the $15,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you furnish cement to the contractors ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. On what contracts are you furnishing this ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is in connection with all the works on the Quebec canals.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As one-fifth of the vote has already been taken the item should be reduced to $4,000 which, with the $11,000, would make the $15,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it intended to improve that part of the canal at Valleyfield that has been spoken of in correspondence with the department ? I imagine that would take a good deal of cement and might explain the purchase of a larger amount than usual ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That will be covered by its own special vote and on that I can give full information.

Mr. LENNOX. Should you not there take the vote of $15,000 ?

Mr. FIELDING. It would be all right to take the $4,000 as $11,000 has been voted.

Cornwall and other St. Lawrence canals, enlargement, $7,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is that enlargement ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This amount is to pay the engineering and office expenses of the engineers looking after the works on the canals in that district, closing up the final estimate. They have not completed the final estimate and this amount of $7,000 is to pay the engineer in charge and the other engineers engaged in completing the final estimates of those canals.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this all going for engineering ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, wages and salaries of engineers.

Mr. BERGERON. It must include something else ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, this item has always gone through, the enlargement of canals. There is a staff of engineers at work on it. They have not yet completed the work and this amount is required. Of course their services will be dispensed with as soon as this work is completed but we require the $7,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Why did you not finish the improvements on the Cornwall canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is all charged to the enlargement of the canal.

Mr. HAGGART. The enlargement was completed a couple of years ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. But this is part of the cost of the enlargement. You want to get the final estimates, and the services of the men who are employed there should be chargeable to the work, in which they were engaged and for which we appropriated money.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you require it after the canal is completed?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Auditor General requires it.

Mr. J. D. REID. The canal was completed a couple of years ago.

Mr. HAGGART. How is this a final estimate of a canal that has been completed for a couple of years?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have been working on all of the St. Lawrence canals. This is to have a finished plan with all the details connected with the work so that it will be a matter of record in a permanent form, made in ink, and made as permanent as may be possible. The records of these canals have been very imperfect. There was no survey of the Welland canal with the result that we were obliged to vote $20,000 for the purpose of completing it.

Mr. BERGERON. I think you had better let that item stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry you are not in a generous mood. I would like to get that item through.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What are we going to take up on April 2?

Mr. FIELDING. The Tariff Bill and then Committee of Supply.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 2, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

That commencing on Wednesday, the 3rd of April, to the end of the session, the rule of the House concerning the closing of the sitting on Wednesday at six o'clock, p.m., shall not apply, and that commencing with the same day, and until the end of the session, the House shall meet on that day and on each subsequent sitting day at eleven o'clock in the morning; that in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock, p.m., there shall be also an intermisson every day from one to three o'clock, p.m.; that government orders shall have precedence at all such sittings, members having still the right to ask questions on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, if committee work is still to continue, some provision will have to be made empowering the committees to meet notwithstanding the session of the House; otherwise you would cut off all committee work after eleven o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That will be subject to consideration.

Motion agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I have a communication to make to the House. For some time past my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals has been subjected to insinuations and rumours of a most injurious character—rumours and insinuations hitherto impalpable and intangible, but which have at last taken the form of a very injurious newspaper acticle. This article I have no doubt is familiar to the members of this House. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals absolutely denies the truth of the allegations set forth in that article, and, in order to better vindicate his character, has tendered his resignation and it has been accepted. The correspondence which has taken place between my hon. friend and myself is as follows:

Office of the Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, April 1, 1907.

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—You and I, and indeed the whole country have been aware that the attention of parliament has been interrupted by certain innuendoes against members of your cabinet. Mere gossip is difficult to meet; but when the medium of the press has been sought to name me as one of your colleagues in a slander, false on its face, I have directed that proceedings be taken against certain newspapers for the purpose of vindicating myself, not only against the direct charge, but also against the insinuation involved therein.

I am conscious that I am in a position to be exonerated in the eyes of the country and yourself.

My object in taking these proceedings is to vindicate my character, aside from all political considerations.

It is expected that you will leave here on Thursday for England in the interests not only of Canada but of the empire, and I would be very sorry to prove to be in any way an obstacle to that departure. Of necessity the decision of the courts will not be in time to

make you feel free. Feeling as I do that it would be unfair to you, to my colleagues and to the party generally, that I should be under such an imputation while occupying a place in your cabinet, I have therefore to ask you to accept my resignation as Minister of Railways and Canals.

Assuring you of my personal esteem, and of my gratitude for the many kindnesses shown by you, and of my belief in and adherence to the policy of your government, and of the hope that my sure vindication will in the end be a matter of satisfaction to you.

I have the honour to be,
Dear Sir Wilfrid,
Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) H. R. EMMERSON.

Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, K.C.M.G.,
Premier, Ottawa.

To this communication I sent to Mr. Emmerson the following reply:

Ottawa, April 1, 1907.

My Dear Emmerson,—I have come to the conclusion that the course which you take is, under existing circumstances, in the public interest. You owe it to yourself, to your colleagues and friends, to clear your character of the charges levelled against it. You could well ignore mere insinuations, but direct and specific charges you do well to face as soon as uttered.

I will place your resignation in the hands of His Excellency.

Let me assure you that I, as well as your colleagues, appreciate the efforts, labour and zeal with which you struggled to advance the public welfare in a most arduous department.

Believe me, my dear Emmerson,
Yours very sincerely,
WILFRID LAURIER.

The Hon. H. R. Emmerson,
Ottawa.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, it will not perhaps be necessary for me in any way to add more than a word to the announcement which has been made by the Prime Minister. I want to be definitely clear as to what my statement should be and with the indulgence of the House I shall read that statement so that it may be understood by this House and by the country as a definite and clear cut statement, and so that there need be no misapprehension as to the words:

I desire, at this time, to repeat my denial, explicitly and unqualifiedly, of the charge which has been made against me by the Fredericton 'Gleaner,' and to say that I have taken steps to secure vindication before the only tribunal having jurisdiction in the premises—the established courts of the land. To this end I have given instructions for the issue of writs for libel against the Fredericton 'Gleaner' the Halifax 'Herald' and the Toronto 'World', and I have been advised of service in at least one of these cases. It is but a question of hours in the other two cases, if, indeed, at this moment service has not taken place.

Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House and with your permission I would like to say one other word. I, in common with every other hon. member in this House, recognize this fact, that gossip has caused more mischief in the world than have the decrees of tyrants, and while I have been aware, coming to me as they have come to me from time to time, of slanderous statements that were untrue, they have not been made in any tangible way and I could not, before my peers and before my fellows, take cognizance of them. In a way I feel relieved to think that this matter has come to a head, that it has reached a point where I will at least be in a position to meet my traducers face to face. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether it be a fact or not that every man in this House is willing to have his private life exposed. I do not know if there is any man within the sound of my voice, indeed within this country, who is in a position to say that he has not done wrong. I admit that I have had my weaknesses, I have had my foibles. Until this matter reached the point which it has reached, I had not thought it was a subject matter for parliamentary discussion or for parliamentary investigation. I had felt this at least, Sir, that the man who was without sin should be the man to cast the first stone, and while I, standing as I do before the bar of public opinion, and as, within a very few days, I will stand before the courts of justice, while I will tell the truth and the whole truth, I expect to be judged not by the standard that would be set up on the plea of 'you're another' while I ask no mercy from that standpoint, if the standard that should be the standard of the people of this country shall govern me, and if I am unfit and unworthy of recognition in this House or in this country, I am willing to go down. But, Sir, after that, and when that question has been fought out and determined there is one other question that the members of this House will ask themselves, that the people of this country will ask of this House and it is this: Are there others? Sir, in making that statement and in making the written statement which I have made strong enough,—I do not know if it could be strong enough because so far as the statements in that paper are untrue, so far as they are false, I want to be understood, but I want to go further and to say that they are unqualifiedly false and that anything I have ever done either in the city of Montreal or under any other circumstances I did to protect the innocent, and I have never been—mark my words, Mr. Speaker, and I make them with the full knowledge of the solemnity of the occasion and of the dignity of my position—that I have never been in a hotel in the city of Montreal in my life with anybody of ill-repute. I shall take occasion, Sir, to show that to be true, and in the protection which I have at all times afforded to the innocent I will never show to the country nor at-

tempt to show it by building up on anybody else's downfall.

Mr. Speaker, it must be recognized, it is recognized as a crisis in any man's life, when statements of this kind are paraded before the country, and while I almost feel a sense of relief and gratification to know that I am now placed where I can and will meet my traducers, I have been in a position during the discussion in this House of not knowing whether these insinuations and these innuendoes have been aimed at me or not; there was nothing tangible, nothing that I could seize upon, nothing that I could take hold of. The occasion has come, the time is now here, and I hope, Sir, to be able to seize the opportunity so that every man who has been able to grasp my hand as a friend, as an equal, will be able to say hereafter, that he can grasp my hand and welcome me as heretofore, as a friend.

So far as my political opponents are concerned, I have no word to say. Political life has its difficulties, its troubles and its struggles. I have known it for over a score of years and I have met these difficulties, I have surmounted these obstacles, with all my weaknesses, with all my foibles—and who are there who have them not? Who are they who are above reproach? I hope they exist; I hope they are within the sound of my voice. But, with all the faults that may be mine—and I have them in common with humanity; I have a strong element of human nature about me—yet I believe, and I have always hugged the belief, that it has been a sympathetic and warm hearted human nature. It is not to leave me at this moment. And except as I ask for a fair hearing and for a suspension of judgment on the part of the members of this House and on the part of the people of this country, I do not make and will not make any plea for mercy. I make no appeal other than this: I want to be considered a man; and if I cannot prove myself a man even with all my weaknesses, I am willing to go down, down to the depths to which those who are beneath the level of true manhood must go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this moment I make no reprisals. I have had good friends; I believe I have them yet. And I say this—that my enemies do not include all those in the ranks of those who have been politically opposed to me. I have this to say, further—that I will do my duty fearlessly; and, if, on a future occasion, these matters come before this House; and if, on a future occasion, there is something to be said as has already been announced, I will be here to say my say; I will be here at least to challenge the bona fides of these accusers; I will be here to declare that, if political warfare is to be carried on with weapons from the gutter of slander and personal gossip—if the political warfare of Canada is to be degraded to that level—those on this side of your chair, Mr. Speaker, will not alone suffer in that warfare. And, if the country would know the facts; if the public press—which has had detectives on my track and on the track of other ministers of the Crown seeking out matters that are of private moment—would know the facts, the employment of detectives is necessary as against those on this side, but, without stooping to secure evidence in that way, there is evidence in existence against others, evidence that has not been purchased, evidence that will be strong, powerful, cogent. And if the great public press of Canada and the people of Canada want that evidence, it is within their grasp; it is within the grasp of this House; it is within the grasp of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a number of motives join to cause me to take the course I do. But the first I would speak of is the high regard I have for my leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the very great esteem in which I hold my colleagues. I would sacrifice myself, though it meant an irreclaimable sacrifice, in order that my great and honoured leader—not merely honoured by me and not merely great because I say so, but honoured by all the people of this country, and great not only amongst Canadians but amongst the men of all the world—may go to the conference in London and go there in no sense dragged down by me, in no sense besmirched because men have seen fit to make statements with regard to myself, statements that I can prove to be untrue, statements that in my heart of hearts I know and realize to be untrue, but yet statements that have been bandied about in hope of injuring me. Why, Sir, I know of officials of this House who, instead of devoting their time to the duties for which they are paid, have gone into No. 6 to circulate untruths, damnable untruths, with respect to myself—and this I can prove out of the mouths of men into whose faces I look at this moment. And this has been going on unfairly to myself, though it has not come to my knowledge until within a very few days, for these things truly are kept until the last moment from everybody who is particularly affected by them. Gossip is the weapon of the coward and the coward seeks out victims whom he thinks to be weak. I may be one. But I am here, and, if I am not a saint I am at least a decent sinner.

I have said all that I should say, and possibly more than needs to be said. But I speak in justification of myself as a man. I propose to stand here as a member of this House and I propose to conduct myself as a member of this House ought to do. And if those who stand upon pedestals of their own creation want to take action, let them do so—and they must take action now that they have gone so far as they have gone.

In what I do I am actuated by a sense of duty, first of all to myself. I am actuated, in the second place by a sense of the duty that I owe to my revered and honoured colleagues in the government and to my colleagues the members of this House. But higher and above them all is the sense of duty that I owe to my constituents, that I owe to the people of this country; and I ask them one thing, I ask the hon. members of this House one thing, and I think I have a right to ask it, appealing simply to their sense of British fair-play, that they suspend their judgment, and await the verdict; and if then I am convicted, and if then these words are proved to be untrue, I shall ask no more. Unfortunately, Sir, in life and with our weak humanity, we are apt to think ill of our fellows; we are too prone to accept the word and the idle utterance of the gossip, and to say that it must be true because it has been said, that it must be true because it has been written. I know that in my personal experience I have had more letters of condemnation, more letters of complaint, of fault finding, than I ever had of letters of congratulation or approval. No matter whether my duty was well or ill done, I have not experienced flowing in upon me a great many words of approval. But I have had that pleasure, even though sometimes, as I know, undeserved; and I have a right to ask this of hon. members of this House, that there shall be a suspension of judgment, awaiting the day when I can meet face to face those who have been striking me under the belt, those who have been stabbing me in the dark and behind my back, and in meeting them I have this confident assurance, that I shall be able to vindicate my honour, to vindicate my character. Reputation is nothing, character is everything, and my course will be taken with a view to vindicate my character, which is the only asset that I have, after a lifetime of struggle. I came into this House a poor man, I go out of this government a poor man; the man does not live who can say aught to the contrary. If I had devoted my life to my profession I think I could have gone on and on, laying the foundation at least of an independence. I have given my life to my country, I have done my best toward that country; and in the discharge of my duties as Minister of Railways and Canals, I have endeavoured to treat all men with courtesy, but I have endeavoured above all to be honest, straightforward and true in the discharge of my duties. I leave the government, I part from my colleagues from a sense of duty. I am here yet as a member of this House. I owe a duty to my constituency, I owe a duty to my friends and I owe a duty to my family, and I have eliminated them from any remarks which I have made. As I have been able to discharge that duty to others in the past, I hope that I may be able to discharge it in the future.

Mr. EMMERSON.

RESIGNATION OF HON. C. S. HYMAN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether there is any further information to be afforded to the House with respect to the attempted resignation of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. C. S. Hyman). The matter has been pending now ever since the opening of the session. We are all familiar with the report brought in by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The present is not a proper occasion to enter into a discussion of all the circumstances, but we should at least have some statement from the Prime Minister as to the position of that attempted resignation, whether there is any more news, and what the attitude of the Prime Minister is with regard to the resignation of the Minister of Public Works as a member of the Cabinet. The subject has been more or less under discussion for about four and a half months, and that we are approaching a period when there should be some finality, and we should know one way or the other what is to be the outcome.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker. I have no information whatever to give to the House at this moment. I have received no communication from Mr. Hyman, either direct or indirect, since the last time this matter came before the attention of this body. It has been stated in the newspapers, everybody has read it, that Mr. Hyman had started to come north again, but had returned to California. I know no more of that subject than any other member of this House. It is quite certain that Mr. Hyman will have to take action before he can enter this House again. Mr. Hyman has given us notice of his intention, and I have no doubt he will make his intention good. Mr. Hyman has been under the impression, and has acted under this impression, that his election having been proven tainted, he owed it to himself to go back again before his electors, and I have no doubt he will carry out his intention. But it is well known that the health of Mr. Hyman compelled him to be away from this House, and prevented him from carrying out the intention which he had. Personally, I have had no communication whatever with Mr. Hyman; but I am free to say that I feel sure that the first thing Mr. Hyman will do when he comes back to Canada, and when his health has been restored, will be to vindicate himself before his electors.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister might state whether any intimation has been made to Mr. Hyman that his attempted resignation was considered not valid; and there-

fore that it is, to use a common expression, up to him to make it good, or to notify the Prime Minister of his intentions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I made no attempt whatever, the reason being that I was informed, and I have information, that since Mr. Hyman has been away south his correspondence could not be placed before him, he had been ordered to abstain from intellectual labour of any kind, and his letters had not been read by him. That was the reason why I did not make any attempt to communicate with Mr. Hyman.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before government orders are taken up I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the Public Accounts Committee meets to-morrow morning and I think we should have a motion passed giving the committee permission to sit during the sitting of this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I believe some witnesses have been summoned from a distance for to-morrow's meeting.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I move that the Committee on Public Accounts have leave to sit to-morrow during the sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 141) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1908. He said: I made the motion under the impression that the Bill had been printed but I find it has not If there are any objections I shall not press the second and third readings now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We might go into committee and consider whether or not we can secure sufficient information to proceed with the third reading.

Mr. FIELDING. The trouble is we have not the Bill to consider in committee. It is a purely formal matter and usually it is considered in committee very slightly. The missing document having turned up I now press my motion.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Bill reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is understood as before stated that the Bill simply provides for the expenditure of one-fifth the amount included in the estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. Some items which have already been voted are dealt with in full, but of the portion with which the Committee of Supply have not dealt, one-fifth is taken.

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

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 134) respecting the duties of customs.—Mr. Fielding.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that this Bill was practically disposed of in committee, but at the request of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) it was not reported, so it is now in a state to be reported, unless any hon. gentleman wishes to make any remarks.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Before this Bill goes out of committee, I wish to make a few remarks in connection with the proposed duty on mowers and binders. When I came to the House at the opening of the session, I considered this question of very great importance, and it was my intention to speak on it when the budget was submitted. However, as both sides of the House seemed anxious to end that debate without much discussion I refrained from speaking. I intended, then, when the item was reached in committee to move an amendment, but the item was allowed to stand, and when it was finally taken up I was of necessity compelled to be absent from the House. The present seems to be the last opportunity that I may have of stating my views on this question. I wish to say, Sir, that after twenty-five years going in and out among the people of Manitoba, I can fairly claim that perhaps there is no man in this House who is in a better position from actual knowledge to know the sentiments of the western agriculturists, than I am. Among the many promises made by the Liberal party and government to the people of Manitoba and the west, there are two which stand out very prominently. The first of these is the repeated assurance that the boundaries of Manitoba would be extended, and upon that question I will have something to say at an opportune time. The other promise made by the Liberal government to the people of the west was, that they would reform the tariff. Well, the tariff has been changed somewhat in shape but very little in effect, and so far as it has been changed in effect, I am of the opinion, and I think I can prove it, that it has been changed in the interests of the manufacturers rather than in the interests of the agriculturists. At this late stage of the session I have no intention of speaking at length, but I would be remiss in my duty to my constituents, and they would hold me responsible for it, if I said less than I propose to say this after-

noon. Now, in order to give some idea of the importance of the tariff on mowers and binders, I shall give the House a little information, and perhaps a little surprise when I refer to the large number of mowers and binders that are used by the farmers of the west. I shall confine myself particularly to my own constituency. The constituency of Souris requires about 7,344 binders to take off the crop of wheat and other grain, and it requires about the same number of mowers. In making my estimate, I have allowed one binder and one mower to a half section of land, which I think will give a very fair average, and not one which is at all exaggerated. If you take the value of a binder at $150, there is therefore a sum of $1,101,600 that the farmers of the constituency of Souris have to invest in binders, and placing the mowers at $55 each, that would amount to $403,920, or a total of $1,505,520 which the farmers of Souris have invested in mowers and binders alone. You will easily see, if that large sum of money is invested in these implements in one constituency, what an immense sum of money must be invested in them in the whole western country. For that reason I feel that I need not apologize to the House if I take up some of its time in moving an amendment. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have every confidence that the amendment I shall propose will have the support of every member of this House from the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs down. Taking the record of the last twenty years, I hope to be able to show, in not too many words, that my amendment is consistent with the expressed sentiments not only of members on the other side of the House, but of members on this side as well. In this connection, I intend to put on record some of the statements which were made by my friends opposite when they were in opposition. Part of this may be ancient history but part of it is modern, and whether it be ancient or modern I believe I can claim that the citations which I shall make are strongly in support of the amendment which I propose to move. Whatever may be our individual opinions in this House as to protection and free trade, there is no doubt now that both sides of the House are protectionists. I think that can be laid down as an established fact. There is no doubt that while the government brings down a policy which is a protective policy, my experience has been that on the public platform and through their press, these gentlemen attempt to hold out to the people of this country that they are the low tariff party and that the Conservatives are the high tariff party. So far as newspapers go in that respect, I do not know of any greater sinner than the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' which, if the Auditor General's Report is correct, receives more government pap than any other paper in this Dominion. Last year it received some $32,000 for printing and about $5,000 for advertising, or in round numbers about $40,000. That newspaper never loses an opportunity of trying to show the farmers in the west that it supports a policy of low tariff, and it always endeavours to impress on the farmers that the Conservatives form the high tariff party. I have said, Mr. Chairman, that both sides of this House are advocates of protection. I am willing to admit, and I think I can prove it, that members of the government and former members of the government, went up and down this country for years, when they were in opposition, telling the honest farmers what slaves they were under this slave-making policy of protection, and telling the people of this country what free men they would be if they, the farmers of this country would only turn from power these men they had inaugurated and maintained such a slave-making policy and return to power a set of men who would all be Lincolnites and set the farmers free.

Now, I am going to prove everything I say to-day in regard to these hon. gentlemen out of their own mouths. After these promises had been made by the Liberals for a number of years, the country accepted them and returned them to power, and notwithstanding any free trade sentiments which hon. gentlemen opposite, from the First Minister down, uttered, notwithstanding any loud declarations which they made that they would for ever eliminate protection as a factor in our trade policy, I want to say that these very men have for ever eliminated free trade as a possible factor in the trade policy of this country, so that both parties in this House stand to-day as protectionists. I do not think these hon. gentlemen did this willingly; I think they worked hard and long to avoid it. I can imagine that the Finance Minister for whose ability and experience, and I may say honesty of purpose, I have a great deal of respect, spent sleepless nights and worked hard and long in the effort to bring down to this House a policy which would be to some extent at least in harmony with the promises which he and his associates had made to the people. But what did they find? It seems to me about like this: that they found that after all this hard work, it was absolutely impossible for them to improve on the policy which the Conservative party had spread on the statutes of this country, so they gave up in disgust, and said, we will be obliged to accept the Conservative policy holus bolus, because we cannot improve on it. I believe that is the true explanation of this tariff. Now, I want to show these hon. gentlemen, especially the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs, that it is absolutely incumbent on them to support my amendment. I assure you that I am not talking to-day merely for the sake of taking up time. I am very much in earnest and I am going to quote

sentiments expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite to show them that they should support my amendment. Sir Richard Cartwright can scarcely have forgotten how he declared :

I say our protective system was a huge mistake in so far as it was honest at all ; and in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery.

Nor can he forget how on the same occasion he denounced the advocates of protection as 'a small ring and clique of combiners and protected manufacturers who were permitted to make a prey and plunder of the people of Canada.' He was speaking in Pembroke in February, 1890. How can these men think that the people of Canada can forget such utterances and pledges as the following :

Their ideal is protection ; ours is free trade. We will never desist until this country is freed from the incubus that has been weighing it down for fifteen long years.

This was said by Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the Ottawa convention in 1893. Speaking in the west in 1894 he made these remarks:

The people of this country, the inhabitants of the city of Winnipeg especially, are toiling for a master who takes away a very large portion of your earnings, the earnings for which you toil and sweat for privileged masters, for those who use protection which I claim is bondage. If the government take away from you any portion of your earnings, be they large or small, to give them to somebody else, that government is as much a robber towards you as is the highwayman who puts a pistol to your head and says : your purse or your life. I denounce against this policy of protection. Protection cannot be defended on any fair principle.

Sir Richard Cartwright in 1893 said this:

Our policy from first to last has been to destroy the villanous protection system which has been grinding out the vitals of the country.

Sir Richard Cartwright in 1894 said :

I oppose protection in all its aspects, because protection means slavery, because protection means corruption, because protection is arrant folly and I am bound to oppose such unholy trinity until I die.

But I have something better than that, something that applies to my own part of the country. I will not say who made these remarks until I read them :

Return us to power, and we will give you free trade as they have it in England. That is the liberal policy. We will no longer tolerate the policy of the Conservatives which robs you for the benefit of a handful of manufacturers. We will at once and for ever wipe off the statute-book the villainous protection policy which has stunted the prosperity of the whole country and taken the heart's blood out of the people of Manitoba. Free coal oil, free clothing, and free implements, you will have if the Liberal party are returned to power.

Now, I am not asking you to give us free implements; I am simply asking you to reduce the duties. Who said that ? The late Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Clifford Sifton, and he said it in my own constituency, in the beautiful little town of Deloraine. I have something here which I will give you for what it is worth. It is a matter of interest to contrast some of the utterances of the men who occupy positions from which leadership is expected. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said in 1876 :

I think that we require protection. We have within ourselves the ability to create an industry. If it is shown that we cannot maintain it unless by legislation, either in the way of premium or prohibitory tariff, then I should be ready to take that into consideration.

In 1892 he said :

I say that the only policy which would benefit this country is unrestricted reciprocity and continental freedom of trade.

Coming on further in 1894 he said :

We will give you free trade, and although it will be a hard fight we will not give in one inch or retrace one step until we shall have reached the goal——

The farmers in the west for whom I speak after ten years are still asking the question, how far away is the goal——

—which is the policy of free trade as it exists in England to-day.

In 1896 he wrote to Mr. Bertram :

The intention of the Liberal party is not and never was to establish free trade in this country.

In 1896 he came into power; he continued the policy of protection; in 1903 he increased the former protection by bounties and by surtaxes on German goods and in 1904 he exclaimed :

The Liberal party may contain those who are free trade doctrinaires and those who are protectionist doctrinaires. For my part, I incline neither to the one side nor to the other.

So much for what the Liberal party said they would do before they came into power along the lines of my amendment. I thought that the best way to induce hon. gentlemen opposite to support my amendment was to remind them of what they had themselves said. The Minister of Finance brought down a policy in 1896 and I can understand why that policy should not vary so very much from the policy under which this country had existed for eighteen years. He might have said : It will not do for us to change the trade policy of this country too suddenly. I admit that that was a very good argument. But, Sir, we have given them ten years and at the end of the ten years, in 1906, the Minister of Finance has been

racking his brain again. Sir, he has been doing more than that; a Royal Commission went up and down this country, spent no doubt a great deal of money and received a great deal of information and after studying and restudying that information he came down to this House and said: There are no radical changes. I think they now call it moderate protection, well what's in a name as the Finance Minister said the other day a rose was as sweet by any other name. What a contrast that is to the policy of that old Liberal party! I think I have proved as far as it is necessary to prove that my hon. friends opposite must support my amendment.

I am now going to prove also by the utterances of our own men why hon. gentlemen on this side must support my amendment, because I want this amendment to pass unanimously. Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues, before they came into power, laid down a definite policy. Sir John Macdonald moved this motion:

That the Speaker do not now leave the chair, but that this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a national policy——

And I ask you to pay attention to these words:

—which by judicious readjustment of the tariff will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion, &c., &c.

Again, Sir John Macdonald moved before going into Supply:

That this House regrets that His Excellency the Governor General has not been advised to recommend to parliament a measure for the readjustment of the tariff which would not only fully aid to alleviate the stagnation of business but also afford fitting encouragement and protection to the struggling manufacturers——

And I draw the attention of the House again to that word 'struggling':

—struggling manufacturers and industries as well as the agricultural products of the country.

Sir John made a prophecy and about the same time Sir Richard Cartwright also made a prophecy, and I would like to show in the light of what has since transpired and of present conditions which of these prophecies turned out to be the most correct. Sir John said:

Why should the United States want reciprocity?

I claim that while I may be going a little apart from the subject of my motion in referring to reciprocity I am justified in doing so in connection with the trade policy.

Why should the United States want reciprocity when they have our markets open to them now? Sir John said: 'They can send to our markets everything they produce agriculturally at nominal prices free of duty, as long as that exists we cannot expect reciprocity.

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

Has that prophecy proven true or not? Have we not been knocking and thumping away in past years at the doors at Washington trying to get reciprocity and how successful have we been? But when this prophecy of Sir John's was carried out and fulfilled, when we did shut our doors by the great trade policy introduced by the Conservative party what is the result? What did Mr. James Hill say and what did Mr. James Bryce say last night at the great banquet at the Russell House? They say that now the United States will be glad to give us reciprocity. But what is our position? Our position to-day is that while we were pounding and begging for it some years ago, to-day we do not want reciprocity. We have had our great trade policy; we have built up our country and there is no one prouder of that fact than I am, and no one more glad that we are in a position to say to our friends to the south that we are able to live without them; that we have built up our own country and are standing by it.

I shall now read Sir Richard Cartwright's prophecy. I have told you what Sir John Macdonald prophesied, and I think it needs no argument to show, I think that every one in this House and the country agrees, that this prophecy has come true. Sir Richard Cartwright about the same time said—and I think that this is the most childish prophecy in the light of present conditions, that was ever advanced, Sir Richard said:

I tell these gentlemen that their tariff is going to afflict them with competition to a far worse degree than anything they have now. They will find that this kind of tariff as it has done in the United States will infallibly produce the most vehement domestic competition and a competition as much worse in its results for them as a civil war is sure to be worse than a foreign war. These men whether they know it or not——

Referring to the manufacturers:

—are signing their death warrant.

I wonder if these gentlemen feel to-day that they were signing their death warrant when introducing struggling manufacturers into this country.

When the consent to a tariff which must assuredly create here as it did in the United States a most intense competition.

Sir Richard's prophecy was that by aiding struggling industries and building up manufactures they would come into competition and eat each other up, that was the final result of Sir Richard's argument. But he goes further, and getting into the department of our worthy Minister of Customs he says:

Worrying about smuggling, we find him introducing a tariff which gives every possible inducement for hundreds of miles to men to

engage most actively in the business and occupation of smuggling.

Now, which of these two prophecies, made by two men has turned out to be in the interest of the country. I read these remarks made by Sir John Macdonald and supported by the Conservative party to show my Liberal Conservative friends, whether they be manufacturers or not—I think I shall be able to show why the manufacturers should be with us before I get through—should support this policy. Sir John Macdonald laid great stress on that part of his argument to show that his policy was to assist struggling industries. My amendment is confined to item 445 of the tariff which deals with mowers and binders. I have shown how many mowers and binders we use and I have shown their value. Sir John Macdonald said that he wanted to support struggling industries. And he carried out that sentiment and the Conservatives carried out that sentiment, because, when they felt that the manufacturers of agricultural implements had received sufficient encouragement, the government of Sir John Thompson in 1894 reduced the tariff on these manufactures from 35 per cent to 20 per cent. Our hon. friends have gone on all these years, and, while they have, perhaps, made an honest effort to reduce the tariff, they have succeeded in reducing it only 2½ per cent, I wonder if they think that they can fool the western farmers in that way? I wonder if they for one moment imagine that they have made the western farmers believe that the tariff has actually been reduced in a way to benefit them. It is true, they have cut down the tariff by 2½ per cent nominally. But they have taken care to benefit their friends in the Senate, the manufacturers of mowers and binders, by the drawback which they have given, and which was at first 95 per cent but is now 99 per cent. And that drawback is of greater benefit to the manufacturers than the injury done by the reduction of 2½ per cent. I have here a few figures that will show that. The reduced duties on materials entering into a five foot mower are as follows:

99 per cent drawback on cast iron, $2.50 per ton..	$0 49
99 per cent drawback on rolled iron and steel, $7 per ton..	0 43
2½ per cent reduction on malleables.. ..	0 07
	0 99
Deduct increase in cold drawn steel formerly 5 per cent, now 25 per cent..	0 27
Net reduction..	0 72

This is about 13 cents less than the reduction in the duty. If you were to take a small mower, the comparison would come out about even, but on the mower of which I am speaking, the loss to the manufacturer is about 13 cents.

Now, what about the binder? The reduced duties on binder with sheaf carrier, are as follows:

99 per cent drawback on cast iron, $2.50 per ton..	$0 28
99 per cent drawback on rolled iron and steel, $7 per ton..	2 17
2½ per cent reduction on malleables.. ..	0 21
	2 66
Deduct increase in cold drawn steel formerly 5 per cent, now 25 per cent..	0 41
Net reduction..	$2 25

A binder is valued for duty purposes, $97. 2½ per cent would be $2.42½. Deduct $2.25, and we have 17½ per cent that the manufacturers would lose by the 2½ per cent reduction.

I have referred to reciprocity. The statement made by Mr. J. J. Hill on this subject has already been read in this House, but I may quote again a few sentences from that speech to show the change that is coming over public opinion in the United States upon this subject. Mr. Hill says:

North of us lies a country of enormous possibilities for development, inhabited by between five and six million people. It has over 20,000 miles of railways with several other great projects under way. It has a foreign trade of over $500,000,000 a year. Its capital invested in manufactures is over $400,000,000——

I call particular attention to this point, because it was mainly to show what is invested in manufactures in this country that I have read.

—and the value of its product is $480,000,000. Its people have deposited in their savings banks $82,000,000,000.

And he goes on to make this statement, which seems to be correct:

It is perhaps the time when reciprocity with Canada can be considered with more favour than ever after.

Now, I am going to refer for a few moments to some remarks made by my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller), who seems to be, either by self-appointment or otherwise, charged with the duty of speaking for the government when it gets in a hard place. The hon. gentleman got up, or was put up, to answer the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I congratulated the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) when he got through the speech to which I refer on having made a first-class Conservative address. Nor have I changed my opinion. The hon. gentleman did not like it; he did not care to be told that he was a Conservative by his utterances. I shall read a few of his statements. Whether they are Conservative or not, they are what I believe, and I think it is our duty on the floor of this House to tell the people what we ourselves think:

The government then must not consider and support only the interests of any one or of

any number less than all of our many industries or line of industry.

I am in sympathy with that expression; the government should take into account all our industries when bringing down a trade policy.

I believe, Sir, that in our tariff regulations we ought to be guided more by our own experience than by any matter of theory.

So our tariff should be of our own creation and should be adapted to our peculiar circumstances and conditions.

That is what I ask the government to do, to adapt this tariff, so far as it applies to mowers and binders, to the conditions which exist to-day and not to those which existed 20 or 25 years ago. Here is what he says again, referring to Mr. Foster:

But my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asks why not make that reduction to the extent of ten per cent?

I did not know that I was thinking along the lines of so great a man as the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in drafting my amendment, but that is what he seems to have had in his mind, for he says:

But I am confident that should the farmers want a reduction of duty on their implements, they will not go to the hon. gentlemen, or his party to which the hon. gentleman belongs.

Why not, pray? Why not go to that party, the party who went the furthest along the lines of reducing that duty? As I said before, the Conservative party reduced the duty 15 per cent; these gentlemen, after labouring ten years, have reduced it to the extent of two and a half per cent; and as I have shown, they took the best care to help their own wealthy friends in the Senate to reap a great benefit, they seemed to be more anxious to do that than to benefit the farmers of the west.

But, Sir, it must be remembered that changed conditions require, as well as excuse, change of method and a change of attitude, and the party or the government that is unable to change its method or its attitude because of changed conditions ought not to be entrusted with the management of the country's affairs.

That is my opinion, expressed in as good words as I could wish. I say the conditions have changed, and I ask this government and this House to support my amendment because the conditions have changed, because it is time that something more was done for the farmers, particularly in regard to binders. Mowers are not of so vital impotance to the farmers as binders. We have conditions existing there that many members of this House know nothing about, and I do not think this government has sufficiently studied the matter in connection with binders. Take last year, for instance, when our crop was going on in the orthodox manner, ripening day after day. But what occurred? One Thursday the crops were fairly green, and in a week or ten days the farmer could have started to cut his crops and have got them well housed. But on the following Friday and Saturday we had two unusually warm days, which ripened the crop prematurely, and it was absolutely necessary if that farmer was to receive a fair recompense for his work during the summer, that the crop should be cut quickly. Therefore it is of the greatest importance that there should be a good number of binders accessible, and that they should be in the best order. You cannot go in and cut your crops with a binder that you think will go through with the harvest, you must be absolutely certain that it will. Therefore I come to this government and tell them how important it is to that country that we should have binders cheap and plentiful, and I ask this government to assist the western farmer to give him that advantage, an advantage which my amendment is intended to secure for him, and which I think should receive the hearty support of this House.

Now I want to say a word about the manufacturers; they are not here, and I am very sorry. I do not want to be presumptous, I do not want to dictate to the manufacturers, but this I do say, that their market is in the west. They are manufacturing 27,000 binders every year, they are not a struggling industry. In 1901 they exported $1,742,946 worth of agricultural implements. In 1903, they exported $2,284,904; and in 1905, $2,313,620. But you may say, they import also. So they do, but they do not import to so large an extent as they export. In 1905 they imported $1,614,627 worth. Now take the capital invested in the manufacture of agricultural implements. In 1881 there was $3,995,782; wage earners, 3,656; wages paid, $1,241,279; value of product, $4,405,397. Those figures have been going on increasing until in 1901 they had $18,207,342 capital invested; they paid in wages, $2,194,241, and the value of the agricultural implements alone was $9,597,389. I think, Mr. Speaker, those figures show that the manufacturers of agricultural implements are not struggling. I believe in protection, I believe in putting these industries on a good foundation but when they are on a good foundation I claim the duty should be reduced. The Conservative government pursued that policy, and I ask this government to continue the same policy. A manufacturer said to me the other day, You must prove that these industries are not struggling. Well, I think the statement I have just read shows that they are not struggling. I will give you another proof, although it is somewhat homely there is a lot of truth in it. Out in the west when we see a farmer extending his business, building a bank barn and improving his home, when he is unfortunate enough to die, leaving a legacy to his children and giving something to charity, we make up our minds that he was not a struggling farmer. I think we are justified in coming

to that conclusion. So I say that the farmers of the west, the farmers of my constituency, have a right to conclude, when they see the manufacturers of mowers and binders living in luxury, extending their plant, and when they are unfortunate enough to die, leaving large legacies, giving large sums of money to charity, besides what the government collects from them by succession duties—I say we in the west have a right to conclude that these men were not conducting struggling industries. Therefore we claim that the duty should be reduced.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have spoken longer than I intended to speak. As I have said, I did not get up here to-day for the mere purpose of talking, I am much in earnest over this matter. I would give this advice to the manufacturers of this country, that they get in as close touch as possible with the farmer, the man who buys their products. Last year, as I said, the manufacturers produced 27,000 binders. The market for those binders will go on increasing year after year. Without desiring to be presumptuous, I have this advice to give to the manufacturers. Knowing the conditions out there as I do, I cannot understand why the manufacturer does not do his utmost, in his own interest, if not in the interest of the farmer, to come in very close contact with that farmer, to go into partnership with that farmer and to produce his product and place it in the western market, that very extensive and ever growing market, at the lowest possible figure.

I have said that I hoped to prove out of the mouths of the government and out of the mouths of Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative party that they should each support my amendment. I ask this House to go further than the 2½ per cent reduction. I therefore beg to move :

That the committee reconsider item 445 and that it be amended by striking out the figures 17½ per cent in the general tariff and inserting in lieu thereof the figures 10 per cent.

I have not dealt at all with the preferental tariff nor the intermediate tariff. The preferential tariff cuts no figure in this because we do not get our binders from England, and so far as the intermediate tariff is concerned, as has been well proven by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), if it is not a snare it is certainly a delusion, so I do not deal with it at all but simply deal with the practical tariff that affects our people in the west, and I ask the House, in all sincerity and earnestness—I ask the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and every member of this House, to help these western farmers and to reduce the tariff in accordance with my amendment from 17½ per cent to 10 per cent upon these implements.

Mr. STAPLES. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up much time in advancing arguments in support of the resolution, but I feel that I would not be doing my duty to my fellow farmers and to the western provinces if I did not say a few words in support of the resolution which has just been moved. My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has covered the ground very fully and therefore I shall not undertake to repeat his arguments, but I would like to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the manner in which the manufacturers, and I might say the wholesale dealers, are treating the western farmers in regard to the prices we have to pay for binders. For example, if a retailer or a jobber goes to Winnipeg to purchase a carload of binders he is told that they would supply him with the American binders from either the Chicago factory or the Hamilton factory. He prefers, perhaps, to take the binder from the Chicago factory and they will supply the carload of binders at exactly the same prices as they will charge him for the binders from the Hamilton factory. This is something which I cannot understand, and which I think it is the duty of the government to investigate. The Chicago manufacturers will pay 17½ per cent duty on the imported article and supply it for the same price as they charge for the binder from the Hamilton factory. We have had investigations into the lumber industry in the west and I feel that it is the duty of the government to make a full investigation along this line and see if we cannot find why the farmers have had to pay the prices that we have been paying in the west for our implements. In the United States—and I have gone to the trouble to find out the exact figures—the Deering binder costs the consumer across the line at Milton, North Dakota, $130 cash, while the Canadian manufacturers charge us for their Canadian binders—and I consider that the Canadian binders are quite as good as the American—yet we have to pay $147.50. I might state here that while the tariff has been reduced 2½ per cent, the price of the binders has gone up $5 to the consumer. This advance in price was made in January last.

There is another thing which I cannot understand and I discovered it only yesterday in speaking to a man who is selling the Massey-Harris binder in Ontario. He offered me a binder—and he said he would sell me as many as I wanted—for $125. Now, we in the west have to pay for that binder $147.50. Surely it does not cost the difference between these two places to place that article on the market in the west! These are matters that I think the government, in the interest of the farmers of the west, should investigate fully and if it is found that the manufacturers are not treating the farmers as they should, if they

are charging us in the west a higher price than they are justified in doing, I feel it is the duty of the government to try and force them to treat all portions of Canada fairly.

My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has shown very conclusively how the Conservative party dealt with the tariff. In fifteen years they succeeded in reducing it 15 per cent. This government, in ten years, have succeeded in reducing it only 2½ per cent, and at the same time they have made other concessions to the manufacturers which practically mean that the manufacturers are to-day in a better position, so far as protection is concerned, than they were under the old tariff.

I do not wish to take up any more time as it is desired to expedite matters. But there are many other aspects of this question that might be discussed. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and I think it is the duty of this House to adopt the amendment and reduce the tariff to the figure called for by the motion.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, as this matter has been referred to by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me as applying only to the west, I would say that there is a demand in the east along the same line. The district from which I come was honoured by a visit from the Tariff Commission, and I think that if the evidence taken before that commission is on record it will be found that the farmers in that district were asking even more than is asked by this resolution. In fact, I regret that the resolution does not go further and include more classes of agricultural implements than it does. The farmers of my district are asking for a reduction in the duty on all agricultural implements. It is found that the manual labour necessary to save the crop is becoming each year harder to get and every kind of labour saving device is necessary. It is thought that the American market would be a great advantage to our people living near the line. I am not now speaking on the abstract question of whether it is well to protect or not, of which party are the delinquents, but the farmers of this country are an intelligent and numerous body and their representations should receive some consideration. The reasons given for many changes in the tariff are that representations have been made by the people interested. I think representations have been made by people interested in the farming industries from one end of the country to the other. These representations made by the farmers should receive some consideration at the hands of the government. The farmers of Canada have been asked to pay bounties for the protection of the iron and steel industry, but the government never thought of proposing that a farmer should get a bounty for producing a bushel of wheat. I think the farmers made out a very strong case before the Tariff Commission. They may not be as aggressive as the manufacturers in following the government up and pressing their claims, but nevertheless they are entitled to consideration from the government; they expected it, and they should receive it. I believe a resolution was passed by the Liberal Association in my county, the members of which seem yet to be tainted with some of the old Liberal doctrines, and in that resolution they ask that the duty on farming machinery should be reduced. I am therefore voicing the sentiments expressed in that resolution, as well as the general opinion of the county, when I ask that the duty be reduced. I regret that the amendment does not go further, but I am ready to support it so far as it does go.

Mr. LAKE. I had intended to discuss the whole question of the tariff before the close of this session, but on account of the anxiety which is felt that the business of the House be so arranged as to permit our Prime Minister to attend the colonial conference, I have decided to wait for another occasion. Coming as I do from a section of the country so far distant from the manufacturing centres that the burden of customs taxation is more severely felt than in Eastern Canada, I feel that I should say just a few words in regard to the amendment. I shall confine myself to the specific question of the duties which come under this item in the tariff. The first question is: Will this reduction in duty of two and a half per cent reduce the cost of the article to the consumer? Frankly, I do not think it will, and the statement just made by the member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) bears me out in that. That hon. gentleman states that while there has been a reduction in the duty, there is already notice sent out that the price to be charged to the western farmers for these implements will be increased. Now, the amount of duty payable depends entirely on the valuation for duty which is placed upon the article at the point of manufacture by the customs official. Not long ago the Minister of Customs informed the House that in 1895 the average value for customs purposes placed on the McCormick & Deering self-binders was $95; that in the year 1900 this valuation had been increased to $102, and that in 1905 it had been reduced again to $97 at which figure it remained last year. Therefore, the farmer who got a self-binder in 1895 had to pay an average duty of $19; in 1900, after this government had been in power four years, he had to pay $20.40 duty on every self-binder imported into Canada, and at the close of last year the farmer had to pay a duty of $19.40 on each of these implements. This means, that after the present

government has been more than eleven years in office the farmer finds that he has actually to pay a higher duty on the self-binder than he paid in 1895. I do not know what accounted for this sudden increase of $7 in the valuation which occurred in 1900, nor do I know the reason why it was reduced by $5 in the year 1905. Now, a new factor has come into the situation by reason of what is called the dumping clause of the tariff. Formerly, the Department of Customs did not mind how much or how little the man who imported agricultural implements into Canada paid for them at the point of manufacture; they simply put on their fixed valuation for the purpose of getting what they thought to be the correct amount of duty. That has all been changed. Nowadays the importer of agricultural implements has to pay whatever the article is valued at by the Minister of Customs, so that the old excuse which used to be given by the advocates of protection, that it was the exporter who paid all or very nearly all the duty, falls to the ground. Just at this point I would like to read to the House an extract from the evidence which was given, in regard to the dumping clause, by Mr. J. H. Ashdown, mayor of Winnipeg, who, I think, is a supporter of the present administration. Mr. Ashdown said:

> That the operation of the dumping clause as a rule injures the consumer and benefits no one except it be the American manufacturer who generally raises his price accordingly.

Later, Mr. Ashdown gave a specific instance of it in the case of cement and he said:

> The duty paid on importations amounts this season to nearly forty-eight per cent (since a duty was put on the sacks). This is on actual importations and on values approved by the customs.

And Mr. Ashdown added:

> It was an outrage.

It will be clear to the House that the new dumping clause is going to affect very materially the price at which imported agricultural implements can be sold to the consumers in Canada. The customs valuation of $97 on a binder means that $97 must be paid to the manufacturer in the United States. In addition to that the importer must pay the full duty of 17½ per cent which on the value of $97 amounts to very nearly $114 as the first cost. In addition to that he has to pay the full freight, for under the law no allowance can be made for freight by the exporter of this machinery. Now, supposing evidence is laid before the customs authorities later, that the prices have changed in the United States, and that the United States manufacturers are charging the consumers a higher price than they were previously, and supposing that price is $100 instead of the $97 which had been charged, an increase of only $3, which is very small compared with the changes which have formerly taken place. This would mean that if the Minister of Customs decided that the evidence adduced before him was satisfactory, and the valuation were increased to $100, the consumer of agricultural implements would have to pay more for this class of implements than he had to pay before the reduction was made in the duty. One of my chief objections to the dumping clause, in its application to agricultural implements, is that a great deal depends on the decisions of the customs officials. I give them the utmost credit for desiring to do what is fair between the exporter and the importer, but a small mistake on their part may result in very serious consequences to the consumer.

In regard to this matter of valuation, let me show the ease with which the duty may be increased. Take for instance threshing outfits, to which attention was called by the Minister of Finance when he made his budget speech this year. He told us that the duty to be paid on threshing outfits would remain at practically the old figure, and working out the figures supplied by the Minister of Customs, I think that is probably the case; but he told us that this was arrived at, although there was a reduction of five per cent in the duty, by increasing the valuation. For my part I cannot see the ground on which that increased valuation was made; but I assume that it was made on representations to the Department of Customs that these threshing machines were being sold in Canada at a lower price than the price at which they were being sold to the American consumer. But this shows the extreme facility with which the actual duties which have to be paid can be raised or lowered at the discretion of the government. Now, I think I have heard lately, in this House and also outside of it, that the present policy of the government is a tariff for revenue only. I do not know whether that is correct or not: at any rate, I interpret it to be a tariff which will bring the largest amount of revenue which it is possible to screw out of the people. The total revenue which was received from the duties imposed on the goods brought in under this item last year was $26,882, which is quite an insignificant sum and can be no reason for making the vast numbers of farmers throughout this country who have to use these implements pay a higher price for them. I think it shows pretty clearly that the real policy of the government is a tariff for protection and not a tariff for revenue only. The estimated saving in duty, from this reduction in the tariff, according to the statements of the government, amounts only to $3,360, and I very much doubt whether even that small sum will go into the hands of the hundreds of thousands of farmers in this country.

In the district of Souris alone, as my hon. friend from that constituency pointed out, the farmers have to invest $1,500,000 in binders and mowers alone. I dare say the question would be asked, why have we signalled out this one particular item, and asked a reduction on it? It is not, I think, because the farmers would not wish a reduction in many other items, but we have taken this as a test case. In the first place, these are goods which are used universally throughout the country, and they are implements which do not last a very long time, and have to be constantly renewed. Indeed, it is absolutely necessary for almost any farmer to possess one or more of these implements. I also think this question has been looked at from the point of view that this article is the staple product of a large manufacturing institution of this country, which claims to be the largest manufacturer of agricultural implements under the British flag, an institution which exports an enormous value of agricultural implements during the year. It has been stated that its exports of these machines in the last thirteen years have amounted to $16,500,000, out of a total export of agricultural machinery amounting to something like $18,750,000. I notice that it is stated in a paper which has been brought down that some of the manufacturers claim that it costs 10 per cent more to manufacture in Canada than it does in the United States. Only some manufacturers claim that. Even if that be true, and I very strongly doubt it, surely it will be possible to meet the wishes of the great mass of the consumers of this country by making a reduction of 10 per cent in the duty rather than the miserable 2½ per cent to which we have been treated. The reduction in the duty to the consumer has been practically offset by a reduction of duty on the materials which the manufacturer has to import to build up the machinery. Now, in my view, agricultural implements are the raw material of the farmer. Without these implements it is absolutely impossible for him to go on producing. Why should the manufacturer have his raw materials brought in at a reduction of 99 per cent of the duty, while the farmer has to stand such large duties as are imposed upon him, varying from 25 per cent downwards, and at the same time has to sell his products in the market of the world, competing with all other producers? The farmer is thus handicapped by this very heavy duty which is placed on his raw materials the implements with which he has to produce his goods. I have seen it calculated that the general increase in the value of all goods which are consumed in this country has amounted to nearly 20 per cent in the last few years. In addition to that we find that the average taxes which are paid as customs duty by the consumer have nearly doubled in the last ten years. Therefore the farmer, especially in the west, is up against this problem, that he has to pay some 20 per cent more for all the things which he consumes, he has also to pay increased customs duties, while he has at the same time to sell his products in the markets of the world, where the value of these products on the average has not materially increased.

These taxes which I have mentioned are necessarily a drain on the resources of the farmer. For every extra dollar he has to pay in taxes he is able to do just so much less work on his farm and while it may only amount to two or three acres for each individual farmer of less crop put in, in the aggregate it will be found that the amount of restriction which is placed upon the cropping capacity of the farmers in the west is something enormous. Therefore I hold that it is not only a detriment to the farmer, but that it is a bad policy for the whole country and contrary to the interests of the Dominion that the great industries of the country should be handicapped in this way.

Canada is a country which has great undeveloped natural resources, greater perhaps than those of any other country in the world, so it should be the aim of good statesmanship to enable the development of those resources to be carried on at the very least cost to the person who is developing them. That is that the taxation which is imposed upon the raw materials which are used for the development of these resources should be reduced to the lowest possible point consistent with giving a reasonable protection to our manufacturing industries. The farmers in the west are practically unanimous in favour of a large reduction in the duty on agricultural implements, and I trust that when this question comes to a vote the House will decide to give a reasonable and substantial reduction, a reduction of 10 per cent rather than the miserable amount of 2½ per cent which is placed in the tariff before us.

Mr. J. HERRON (Albert). I wish to put myself on record as being in favour of the amendment, but I shall not take the time to make a speech or to advance arguments. The arguments put forward by the hon. member for Souris were my sentiments; I feel as the previous speakers do and I endorse their statements. As they have said, when our manufacturers of farm implements are able to compete in the markets of the world, I think that they ought to be able to compete at home. If there is an advantage gained by a low duty on these implements the people of the west are entitled to it, and I do not think that the reduction which has been made will benefit the farmers of the west in any degree. The 2½ per cent reduction from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent will never reach

the man on the farm. I do not think it is sufficient, I think the manufacturers could afford to carry on the same business as they are carrying on to-day, with a lower protection than they have to-day, and for these reasons I am in favour of the amendment offered by my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner).

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Speaker, I do not want, of course, to enter into a long discussion; that does not seem to be the temper of the House, and the gentlemen who have spoken have spoken briefly. It is only courtesy though that I should say a few words in reference to the reasons which led us to deal with this item as it has been dealt with in the tariff. We were through the west as well as through other portions of the country and we met large bodies of the agriculturists of the country at different points. I need not tell any one who has travelled through the Northwest that in meeting a number of men selected by their neighbours or having sufficient public spirit to come, as some of them did, 100 or 200 miles to meet the Tariff Commissioners, that we met some of the brightest men that could be found in Canada. They presented their case in a very clear and lucid manner and I am bound to say they were not unreasonable. They recognized the fact that has been alluded to by all of the speakers to-day that, for instance, reapers, mowers and threshing machines were expensive items with them, that they bulked more largely with them than they did even with the farmers in other parts of the country because of their large holdings of land, and it was represented to us that they would be pleased if we could make a reduction in the duties on those articles. Different representations were made—I speak from memory, but I think correctly—in one case it was suggested that the tariff might be reduced to what it was under the McKenzie administration, 17½ per cent. That was at a time when the manufacturer had practically all the raw material that entered into the construction of his binder free of duty, so that if the McKenzie tariff was considered as being a revenue tariff, and if we have been accused of exceeding a revenue tariff in some cases, it would not be in this case, where we have adopted the 17½ per cent rate, but have not by any means given free material to the manufacturer as he had in a large measure at that time, although we have given him some advantage. At one place they said that they would like the duty at 15 per cent and I think in one case a gentleman suggested 10 per cent. We found them very amenable to reason. We said: Here is an industry going on, employing people in the country, an industry that has to pay duty on its machinery, oils, varnishes, bolts, nuts, steel, iron and everything entering into the implements; they do not get by any means the full benefit of the 20 per cent. They thought they would be content with that amount. They would rather no doubt have had 15 per cent and would have been still more pleased with 10 per cent. There is a difference of opinion about that. but here is a thing that we have to consider, why should this one manufacturing industry be placed on a different basis from any other. The gentleman who last addressed us has given us a reason that it is on a broader basis than the others. If I understood him aright he said that that is not the only article, that this is to be a test case and that others are to follow. I submit that if this were reduced by 10 per cent it would not be a revenue tariff basis.

Mr. LAKE. I may say that that is not my intention at the present time.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg pardon, I thought the hon. gentleman said that this was a test case, am I right in this?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. Then that would follow because there is no reason particularly why these implements should be dealt with differently from other manufacturing products save and except the reasons put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite and which carry a certain weight with the committee and led us to recommend the 2½ per cent reduction. We were impressed with the importance of the reduction slight, thought it may seem to the people of the west. Why should they not expect us to go much below 20 per cent? Why, because 20 per cent is below the average duty upon other lines of manufactures.

And they are employing a large number of men. Therefore, it was only because we felt that the conditions of the west called for recognition and for special consideration and concession that this reduction was made. Otherwise it would not have been unfair to give these manufacturers 20 per cent where other manufacturers have 25 per cent, 30 per cent or 35 per cent. And, by the way, it is notable that none of these are moved against in this House. I do not agree with the hon. member (Mr. Schaffner) that we have more than offset the reduction in the duty by the drawback that has been allowed on raw material of this manufacture. At the same time, I do not disguise the fact that we propose to give these people nearly the amount of reduction in duty that has been made. For it must be remembered that 17½ per cent is no more than a revenue tariff. These manufacturers do not get a drawback on all their raw material, though they do have a drawback on certain articles. It stands to reason that they should not be placed in a worse position than other manufacturers. If this is to be a test case, it must be considered in its relation to the tariff generally. And I state with perfect

confidence that you cannot carry on this country with a 10 per cent tariff. I am not going into the general question of protective or revenue tariffs; but I state only an obvious truth when I say, that, unless you offset a customs duty with an excise duty there must be some incidental protection in the duty levied upon the imports. But, without considering that at all, the fact still remains that, in order to raise the necessary revenue for this Dominion you must have the customs duties upon a wide range of articles. This means that you must begin at the base of many lines of industry. Take, for instance, pig iron. If you are giving incidental protection to other manufacturers, the manufacturers of pig iron are entitled to similar treatment. But, by placing a duty upon pig iron, whether the object is to raise a revenue or afford protection, you increase the price of the goods. Pig iron is the raw material of the manufacturer of steel. He comes and says: You have burdened me with this duty on the pig iron that I must use in my manufacture and there must be all the higher duty upon steel. Then come the manufacturers of files, cutlery, ploughs, agricultural implements and other users of steel, who represent that they have been burdened with this duty twice repeated and for that reason must have higher protection. And, even with the drawback that is given upon certain of the raw materials, 17½ per cent is a low rate of duty on agricultural implements. There are articles in the tariff—I am not suggesting them—that might be attacked with much better reason, and articles in which the farmers are directly interested.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Not so far as my constituents are concerned.

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose the hon. gentleman's constituents wear woollens and cottons and that there is an occasional purchase of silk amongst them. It may be said that more money is spent in agricultural implements than in these things. Well, we went into that question, and we found that, considering the length of time a binder can be used, and considering how often clothing has to be replaced, we found that the cost of clothing to the farmer was a little, if any, less than that for agricultural implements. A strange argument used by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner), though one that had been used by hon. gentlemen opposite before, was that since the reduction of 2½ per cent in the duty, the manufacturers had increased the price by $5. Well if that is the case, if we were to reduce the duty by 10 per cent, they would increase the price by $20.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Then, the manufacturers should not object.

Mr. PATERSON. But, if decrease of duty causes an increase of price, and the greater the reduction of duty, the greater the increase of price—and that is the logic of the hon. gentleman's argument—why does he favour this decrease? Of course, it is in line with the argument that hon. gentlemen have supported by their votes over and over again. They have declared that putting binder twine on the free list had increased the price. Yet, they have declared themselves in favour of adequate protection. Do they mean to say that 10 per cent is adequate protection for this implement industry?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes, considering the need of protecting the farmers.

Mr. PATERSON. But, in other cases, 'adequate protection' means prohibitory duties.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON. Why, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) told us that if it took duties of one hundred per cent, he would favour them in order to keep out imports. And, we had one or two special illustrations. Under our duty of three cents a pound on cheese, it was shown that 368-631 lbs. of cheese comes into the country. And hon. gentlemen opposite wanted us to put on such a duty as would even shut out these small imports. Though our manufacturers supply all that Canadians would buy of them and exported $20,000,000 worth, they wanted adequate protection' to shut out imports completely, although our imports of cheese amounted to a bare one ounce per head of our population. They wanted to carry out the same policy with regard to butter, though our imports amount to only 143,000 pounds, or one-half ounce per head—barely enough to spread one slice of bread for every man, woman and child in the country. This is the 'adequate protection' that these hon. gentlemen call for; and we have been denounced over and over again for not yielding to their demands. That being the case, by what line of fair play or logic are you going to reach the conclusion that the duty upon this line of manufactures should be reduced to 10 per cent. If these hon. gentlemen propose to make this a test case, we shall be quite ready to meet them. There must be some sort of consistency and fairness in these matters. I can assure our friends from the west that it was because we recognized the importance of that growing country and its need of these implements that we reduced the duty by 2½ per cent. At the same time, of course, we arranged that it should not be the agricultural implement men alone who would bear the burden, but that it should be borne in part by the iron and steel producers also. The reason was that they only had 20 per cent when we attacked them while the other manufacturers had a much larger amount. We recognized the importance of the west, we recognized that with their large holdings and their immense fields, they needed threshing outfits that

would thresh their grain as early as possible, so that they might get their wheat early to the markets of the world, and for that reason we reduced the duty on threshing machines 5 per cent.

But, as my hon. friend truly says, there had been a ruling of the customs about a week or ten days before the tariff was brought down which allowed a larger discount than was warranted under the law. That was changed, not arbitrarily, because the customs never acts arbitrarily; it was changed because the law passed by this parliament imposed that duty upon us, according to which law goods entering this country must pay duty no matter at what price they are sold. The manufacturers may sell their goods, or give them away if they like, but this parliament has enacted that whether sold cheap or high or given away, the value for duty has to be levied upon the value of that article as generally sold in the markets of the country whence it is exported. We had made a mistake, circumstances had changed, and there had to be a revision of the discount on threshing machines. That revision took place, and the effect of it was explained by the Minister of Finance, who wished to deal honourably by the House and who pointed out that while we had made a reduction of 5 per cent on threshing machines, it might be found after all that on another purchase they would not be so much cheaper because of the changed rulings, which we ascertained were the right rulings. These are now adopted after investigation at the head offices of the company that supplies these machines. But remember this, and I would impress this upon the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), that if this 5 per cent had been left on the 25 per cent instead of 20 per cent, as now, that 25 per cent would have been levied upon the value of the threshing machines. It is virtually a reduction of 5 per cent. It was a mistaken ruling, or at least a ruling that circumstances in the trade just now would not justify, to allow 40 per cent off. It is found that on certain lines of manufactures, I think there is only one that gets 30 per cent, or perhaps 35 per cent. We examined their price lists, these lists vary, and we reached by conference with these men what is the fair market value, and on that the duty is raised. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle has pointed out that since this government came into power the valuation on reapers, for instance, has varied. That on one occasion they went higher than under the old government, and then went down again. That is accounted for by the fact that the cost of these articles has increased and they were sold higher. We have periodical investigations of the prices at the headquarters of the various firms. You remember that a few years ago steel went up 50 per cent, nearly 100 per cent at one time, and of course that raised the price of implements.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Can the minister say if, in the course of the tariff investigation, they made inquiry into that point, as to the cost of producing one of these machines?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, we inquired into the cost, but they would not give you the absolute cost.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the minister know, for instance, what it costs to construct one of these machines, say the Massey-Harris binder, or the Deering binder, or the McCormick binder?

Mr. PATERSON. No, I could not tell you. I have heard the figures, but I do not credit them as being correct. Now, there are one or two very large firms, perhaps more, that are very wealthy. But do not forget this: We must not conclude that because a few firms have become wealthy it is owing to an undue advantage given them by the tariff. Within my memory, I think there have been twenty or thirty agricultural implement manufacturers that have gone to the wall. A few firms have lived as the others dropped out; there was a large market for the remaining firms and they have made money. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) therefore must not say that because we find a few wealthy firms they are unduly oppressing the people. I may tell my hon. friend from Souris that I have heard, I do not know if it is a fact, of gentlemen in the medical profession who have made immense fortunes whilst other men have not made so much. Well, that was not the fault of the fees; one man has been fortunate and the other has not been so fortunate. I am told that it is the same in the legal profession, that some legal gentlemen make fortunes while others do not command so high fees.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the hon. gentleen tell me what point he is trying to make now?

Mr. PATERSON. I am trying to refute the argument of the hon. gentleman that the duty on agricultural implements ought to be reduced from 17½ per cent to 10 per cent, because the Massey-Harris Company have made a great deal of money. That is what I am trying to do, and I think I have made my argument plain. The hon. gentleman argued this way: He said, If you go out into our country and see a man who has a nice farm, good house and barns, and so forth, you do not conclude that he is a struggling farmer, and in the same way when you see a wealthy manufacturer you do not conclude that he is a struggling manufacturer. Well, I am glad to know

that we can go through the hon. gentleman's county and find scores and scores of magnificent farms and comfortable houses and we can conclude that those farmers are not struggling either. You have to look at the whole question; you have to consider what is fair and what is right. I have no objection to this motion coming before the House. My own course is clear. I think we have met the wishes of the farmers in this respect so far as could be done, and I think people will be satisfied with what we have done. We have done no injury to the manufacturer of these implements, because side by side with the reduction, we have compensated him in part by making the producer of iron and steel that goes into his products bear a share of the burden. I trust I have made the argument clear by these brief remarks.

Mr. HENDERSON. During the last 25 years or more I dare say there is no special item of the tariff that has received more attention than the one that is now under discussion, the duty on mowers and binders.

An hon. MEMBER. Why ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly before I am through I will tell the hon. gentleman why. There is a widespread belief throughout this whole country amongst the farming community, not only in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta but in the older provinces—and I speak more particularly with reference to Ontario,—that the price of these implements is excessively high, higher than is absolutely necessary in order to give a fair revenue to the manufacturer, a fair profit and return on his investment and a fair living from the industry. To what cause is this excessive price generally attributed ? I am speaking now of the matter as represented by the farming community. Every farmer will tell you that it is due to the high duties on agricultural implements coming in from the United States. They believe honestly, as has been said by the hon. gentleman from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) that if the duty is substantially reduced the price will be correspondingly reduced and that is the source from which they expect relief. The farming community justly claim that they furnished the capital which has gone into this entire business of manufacturing reapers, mowers and harvesters in Canada. They have contributed out of their hard earnings the money which has built up these large industries and very naturally look for some return upon the money they have invested in them. It is true, I believe, that they have been receiving a return all along. They have been receiving a return inasmuch as the agricultural implement manufacturer, by reason of employing a large amount of labour, has given an increased market in Canada for the perishable products of the farmers. In that way, I contend, the farmers have been all these years receiving a reasonable return for the investment which they made. But the time has come when the farmers say : We want something more than that, we think the time has come when we ought to have a substantial share, a dividend from this business to which we have contributed so much money. They hope to gain that in the shape of a reduced price on the implements which they are compelled to buy. I fear that the small reduction of 2½ per cent in the duty is not going to bring about what the farmers expected. We have evidence here already that in the face of the 2½ per cent reduction harvesters have been advanced in price by $5. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) argues—and I do not think that he was in earnest when he threw out the suggestion—that if you reduced the duty ten per cent the price would be still further increased.

Mr. PATERSON. Logically it would.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think the minister was logical, I do not think he was in earnest ; I do not think it would operate that way. My contention is that a substantial reduction would enable the farmers to import machines at a lower rate, but that the 2½ per cent reduction will not do that.

Mr. PATERSON. If we had them on the free list how would it work ? Like the binder twine ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not going to propose putting them on the free list, but if I were proposing this amendment I would leave it entirely to the manufacturers to say whether the duty should be reduced or not ; I would insist that if they did not reduce the price the duty would have to come down.

However, I do not propose to bring that before the House at present. We will have an opportunity in the course of the next year to see how this reduction will work and whether it will bring the relief in price which the farmers ask and to which I think they are honestly entitled. There is no doubt the farmers are firmly of the belief that a lower duty means a lower price on these implements. I do not believe that applies on all things, I believe there are many things in this country where a high duty really brought a lower price. We never had cheaper and better cottons and woollens than under the national policy. That I think will be conceded by any member of this House and I am firmly convinced that this is the case, but I do not deny that the farmers have some foundation for the argument they advance. I have all my life supported the principle of protection. Long before hon. gentleman on the other side of the House became protectionists I advocated that principle and I stand by the views

I have always held. I do not think that any other policy can prevail in this country if Canada is going to continue to be a prosperous country. This is my firm conviction, and I would be the last man to say that we should open the door and allow manufactures of implements or anything else, to find their way into this market, invading it in such a way as to destroy it for our manufacturers of similar classes of goods. While I hold these views I am still of the impression that a reduction to 10 per cent would not destroy the industry as it is too well and firmly established in Canada now to be affected by a reduction from 17½ per cent to 10 per cent. As I said, if no reduction in price results from the reduction in duty I would approve of a reduction in price being a condition to maintaining the duty, but I do not propose to deal with that matter at this time.

The question has been raised by the Minister of Customs, why take this particular item? There are several reasons for attacking it, but let me give one reason, and I think it is a substantial reason and one which will commend itself to the minister. We attack this item because the minister himself attacked it; he gave us the example. He has reduced the duty from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent, showing that in his estimation the 20 per cent was too high. He has shown us the way, and whether it is a good precedent or not we are simply trying to do a little better than he has done.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NICHOLS COPPER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 119,) to revive certain patent of the Nichols Copper Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask before the Bill passes, whether it contains all the usual provisions which, under the practice of the House, have been inserted in Bills for validating patents after they have expired?

Mr. STEWART. I may say that the Department of Agriculture was represented at both the Committee on Private Bills of the Senate and that of the House of Commons, and is perfectly satisfied with the Bill. I know nothing of its provisions, but I was asked to take charge of it in Mr. Clarke's absence.

Mr. SPROULE. We have usually provided that when a patent has expired any one who has innocently commenced manufacturing shall be allowed to continue to enjoy that right. We have no information whether that is the case in this instance, or whether the patent has lapsed.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps the third clause covers that point. I have no doubt the Minister of Agriculture, who usually gives attention to Bills of this kind, has considered this one; but if there is any objection to it, I will let it stand.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the United Baptist Woman's Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 104) for the relief of Osprey George Valentine Spain.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 117) for the relief of Celina Kingan Ansley.—Mr. Ross (Yale-Cariboo).

Bill (No. 118) for the relief of George William Hadley.—Mr. Ross (Yale-Cariboo).

Bill (No. 125) respecting the Lake Superior Power Company.—Mr. Dyment.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 140) to incorporate the St. Leon Railway Company.—Mr. Finlayson.

Bill (No. 142) to incorporate the Abitibi and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House in committee on Bill (No. 134) respecting the duties of Customs.—Mr. Fielding.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) asked the mover of this amendment why this particular item of self-binders and mowers had been attacked. I was proceeding to give the reasons why I thought that that was a very proper course and that this item stood alone amongst all the other items of the tariff. It is unique in this respect that it is practically the only industry in this country whose export trade is larger than the import trade in the same article. I do not think we can find in the Trade and Navigation returns more than possibly one other large industry where that is the case. The imports of shingles are certainly very small compared with the exports, the imports being $21,311 and the exports $1,908,486, but there is no duty on shingles entering this country. That is along the line that we are indicating in the resolution moved this afternoon to reduce the duty on the article where the exports are in excess of the imports. From 1894 to 1906 the total imports of agricultural implements of all kinds amounted to $19,678,003, while the total exports of the same implements amounted to $20,694,204, snowing an excess of exports over imports of $1,016,201. What I desire to say is that in no other large industry in this country does this same thing

occur; in no other large industry is the export trade at all equal to the import trade in the same article. The fact is that this industry has a world wide market, that was stated by the Hon. Mr. Jones before the Tariff Commission in Toronto, that they had a world wide market and there is no other industry in the country that can claim the same thing. My contention is that when an industry has reached the stage that it can claim a world wide market, when it not only has the market of Canada, but the market practically of the civilized world, it is in a position to carry on its manufacture with a lower rate of duty than another industry that is hampered by a very large importation. Let me point out how this industry differs from other industries. The Minister of Customs this afternoon cited some others and said: Why not take these; why not take the woollen industry—and I think he referred to one or two others. If the duty on woollen goods were reduced in the same manner in which we propose to reduce it on agricultural implements, it would practically wipe out the whole industry, because the imports are so enormously large compared with the exports. But this implement industry does not rely on the home market, although it practically has the greater part of the home market; twenty-eight out of every thirty self-binders used in the country are manufactured in Canada; in mowers, practically forty machines out of forty-one, so that our manufacturers practically have the whole market of Canada. The imports last year of self-binders amounted to only 927, whereas the home manufactures amounted to 27,500. The importation of mowers amounted to 766, whereas the total manufacture in our own country came to something over 34,000.

Now, I say that the industry which possesses a market like that at home and, at the same time, has a world-wide market acquired by skill and capital fostered by a protective tariff for many years, ought to be able to walk practically upon its own feet. How often have we on this side been asked, when supporting the national policy: How long are you going to feed these infant industries? That is a question that the Minister of Customs has thundered from the housetops many a time. Well, Sir, we think that this infant industry has attained such proportions that it is able to walk. I am not going to say, walk alone; I do not ask that it shall walk alone; I do not think it would be in the interest of the country, for I think we should have our market hedged about sufficiently to prevent free invasion from abroad. But the protection to be thrown about this industry should not be such as to enable the manufacturers of these implemets to unduly raise the price to consumers.

Now, I understand, from my reading of the history of tariffs, that in Great Britain for many years they had a high protective tariff, protection of a kind such as we in this country have never known. And it was only when Britain came to the conclusion that she was mistress of the world's markets that she threw open the doors and invited other countries to come and trade with her on free trade terms. Now, we in Canada never expect to be in that position with regard to general manufactures. Competition in the world is too keen. Germany, the United States, Great Britain and other countries are competing in almost all lines of our manufacture. But we have succeeded in one item—this one that is now under consideration—in attaining that position when we can say to the world: Come and trade with us for we are masters of the situation. That is the reason why I say we are in a position to warrant our asking the government to reduce the duties on these implements, so that the farmers of this country may secure these machines at the lowest possible price.

I said that Canada exports agricultural implements all over the world. Using the expression of Mr. Jones, these manufacturers practically have a world-wide market. Last year our exports of agricultural implements amounted to $2,499,104, and our imports to $1,615,123. I have no means of knowing how much of these exports consisted of mowers and self-binders, because the trade and navigation returns for some reason which I cannot explain, do not separate these items in the table of exports as they do in the table of imports. I am not reflecting on the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) for that. There may be a good reason for it, for, I believe the same rule exists in other countries. I endeavoured to investigate the statistics of the Commonwealth of Australia, and I found that up to 1905 they followed a similar course, and that one cannot learn the exports of these articles any more than he can from the Trade and Navigation returns of this country. To substantiate what I have said, that this industry stands on a unique basis, inasmuch as it has an export trade which is not possessed by any other industry in the country, let me quote some figures showing exports and imports in other important lines:

	Imports.	Exports.
Glass and manufactures thereof..	$ 2,680,274	$ 22,403
Stoves and parts thereof..	473,422	11,885
Sewing machines and parts thereof..	256,235	35,225
Boots and shoes..	1,284,654	146,115
Electric apparatus..	3,584,254	180,339
Cement..	1,003,022	13,798
Carriages..	2,525,177	441,576
Buttons..	291,332	5,566
Musical instruments	601,791	301,072
Furniture..	753,589	289,241
Manufactures of cotton ..	10,745,206	1,363,871
Manufactures of wool.. ..	17,601,271	453,859
Gloves and mitts..	1,167,094	Nil.
Flax, hemp and jute.. ..	5,212,231	258,251

	Imports.	Exports.
Fancy goods..	$3,367,174	Nil.
Brooms and brushes.. ..	286,037	Nil.
Collars and cuffs..	189,849	Nil.
Manufactures of tin, plain and japanned..	228,971	Nil.
Agricultural implements ..	1,615,123	2,499,104
Shingles..	21,311	1,908,486

Now, I ask: How could any of these industries live in Canada were it not for the protective tariff? The figures I have given show that this manufacture of agricultural implements stands alone among the great industries of this country, except possibly, the manufacture of shingles. And, as in the case, there is no duty at all it cannot be considered, for the purposes of this argument, as in the same category with this agricultural implement industry. How would the woollen industry be carried on in this country without protection, with imports of $17,601,271 and exports of only $453,859? The market of this country in respect of cottons is invaded, because the imports amount to $10,745,206, whereas the cotton manufacturers of this country find a market abroad to the extent of only $1,363,871.

I think I have given in this statement sufficient to show that the industry to which reference is made this afternoon, that is the manufacture of binders and mowing machines, stands entirely alone and is different from all the other industries. It has a market outside of Canada, a world-wide market which these other industries have not, and there is no reasonable probability of their attaining it. At any rate, until they can attain to a position of that kind no government in this country can afford to sacrifice these industries, or to reduce the duties that are essential in order to give them a fair show for a living. With regard to the manufacture of binders and mowers I say the time has come when it is not necessary to feed the infant industry as it was in bygone years. This industry was fostered by a protective tariff from 1878, first by 35 per cent, until 1894, when the then Minister of Finance, believing he was justified, reduced it to 20 per cent, and it has remained there until the present year. Now this government, realizing possibly something of what the Minister of Finance did in 1894, that a high protection was not desired, propose to reduce it a small modicum further. We say on this side of the House that the time is past when even 20 per cent, when even 17½ per cent, is necessary to foster that industry in this country and that the duty ought to be further reduced.

Permit me to say here, however, as I said this afternoon, that I have always adhered to the protective principle, and I have not yet seen my way clear to changing my mind. I believe it is the true policy for this country, a policy that must be maintained. But there are exceptions to all rules; and repeating what I said, when an industry has obtained the wonderful position this industry has, I think the time has come when we can reduce the protection that we afford to it. Unless the manufacturers of these instruments choose to sell their goods at a lower price—I believe they can do that, I believe that it is possible—and if they would meet the farmers' view by reducing the price of these goods, it would be the surest way of getting rid of the cry for a lesser protection. If I had the drafting of this resolution, which I had not, I would not have drawn it up in the words in which it has been proposed. I would not have proposed a straight reduction to 10 per cent, but I would have made it a conditional matter. I would have said this to the manufacturers of these implements. If, within one year, you reduce the price of your output to the extent of 10 per cent below what it was last year, then the duty can remain where it is; but if you do not do that, the duty shall go down to 10 per cent. That is the condition I would make, that is what I would say to the manufacturers of these implements to-day. If I should chance to be in this parliament in future years, and the result of the legislation we are proposing to-day has not brought about a reduction in the price of these implements, I shall be prepared to move a resolution along that line, and insist that the manufacturers of these goods give them to the farmers at a lower price, otherwise their protection shall be taken away from them, at any rate reduced to the extent of 10 per cent.

This is not a new matter. A policy of that kind is in force to-day in the Commonwealth of Australia. Although a newer commonwealth than we are, in some things they have made an advance on us. The government of Australia passed a Tariff Bill last year, on October 12, which is cited, 'The Customs Tariff of 1906.' I do not pretend to read any large portion of the Bill, but sufficient to show that the idea I throw out here is not a new idea, and that it is believed by the people of Australia to be a practical idea. They have a duty on stripper harvesters of £16, and after September 7, 1906, that duty shall be £12. But they make a provision in the tariff as follows:

> If the Governor General is satisfied that the cash prices at which stripper harvesters and drills manufactured in Australia are sold exceeds the price hereunder set out, he may by proclamation reduce the rate of duty specified in the schedule in respect to stripper harvesters, but so that the reduction shall not reduce the rate of duty below one-half the rate of duty imposed by this Act.

Then it goes on to give the rate of duty and the prices at which stripper harvesters must be reduced in order to maintain the maximum of duty. If, after February 1,

1907, strippers harvesters are not sold at or under the price of £70 then the duty shall be reduced one half, that is, instead of £16 it will be reduced to £8. Then again if, on February 1, 1908, stripper harvesters in Australia, made in Australia, were not reduced to £65, then the duty should be reduced by one half, namely, from £16 to £8.

Now I think that a wholesome provision of that kind in our own tariff would give the farmers of this country a cheaper implement, would give them a machine at a fairer price. And if we find that under the present legislation, this small reduction, is not going to work out in the interests of the farmers so as to give them cheaper implements—because that is what the farmers are after, they are not so particular about what the duty is as long as they get the machine at a reasonable price, or what they consider a fair price—I say that if in the future we find that the manufacturers of these implements have not reduced their prices to the farmers, then I suggest to the government that the remedy which has been applied by the commonwealth of Australia would be a very healthy remedy to apply to that industry in this country.

Now the question arises: Can these implements be reduced? I do not wish to ask what I would regard as an absurd or impossible thing. I am firmly of the conviction that these implements can be made cheaper, that they can be sold cheaper than they are at the present time The Minister of Customs told us this afternoon that he had no means of knowing what the cost of the machine was, and I presume that outside the manufacturer himself there is no man in this country who can tell what it costs to build a self-binder or a mowing machine; it may be a great deal less than many of us suspect. We cannot tell definitely, all we can arrive at is a conclusion by inference. In answer to the question, Can machines be sold cheaper? I would say that the Canadian manufacturers have the capital, they have all the capital that is necessary to carry on a very, very large industry. They have labour in this country, to my mind, just as cheap and as good as the manufacturers of the United States have.

They have their raw material, their iron and steel and they ought to manufacture as cheaply as they do in the United States. If it is not as cheap in Canada it can be imported and the duty will be given back to the manufacturer under the present tariff. We are paying a bounty to produce cheap iron and steel in this country and we are giving a drawback to the manufacturers of these implements on practically all the iron that goes into a machine. In so far as the raw material, outside of coal is concerned, I believe our Canadian manufacturer has all the advantages that the American manufacturer has. Therefore, I say he should produce a machine as cheaply as it is produced in the United States. I am aware that the Hon. Senator Jones has said that in the opinion of some it costs 10 per cent more to manufacture in this country than in the United States. Beyond the bald statement I am not able to judge. As to the fairness of that statement I do not doubt that it is honestly made, but it does not appeal to the people of Canada to say that it would cost 10 per cent more in this country to build a machine than it does in the United States. The United States makers of these machines have been willing during a great many years, to pay something into the treasury of this country in order to find a way into this market with their machines. I do not say that they pay all the duty. I do not say that they pay half the duty or what proportion they do pay, but I am under the impression that they pay a fair proportion in order to find a way into the market of Canada to sell in competition with our own manufacturers. Now, if the United States manufacturers, with no better advantages than our manufacturers have for making machinery, can afford to pay into the treasury of this country a certain sum on every machine they send into Canada, why cannot the implement makers in Canada give something back to the farmer more than they have done? For the reasons which I have stated I believe that the machines that are sold in Canada ought to be sold at a lower price than they are. We know just what the prices are. They seem large. We have had quotations this afternoon. According to the price-list of the Deering Harvester Company for 1905 in the west, a self-binder costs $150 cash, $155 in two payments and $160 in three payments, and I believe that other manufacturers quote the same price. A six-foot McCormick binder costs $150 cash, $155 in two payments and $160 in three payments. In the province of Ontario we are aware that these prices are not so high and that these machines sell at a lower price, especially the Massey-Harris binder. From this I come to the conclusion that the manufacturers of machines in Canada with all the advantages they have ought to be able to sell as reasonably low as the manufacturers of the United States. The manufacturers of the United States, before they can get into our market, have to contribute to the coffers of our country a certain sum. I say let the manufacturers of implements in this country hand over a certain amount to the farmers and satisfy them, because then and then only do I believe that the community will realize that they have a fair deal from this large industry which they have supported with their money for many years, which practically they have built up by their hard-earnings and which they now say ought to

grant them a dividend or a share of the earnings of the business which has been built up from the capital which they have contributed. I shall support the amendment of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner).

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). As I have the honour to represent an agricultural constituency which is very much interested in this item of the tariff I shall be excused for taking up a moment or two of the time of the House for the purpose of explaining my vote on this question. I purpose supporting the tariff brought down by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) for the reasons which I shall explain to the House. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments which we have had presented this afternoon from the other side of the House. It is only a short time since we have had the pleasure of assuming the responsibility of advocating a certain tariff on fruit as against hon. gentlemen opposite who expressed the view that fruit should be a great deal higher. On that occasion hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House were for raising the duty on fruit that it might be higher in Canada and especially in the west. There was, I admit, one exception amongst hon. gentlemen opposite—the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), who, upon receiving something of a polite challenge from myself, stated that he was not in favour of raising that duty. With that exception our hon. friends were for raising the duty on fruit and for making the settler pay more for that necessary commodity. We find them now at this late date, in dealing with another feature of the tariff, coming down with this resolution. I have not the power of mind reading and I do not take it upon myself to say what is passing in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I believe if there were a secret ballot taken every one would vote against their own motion because I would be surprised if any hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House expected or wished this motion to carry. I just wish to say a word or two regarding the remarkable utterances of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). He has given us a clever speech, a speech with a great deal of information in it, but I must say that it was a singularly remarkable speech to be delivered by a man who stands up in this House and calls himself a protectionist. We find that when the Liberals were in power, under the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, the tariff on agricultural implements was exactly what the present hon. Minister of Finance thinks it should be—17½ per cent. We find that when our friends now in opposition were in power they exactly doubled that, or, in the course of fifteen years they doubled it. We find that in the course of another fifteen years it has been cut down from 35 per cent to 17½ per cent. I think that is making fair progress in bringing the tariff down to a very reasonable figure. When you reflect that in the course of the few years that the Liberals have been in power this tariff has been reduced to that extent they cannot be accused of any inconsistency when they say that it is a reasonable tariff.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Who made the greater part of the reduction ?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is in the sentence that I had just commenced to utter. I am well aware that a reduction was made while our hon. friends were in power, but they knew that they were not going to be in power much longer and on the eve of the general elections they made one sweeping reduction, bringing the tariff down to 20 per cent. They put this on the statute-books, but they never did business at reduced tariff. Notwithstanding the fact that they may have passed legislation, the crelit for carrying on the country's business, for looking after the manufacturer and for seeing that the farmer did not pay an enhanced duty belongs to the present government. My hon. friend from Halton has given us his reasons for thinking that the manufacturer of agricultural implements should not continue to be protected as highly as he now is. I could not follow my hon. friend very clearly. Either one of two things must happen. The manufacturers of agricultural implements must certainly undersell the other manufacturers of the world or they must compete with them at least. They can do so either by cutting prices or by selling in the open market at the same price as they are selling in Canada. If they do so by selling at cut prices, it is no argument in the mouth of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that the agricultural implement makers can stand on their own footing. If they sell in foreign markets at the same price as in Canada, then they can compete with their competitors and the removal of this duty would make no difference at all. If they are able to sell in the world's markets, and do sell so as to compete with the manufacturers in any part of the world, and if they do that at the self same price at which they sell to the farmers of Canada then I say the Canadian and American prices must be the same. I do not say that the specific prices are the same for each binder, but a man must get the same value for his money or he would not buy the Canadian implement. If you reduce the duty to ten per cent then you leave that man nearly in the same position as the man in Australia, who has a chance to buy wherever he likes. If the Canadian manufacturers compete in the world's markets their price must

be just as low, and there would be no object whatever in reducing the duties further. My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Staples) said that the manufacturers had already raised the price of binders five dollars. I do not know what reason there can be for that, but I am content to accept the hon. gentleman's statement that since the tariff was announced they have raised the price.

Mr. STAPLES. They raised the price list on January 1.

Mr. KNOWLES. The tariff was brought down on November 29, and a month afterwards they raised the price. Since hon. gentlemen have quoted that as an argument in favour of their contention, I suppose they pretend that the effect of reducing the tariff was to increase the price of the article. I do not see how that can be reasoned out, but if it is so, then of course it would be a dangerous thing to reduce the duty any further. If you reduce the duty 2½ per cent and there is a $5 increase in the price, then if you reduce the duty 10 per cent more there would be a greater increase in the price according to the kind of logic advanced by our hon. friends opposite. Arguing on that kind of logic, it would be idle to reduce the tariff further. I am well aware that in the next election, it will be said of those of the western members who may vote against the amendment: So and so, and so and so, voted against a motion to reduce the duty on agricultural implements. Now, these items have gone through committee; no objection has been taken to them by our friends opposite since November 29 last, and no protest has been entered by them. I must, therefore, interpret their actions to mean, that when they bring such a motion forward at this last hour they are not sincere. I am free to say that I am not a hide bound party man, but when I look over the history of the two political parties in the past and right up to the present date, I have no fear whatever in trusting to the fair-mindedness, and the honest British fair-play of my constituents, when I stand here (not shirking the vote nor running out of the chamber) to support the Minister of Finance in this real, genuine, honest legislation he has brought down, and to vote against this motion which I believe from my heart to be a mere political dodge.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) has summoned up sufficient courage to stay in the House since eight o'clock, but I noticed that nearly all the time prior to six o'clock he was conspicuous by his absence.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will my hon. friend excuse me; I was here before six o'clock.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Yes, I saw you dodging in and out occasionally.

Mr. KNOWLES.

Mr. KNOWLES. You will have to admit that I came in just as often as I went out?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). And oftener, if you count the last time you came in. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) lecture us because some members on this side of the House from the east, where fruit is grown, are anxious for a higher tariff on fruit; and arrange all the members on this side with being equally desirous for such a tariff. He accused us of being inconsistent because we are now asking for a reduction in the duty on agricultural implements. The hon. gentleman need not come to this side of the House for an example, if he terms that inconsistency; he can cast his eye on the seat in front of him and there he will see a representative of this same inconsistency in the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell), who is an ardent advocate of increased protection on market garden products, and who does not call himself any the less a free trader because of that. Therefore, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) need not come to this side of the House for evidence of inconsistency of that particular kind. I do not see how it can be inconsistent to say that as to one particular item the duty is too high and as to another particular item that it is not high enough. I think each item can stand upon its own merits. As the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has said we have an example set us by the ministers in asking for a reduction on this particular item, because they themselves proposed a reduction from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) stated that when the Mackenize government was in power the duty on agricultural implements was 17½ per cent, but when the Conservatives came to power they raised the duty to 35 per cent, and that now it has been reduced to 17½ per cent. If he were addressing an audience devoid of intelligence, he might have succeeded in conveying the impression that it was the present Liberal government that had reduced the duty on agricultural implements, but on being questioned he was compelled to admit that it was the Conservative government, which, when they found the Canadian manufacturers could successfully compete in the markets of the world reduced the duty from 35 to 20 per cent. And Sir, the Liberals went from hustings to hustings throughout the country declaring that this 20 per cent duty was too high, that if they were in power they would reduce the duty not by 10 per cent, but that they would put agricultural implements on the free list.

Mr. PATERSON. Hugh John said that.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The Minister of Customs says it was Hugh John who said that, but he is quite aware that Hugh John's antagonist, the present

member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) showed him the good example, if you look at it that way, and had the dead walls of the constituency placarded: Vote for the Liberal candidate and free agricultural implements. In 1896, the constituency of Marquette was placarded: Vote for Ashdown and free agricultural implements. The constituency of Lisgar was placarded all over with: Vote for Richardson and free agricultural implements. Mr. Richardson to be sure, since that time has looped the loop politically speaking, and I do not know whether he will be found in the future as in the past, condemning this government for the non-fulfilment of their ante-election pledges in this respect.

Mr. PATERSON. Did the Minister of the Interior do that in the elections of 1904?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). No, that is where his inconsistency comes in.

Mr. PATERSON. The people supported him.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Like the Minister of the Interior, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) succumbed to the blandishments of the Massey-Harris people and some of the others connected with this trade, and it had a remarkable effect on him.

Mr. PATERSON. His constituents returned him?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I have before me some of the expressions used by the member for Brandon in 1896, when touching on this very question of agricultural implements. He spoke in Winnipeg, pointing out to the people of Manitoba how they were being fleeced in order to afford the competitors of our Canadian farmers cheap agricultural implements to compete with them in the raising of their grain and its disposal in the markets of the world. And not only did the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) refer to that, but he referred to the fact that the rebates of duty were allowed on those machines for export, while the Canadian farmer had to pay the duties in his own market. I read the following in order to show the Minister of Customs just where his late colleague stood in that respect. He said:

It had been stated by gentlemen conversant with the facts that the Massey-Harris binder sold in Winnipeg for $140, and it was sold in Glasgow for $75. Here the Canadian farmer was unduly burdened as against his competitor.

The great competitors of the Canadian farmers were, among others, those in the Argentine Republic, and in that country they were buying their machines for about half what the Canadian farmer had to pay for them. Another competitor was Australia, and an implement was shipped from Toronto to Sydney, Australia, over a line heavily subsidized by our money, and laid down there at a freight rate as low or even lower than that on an implement from Toronto to Winnipeg. Now was it not time to think about these things and see if something could not be done for the farmers who had to fight against these competitors who brought the price of wheat down to forty cents a bushel? Is it not time to forget party and do something for the good of the country?

This was what the hon. member for Brandon said when appearing in 1896 for the votes of the farmers in western Canada. Yet that same system of subsidizing lines of steamship to carry implements to Australia in order that they may be sold to the Australian farmer at little more than one half the price the Canadian farmer has to pay for them continues in effect to the present day. Further on he said:

The Canadian manufacturer when he imports his iron and steel has to pay a duty on it, which is of course repaid to him by the Canadian farmer, but when he ships that machine to a foreign country to a competitor of our farmer, he gets a rebate of that duty on the material, so that our farmer is paying taxes to allow the manufacturer to sell cheap machinery to his most keen competitors.

The people of Manitoba are not expected to look after the interests of some manufacturer in Toronto. He was quite capable of looking after his own interests.

Whether the fact that the Hon. Lyman Jones, the head of the Massey-Harris Company, has since that time been called to the other Chamber, and has now more influence with the present government, has been the cause of the change in the attitude of the ex-Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Customs in regard to this item, these hon. gentlemen can probably explain. In 1900, when the hon. member for Brandon went before his constituents, he had a different song to sing. He told them what a mistake it would be to make even an infinitesimal reduction in the duty on agricultural implements. He went on to say that there were in eastern Canada 9,000 people engaged in the manufacture of these machines, that these people had families depending on their ability to earn their bread and butter in this country, that they were thus enabled to buy the products of Canadian farmers, affording them a home market which they would not otherwise have, that the existing duty of twenty per cent was not even a revenue duty, and that if it were reduced to an appreciable extent, these 9,000 people with their families would cross the border and go to the United States, there to earn their money and consume the products of American farmers rather than those of Canadian farmers, and that the American manufacturers of these machines, if such a reduction in duty took place, would slaughter their surplus products in Canada until they strangled our industry, and having done that, would raise the price to the Canadian farmers, so that their last

state would be worse than their first. Good Conservative doctrine, which the same hon. gentleman opposite had ridiculed in days gone by. Evidently the responsibilities or the emoluments of office had a wonderful effect in changing his views on this question. On this subject it is worth while to quote the expressions of another colleague of the Minister of Customs, Sir Richard Cartwright, who, in dealing with the tariff in 1895, gave voice to a truth which is very applicable to the policy of the party of which he is now a member. Said that hon. gentleman, in referring to tariff thinkering:

This is not a case for half measures. You have in the fate of the Democratic party of the United States a warning and an example of the doom which will overtake any party that palters with its convictions, and after having placed itself at the head of a great popular movement, will offer the people a stone instead of bread.

What can you call this reduction of 2½ per cent on implements but a stone which hon. gentlemen opposite are offering to the farmers of the west? For in my humble judgment it will not reduce the price of these machines one single dollar, while if the amendment of the hon. member for Souris is carried, it will give them an opportunity of testing whether a tariff reduction will have the effect of lowering the price to the farmers. But there is another hon. gentleman on the treasury benches who visited western Canada prior to 1896, and also singled out this duty. Speaking in the town of Moosomin on October 4, 1894, and referring to the offer of the United States to admit these machines free of duty whenever they were put on the free list in this country, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sydner Fisher) referred to the negligence, as he called it, of the Conservative government in not taking advantage of the reciprocal clause in the American tariff in the following words:

Because the United States congress has made a standing offer of reciprocity in implements, and it was the duty of the Canadian government to take advantage of that offer. Last year the farmers of western Canada imported $120,000 worth of American implements on which they paid $40,000 duty. Referring to the Massey-Harris combination, he claimed that the fact that these people spoke of going to the States to fight the Yankees in their own markets showed that Canadian manufacturers were able to get along without protection. Canadians were able to hold their own with the Yankees in any walk of life. If Massey-Harris got protection, why should not the farmers?

Echo answers, why? The hon. gentleman gave the answer himself when he told the people of the motherland that we did not wish them to adopt a protective policy or to give us any preference in their market. To be sure, he has explained that he only spoke as a farmer, not as a statesman; but we know that his speech on that subject has been interpreted by the English press as coming from a member of the Canadian government. He stated in 1894 that the Massey-Harris Company were able to compete with the American implement manufacturers in the markets of the world; and yet to-day that company continue to enjoy just as much protection as they did then—in fact more, because the valuation of the machines has been increased since this government came into power, and the 20 per cent of duty on the increased valuation raises the duty considerably above what it was under the Conservative regime. These hon. gentlemen are taking care that their good friends, the Massey-Harris people, shall not suffer, because what they are taking away with one hand, they are giving back to them with the other in the shape of a rebate on the duty paid on the raw materials entering into the machines. Another reason why I think this duty should be reduced is that the Massey-Harris people were not the only people who claimed that they could get along without protection. Senator Frost prior to the election in 1896 issued a circular in which he stated that he did not require protection to enable him to compete with his American competitors. Yet to-day, when these gentlemen are amassing fortunes at the expense of the farmers of this country, they are surely in a much better position to compete not only with the Americans but with any other people engaged in the same line of business. Now, the cost of producing these machines has not yet been investigated by the Tariff Commission. I was somewhat surprised at the Minister of Customs admitting that this afternoon. I should have thought that was one of his first duties in making a thorough investigation, in order to assure himself whether or not the manufacturers were imposing on the farmers by having an undue profit on their machines. One of the first things should have been to ask the manufacturers the cost of building one of these machines. The minister may say that that is a very difficult matter to get at, that possibly no person other than the manufacturers would be able to afford that information. Well, it is the manufacturers who should have supplied it, they should have produced that evidence. I remember reading a few years ago of an accident on the Canadian Pacific Railway by which certain cars were derailed and some binders were injured. There was a lawsuit and the question of the valuation of the machines—I think they were McCormack binders—came up and evidence was adduced at the trial which went to show that the cost of construction was $48 or $49. That is a point with which the members of the government should have made themselves thoroughly converstant before touching the duty; they should have

ascertained whether the manufacturers are really reaping undue profits as we think they are.

We have had tariff commissions more than once. The Liberal party denounced the Conservative government before 1894 for going to the west and to other parts of Canada seeking information. They said that the information was available, that it was not necessary to have such a commission, and yet one of the first acts of the Liberal government in 1896 was to appoint a commission to go through the country and take evidence just as in the days of their predecessors. Not only that but before revising the tariff last year they appointed another tariff commission and apparently, from the reply of the Minister of Customs, this commission did their work none too thoroughly; they omitted to accertain some things that might throw light on such questions as the duty on agricultural implements.

In voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) I think I am still a protectionist, I think I am a consistent protectionist. It was never intended by the designers of the national policy that there should be a really high tariff such as 35 per cent on agricultural implements and other things, and that the tariff should last for all time to come, irrespective of changes in trade conditions and markets. I would feel like meeting the wishes of my constituents and I am sure I would be doing so in voting that the duty on implements be reduced 10 per cent, and if there is any benefit in price to be derived by reason of the reduced tariff, it will not be derived by the mere pittance of a 2½ per cent reduction, but would be much more likely to result from a reduction of 10 per cent

Mr. PATERSON. When it was stated that implements had gone up $5 I did not impugn the speaker's source of information. My impression is, however, that when hon. gentlemen go back to the west they will find that implements have been reduced in price to an amount equal to the reduction of the tariff. They will ascertain whether that is correct or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Will they send us word then?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know whether gentlemen on your side will but I hope it will reach us from this side.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it only in the west?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know about the east but gentlemen opposite made the statement that in the west the price had been raised.

I wish to allude to a remark of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). He is a very fair debater, and he has given a reason why this article of reaper and mowers has been a special object of attack. He draws a line because the manufacturers of these articles have a large export trade and other manufacturing industries have not as large a line of exports, and he says that when the export nearly equals or exceeds the imports on any article then the duty ought to be reduced. I think that is his argument, am I correct?

Mr. HENDERSON. That was my argument, that where an industry has a worldwide market I thought that all that was expected by the promoters of the national policy has practically been accomplished, the industry has been put fairly on its feet and ought to be able to walk with less help.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has, not so much as other gentlemen, regaled us with old speeches; I think we have had Sir John Macdonald in 1876, thirty years ago, and Sir Richard Cartwright ten or 11 years ago. I want to come down to more recent utterances. I remember my hon. friend from Halton was advocating only a few nights ago a higher duty on butter and cheese. Well we will apply his rule to these commodities. The import of cheese was 368,631 pounds; the export was 215,916,157 pounds—and he calls for an increased duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. gentleman regard that as one of the manufacturing industries of the country?

Mr. PATERSON. I regard that as one of the most important manufacturing industries in the country, and if my hon. friend will tell his farming constituents that it is not a manufacturing industry he will get his answer.

Then take butter: we imported 143,451 pounds of butter and exported 34,081,142 pounds. And the hon. gentleman, in common with other hon. gentlemen on the other side, clamoured to have a higher rate of duty. But lo and behold, when you come to agricultural implements, of which I do not know if the exports equal the imports, then that is a reason to cut the duty in two. Think of that, we need not go back ten years for that.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Have you reason to suppose that the manufacturers of butter and cheese have unduly enhanced the price to the consumers?

Mr. PATERSON. No, but if I might use the same argument, the hon. member for Halton would be obliged to admit that the twenty per cent duty on agricultural implements does not enhance the price either. You see that? I point out to the hon. gentleman from Halton and hon. gentlemen opposite that if they look up the returns they will find that the exports of the hog are over fifteen million dollars, and the imports will not be found to be one-third of that amount. Shall we therefore

reduce the duty on pork ? Undoubtedly, by the hon. gentleman's argument that must be done. That is one of the most important manufacturing industries in this country, one in which the farmers are most vitally interested, and it is inevitable, according to my hon. friend's argument, that the duty must come off butter, pork, cheese, on which he has been clamouring for a higher duty. Is it not better to discuss speeches like these instead of speeches that are twenty years old ? Hon. gentlemen who have spoken to-day who were in the last parliament voted for the resolution of the leader of the party, which is the party platform ; that was a vote of want of confidence in this government because we had not given what they termed adequate protection to the various industries of this country. This is not a question of ten or five years ago; these are speeches the echoes of which are still around this House, which have never been repudiated, and as to the term 'adequate protection,' while the mover did not give the figures it was declared by his followers, and from his argument it was to be inferred, that it meant the prohibition of the importation of the millions of dollars worth of goods that were coming into this country. That is what they voted for. And you voted for that in agricultural implements too. There is no shirking it—that is where you stand, with reference to this matter. The declaration plainly made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and other gentlemen on that side, when they were asked what they meant, one of them declared that he did not care if the duties were 100 per cent.——

Mr. HENDERSON. Which one ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) said that if he had his own way he would build a Chinese wall around this country and not allow anything to come in. Now, I am not here to consider what Sir Richard Cartwright said twelve or fifteen years ago, or what Sir John Macdonald said thirty years ago; I am dealing with living issues with questions that are now before us and must be faced. Why, they taunt hon. members on this side with changing their views—there can be no such change of views on this side as that shown by hon. gentlemen on the other side in calling for what they called adequate protection at one time, and now favouring ten per cent duties. There is no such volte face to be pointed to in the history of the tariff controversy. You tell me that both parties are alike on the trade question ? I tell you no: You are protectionists and have declared over and over again that you believe in the principle of protection in the tariff: We as a party, have denounced a tariff founded on protection as a principle.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. PATERSON. Hon. members opposite laugh. The protection principle is what they voted for, and 'adequate protection' that would exclude every article that would compete with any line of production in this country. We took our stand against them and declared for a tariff framed for revenue purposes. This tariff was founded on that principle, and that it carries out its object is shown by the fact that under it we have collected a revenue of $50,000,000 at a lower rate of taxation than that employed under their protectionist tariff which raised only $17,000,000 or $18,000,000. No, the parties are not alike on the trade question. We do not believe in prohibiting the importation of goods into this country, we believe in a tariff that allows competition. But these hon. members opposite, who were in favour of hundred per cent duties and a Chinese wall, tell us that in case of this industry in which there is an importation of $130,000 worth, in this country, they want a reduction of the duty to less than the revenue basis. Let them be consistent for once and ask for a tariff of forty per cent in order to exclude these imports instead of talking about the utterances years ago of Sir Richard Cartwright and Sir John Macdonald. Talk about yourselves, and what you voted for and what you stand for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The pumped-up excitement of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is a little amusing. I do not wonder that he does not care to discuss his speeches of ten years ago, or those of Sir Richard Cartwright of fifteen years ago, or those of Sir John Macdonald of thirty years ago. He naturally would not care to discuss his own celebrated speech in 1894 or 1895, when he asked his hearers if that policy which had made Paterson rich had made them rich also. I happened to glance over that speech the other day, and I think I must soon give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) an opportunity of committing it to memory, for he has evidently forgotten a good deal of it.

Mr. PATERSON. No, it was all right; it was a very good speech.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) takes good care not to make such a speech to-day.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, just the same.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We shall see.

Mr. GERMAN. If the hon. member (Mr. R. L. Borden) will excuse me—what the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said was that people said that the tariff had made him rich, and he asked the public if it had made them rich also.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN : And then he went on to describe the policy of protection as one which had taken the money out of the pockets of the consumers and put it into

the pockets of the aforesaid Paterson and other maunfacturers.

Mr. PATERSON. No, no.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We shall get that speech one of these days and read a little of it to see whether it bears out my contention or that of the hon. gentleman opposite. He says the two parties have not the same policy. That is true in one respect. Hon. gentlemen opposite go through the country and, where it suits their political interest, they pose as free traders ; yet, they take good care, as in the case of agricultural implements, to arrange the tariff so that it shall protect their political friends, and if they reduce the duty on agricultural implements by 2½ per cent they take good care that this does not come out of the manufacturers of agricultural implements—because these gentlemen are mainly their political friends—but comes out of other manufacturers through drawbacks. That is the the position of the Minister of Customs before the House to-day. He is not saying to the consumer now, as he said in 1895 : This money is being taken out of your pocket and being put into those of manufactureres like myself and others. Oh, no. To-day he tells the consumer : We will keep up the tariff ; but, if we are compelled to reduce any duty which benefits friends of ours, we will take good care to make it up to them in another way. Why, since the House opened at three o'clock this afternoon, the hon. gentleman has contradicted himself over and over again, as to the policy on which this tariff is framed. He tells us in one breath that it is based upon the policy of revenue, and he makes the astonishing argument that it is based on revenue because it brings in a large revenue.

Mr. PATERSON. At a lower rate of taxation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) knows that that was not his argument in days gone by. His argument then was that the taxation must be judged on a per capita basis.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the way to measure the national debt.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And that was the way to measure national taxation according to the hon. gentleman not so many years ago. But that is not his song now ; to-day he makes these extraordinary statements about the policy upon which his tariff is based. Why, this tariff is not based upon any policy at all except to get as much money out of the people as possible and to protect the interests of his own political friends. In one breath he tells us it is a revenue tariff, and in the next he tells us that it is framed with a view to protecting some particular interest. He talks of incidental protection. And he and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) have been defending item after item upon a protectionist theory and that theory alone. And then he stands up here and in a voice, the echoes of which, I imagine, to use his own expression, will be ringing for some days to come, he tells us that this tariff has no basis at all.

Mr. PATERSON. You want to listen to those echoes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, because they are amusing and we need a little amusement to relieve the strain of the hard work in this House.

Well, what would one have supposed to be the proper object of that Tariff Commission of which the hon. gentleman was a member ? Was it not his story in by-gone days that money was being taken by excessive prices out of the consumers of this country, and that that money was going into the pockets of millionaire manufacturers—'Robbers great and robbers small,' as they were graphically described by the Minister of Trade and Commerce ? The money was being taken out of the pockets of these people by excessive prices. Have not the farmers of this country been complaining from one end of it to another that they were being charged higher prices for their agricultural implements than were the farmers of the United States ? Have they not been urging that these implements could be manufactured in Canada just as cheaply as in the United States ? Well, if the Minister of Commerce had had one spark of the principles which actuated him in by-gone days, what would he have done? He would have called these manufacturers before him and would have ascertained the cost at which these goods could be manufactured in Canada. That is the first thing he should have done. Did he do it ? No, he kept just as far from doing that as possible, it never entered into his mind to do it. What would he have done next? Would he not have ascertained for the benefit of the farmers whether these articles were being sold throughout the markets of the world at a lower price than they were being sold to the farmers of Canada ? Did he touch that question ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the result ?

Mr. PATERSON. That Canada buys her implements cheaper than any other country under the sun except the United States, I think was the answer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I do not see any statement like that in the document which has been brought down, although I inquired definitely as to that two or three weeks ago. I made a number of inquiries with regard to matters that seemed relevant to the discussion of this subject, but

the information which has been brought down is of the most meagre character Surely I was entitled to the courtesy of that information if it was in the possession of the government. I asked for it two or three weeks ago, and I did not get it. The hon. gentleman now informs me that he thinks it is in the possession of the government. The only question I have to ask is this, if it was in the possession of the government, why was it not afforded to myself and other members of this House after we had made a courteous request for it ?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot remember whether that is in the long hand notes or not. But it has been stated to me, I think publicly, it may have been in the press, it may have been in a circular letter, but I think it was stated before the Tariff Commission, that agricultural implements, having special reference I think to reapers and mowers, were sold at a lower price—I think that was the expression—in Canada than they were in any other country under the sun except the United States. That is my remembrance of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman perhaps is referring to the summary of Mr. Jones' evidence contained at the end of this memorandum, and it is only right I should give it. He said :

There is no country in the world where such implements are sold to the user as low as in Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. It may be that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be that. It seems to me that is a very casual inquiry to make into a subject of so much importance to the people of this country. It was not an inquiry at all, it was not even evidence taken on oath ; it was simply a statement of one of the principal manufacturers of agricultural implements who goes before that Tariff Commission with the idea that the duties should be increased, or at least maintained, and he makes the remark that nowhere are these implements sold to the users so low as in Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. Be fair now. Could we have ascertained all the hon. gentleman is asking now from anybody else than the manufacturers of those implements themselves ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But did not the Tariff Commission have power to take evidence on oath ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was never proposed to be an inquiry on oath.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They should have had that power.

Mr. FIELDING. Not at all.

Mr R. L. BORDEN. Well, in other countries they do not look at it in that way. A commission in Australia investigated that subject by evidence taken on oath, and they were able to report to the parliament and people of Australia the exact cost of these implements in Australia. For my part I do not see why information of that kind should not be afforded to the people of this country. It is right that it should be afforded ; if the statement of Mr. Jones is correct, then it is in the interest of the manufacturers themselves that it should be afforded to the people. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs talks about adequate protection. Adequate protection I stand for as much as I ever did ; but I do not stand for adequate protection under conditions which will make our people pay more than they ought to pay for agricultural implements, or any thing else. The principle of this very Bill is that where there is a combination among the manufacturers unduly to promote their own interests at the expense of the consumers, then the government, on satisfactory evidence of that kind, is authorized by order in council to remove the duty altogether, or to lower it. That is a principle for which the Minister of Customs stands. If excessive prices are charged to the consumer in Canada at the present time for agricultural implements, that must be owing to a combination among the manufacturers of those implements, there cannot be any doubt of that. I should think that that subject should have engaged the attention of this commission. We should have had information at least on these three points : One, the cost of manufacturing these articles in Canada ; next, the price at which these goods are sold in the markets of the world ; and thirdly, if excessive prices are charged, are these excessive prices due in any way to a combination among the manufacturers ? Now so far as I am concerned, I can readily conceive that these industries might be established upon so firm a basis that 10 per cent would be a fair protection to persons engaged in the manufacture. I do not think there is evidence before the House to justify me at present in coming to that conclusion, and for that reason I would not be inclined to support the reduction which has been proposed. But I do say to the government that I believe it is their bounden duty to ascertain whether excessive prices are being exacted in Canada, prices which are not being exacted elsewhere in the world; the government should ascertain whether these charges are based upon substantial facts, and if they are based upon substantial facts, then it seems to me that the government should take steps to modify the tariff, unless the manufacturers of these implements are prepared to lower their prices to the farmers who are so vitally interested in obtaining these goods at a fair rate.

The Minister of Customs, and the Minister of Finance as well, based their modification of the tariff upon sugar on the theory that the manufacturers of sugar were making too great profit; that was the argument put forward by the Minister of Customs himself. Well, if that is a good argument to modify the duty upon sugar, why is it not a good argument to modify the duty upon agricultural implements? Does the Minister of Customs stand for a tariff which will enable these gentlemen to combine among themselves and charge the farmers of Canada $30 or $40 more than they should charge upon each one of these implements?

Mr. PATERSON. Do you assert there is a combination?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. Minister of Customs assert that there is not?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not need to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You never found it out by your Tariff Commission; that is what it was for. If it were not to investigate matters of that kind for what purpose did these gentlemen roam around the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific? I do not know. What did they accomplish? What information of value did they get if they did not touch a subject of this kind. I do not think they accomplished very much and I would be inclined to think that if they had gone into some matters of this kind they could have accomplished something. My hon. friend from Halton has referred to what has taken place in Australia. The difficulty I have about his proposition and about the proposition of my hon. friend from Souris is that the government has not afforded the House the information which it ought to have been afforded and upon which this matter could have been discussed intelligently and thoroughly. We know just about as much in regard to the particular subject we are discussing to-night as if these three ministers had not gone about the country at all. We are in no better position to discuss this subject intelligently to-night than we would be if the Tariff Commission had never roamed around the country during six or seven months of last year. Under these circumstances it does not seem to me that the suggestions of the hon. Minister of Customs are of very much relevancy to this debate and I sincerely regret we have not that information which would have enabled us to deal with this mattter in a more thorough and businesslike way than we seem to be doing at the present time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may be entitled to say a word in answer to the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). He gave me credit for being a fair debater. I am inclined to treat him with the same courtesy but I desire to draw attention to one statement he made in which, I think, he did me somewhat of an injustice. I think I can enlighten the minister of Customs as to how he fell into the error. He charges me with having advocated some years ago a Chinese wall around this country as an evidence of the kind of protection that would advocate. I may say to the Minister of Customs that that is an expression that I have no recollection of ever having used in a tariff debate either in this House or in the country and I am quite sure at this moment that I did not make use of such an expression.

Mr. PATERSON. I certainly withdraw it then.

Mr. HENDERSON. I want to inform the minister how he fell into the error. I remember being in a western town in Ontario several years ago when the same thing was quoted against me by a former member of this House, Mr. Mahlon Cowan. I asked him to produce the authority upon which he made that statement and he handed me a copy of 'Hansard' which contained the assertion that the member for Halton had made that statement in the House of Commons. On looking into it I discovered that the speech was delivered by the Minister of Customs, not by myself at all. The Minister of Customs intended in that speech to make a quotation of something I had said in this House. I may tell the minister, and I hope it will save him the trouble of repeating that statement, that I investigated that matter afterwards and discovered the truth of what had been my impression that the Minister of Customs, instead of quoting it as the statement of the hon. member who had made the statement, quoted it as having been made by the hon. member for Halton. He thus incorporated it in his own speech and I presume it is for that reason he has repeated the statement to-night.

Mr. PATERSON. I certainly was honest in my expression. Who was the member who made the statement?

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps the hon. minister, if he investigates the speech delivered about that time, will find out.

Mr. BOLE. I have the speech right here, and in order that the hon. member (Mr. Henderson)——

Mr. HENDERSON. I am stating that that is my impression about it.

Mr. BOLE. Shall I read it?

Mr. HENDERSON. Read it.

Mr. BOLE (reading):

> But we say we will put a Chinese wall round this country, and we will not allow these Americans to come in here and monopolize the markets.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the hon. member quoting from?

Mr. BOLE. If the hon. member says that this quotation is from the speech of the hon. Minister of Customs 'Hansard' does him an injustice because it appears plainly as his own speech. It will be found at page 2087, vol. 1, 1903.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no recollection of ever having made that statement, but my recollection was that the Minister of Customs quoted from another gentleman in the House and not from myself. In order to put myself right if I am wrong and if I am accusing the Minister of Customs wrongly, which I have no desire to do, I may say that was the impression that I had for some years after it was quoted against me because I have no recollection of ever having made use of any such expression nor did I ever intend to advocate any such policy.

Mr. BOLE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me if he has any recollection of making another statement to be found in the same speech, page 2096, which I will just read:

> I think I can safely make this statement without fear of successful contradiction, that we never had cheaper agricultural implements in Canada that we had under the thirty-five per cent tariff, when the national policy was in full swing. We took fifteen per cent off, but there was not a drop of fifteen per cent in the price.

If we take 7½ per cent more off will there be a difference of 7½ per cent in the price?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think so. I think it is possible that I did make that statement and I referred to the fact this afternoon but I did not contend that high duties conduced to high prices. I said that we had under the regime of the national policy cheaper woollen goods and cheaper cotton goods than at any other time, and I am not aware that there was any reduction in the price of agricultural implements after the reduction from 35 to 20 per cent. Now, the Minister of Customs endeavoured to make a point against me by classifying buttter and cheese factories with manufacturing industries. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman puts these in the Trade and Navigation returns. I have always understood that butter and cheese came under the head of agricultural products and I think I am right in that respect. If you go to the country to-day and ask a farmer who is growing grain, wheat, barley or oats, or who is raising hogs and selling them to the pork packer, or who sends milk to the creamery and has it made into butter and cheese if he regards himself as a manufacturer he will say no. There is not one farmer in the country who will so classify himself. The farmers throughout the country, east and west do not regard themselves as manufacturers. They are farmers, they are agriculturists and I was perfectly right in the distinction I made in quoting from the Trade and Navigation returns with respect to the tariff as affecting the manufacturing industries of this country, cheese and butter making is not treated as a manufacturing industry. The raising of cattle or beef is not treated as a manufacturing industry. They are not so regarded by the people of the country and in the Trade and Navigation returns they have always been classified as being apart from manufacturers. They go under the head of agricultural products. I think my statement was quite clear and I shall not be obliged to make any change in the basis of the proposition I have made.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) ever heard of a cheese factory and a butter factory; factories must manufacture something?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, and I heard one time of a man living on dried apples.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Is that what sent you to the hospital?

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Customs asked if we considered 10 per cent a sufficient protection for agricultural implements. I will answer that by asking him another question. There is a glove manufactory in my town, and all the protection that is given to it by this protectionist government is 9⅛ per cent. The Minister of Finance considers that 9⅛ per cent is sufficient protection for the glove industry to live under, but he objects very much to the agricultural implement manufacturer having less than 17½ per cent. The glove manufacturer pays 10 per cent on the chief part of his raw product, and when he imports from Germany, which he does to a considerable extent, the surtax makes the duty on his raw material 13⅓ per cent. As the protection under the preferential tariff, under which most of the imported gloves enter is 22½ per cent, therefore the glove manufacturer has a protection of only 9⅛ per cent. The Minister of Finance calls that protection for the glove industry, but he objects to 10 per cent as being sufficient protection to the farm implement maker. The Minister of Finance discountenances the idea of being called a protectionist. I do not see why these hon. gentlemen opposite should fight so shy of the name. Since they adopt the principle why do they not accept the name as well? Let me give an example of how much higher protectionists these hon. gentlemen opposite are than were their predecessors. When the Conservative party left power in 1896, gray cottons, an article of every day use in every household, had a duty of 22½ per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite put it on the 25 per cent list. True, they gave a preference on goods imported from Britain, but practically the importation of that class of goods is from the United States under the 25 per cent tariff, and very little comes

from Great Britain. The minister will therefore admit that gray cottons are 20 per cent higher to-day than they were ten years ago, and consequently on the 20 per cent advance the duty on a dollar's worth of cotton would be 30 cents, whereas under the Conservative regime it was only 22½ cents. And yet these hon. gentlemen opposite tell us they are not protectionists.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) must quarrel with 'Hansard,' but I suppose all of us occasionally get into that box.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am quarreling with my memory.

Mr. FIELDING. We do not trust our memory in this House; there are occasions when we forget. We have a 'Hansard' which is awkward sometimes for some of us, and I have no doubt that occasionally I find it awkward myself. But even if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) should persuade us that he never gave utterance to that sentiment, yet it is strongly in accord with the position of his party on that question, because I well remember that the whip of the Conservative party (Mr. Taylor) when, in one of the discussions, he was called upon to define what adequate protection was, he said it was sufficient protection to keep the foreign goods out. That is a very simple answer and a very fair one, and so my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson), just as coming events cast their shadows before, was merely anticipating the principle which was laid down in the definition of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I think the leader of the opposition was rather ungenerous in his reference to the Minister of Customs. I think he ought to be very grateful to the Minister of Customs for calling his attention to the phrase 'adequate protection.' for had it not been for that reference of the Minister of Customs, we never would have heard of it throughout the present session. True, we did hear of it occasionally in past sessions, when there were no tariff proposals before the House, but now that we have submitted an elaborate proposal involving a revision of the whole tariff, during the several months since the tariff has been brought down we never heard of adequate protection until to-night, and then only when the Minister of Customs drew the attention of the leader of the opposition to it. My hon. friend says he cannot understand what the object of this Tariff Commission was, if it did not take evidence upon oath. Well, the manner in which this commission conducted its affairs is well known; its proceedings were held in the open, and I believe that to-night for the first time has any body stated that it was a case which called for an investigation on oath. My hon. friend asks why we did not inquire into the cost of making agricultural implements. There was no more reason why we should take evidence upon oath as to the cost of making agricultural implements, than as to the cost of making any other article produced by the manufacturers of Canada. If we had undertaken to inquire by sworn evidence into the cost of making every article produced by the manufacturers of Canada, if we had undertaken to inquire by sworn evidence into the cost of making every article produced in Canada, then instead of roaming over the country (to use the expression of my hon. friend) for several months, that commission would have found it necessary to anchor itself somewhere for several years. I fear it would have been too heavy a task for the ministers who had that matter in charge. What then was the purpose of the commission? It was not to hold investigations in the sense in which my hon. friend referred to them. The object of the commission was to afford the people in different parts of the country an opportunity to present their views. That opportunity had not always been given to the people. Sometimes, for reason consistent no doubt with the public business of the time, Ministers of Finance were not able to give this opportunity to the people generally throughout the country. They were able to hear such persons as came to their office and presented their views. Naturally the effect of that was that the well organized manufacturers of the country were constantly in attendance at the office of the Minister of Finance, but there was little opportunity for the rank and file, the mass of the people, to be heard. And so, inasmuch as the masses of the people could not be expected to come from the east and the west, and the north and the south, to present their views at the office of the Minister of Finance, it seemed only reasonable that a committee of ministers should visit the different parts of the country and afford the people an opportunity of presenting their views. The Tariff Commission was very largely a listening commission, and, having given the people an opportunity of presenting their views, the whole purpose of the commission was carried out. Nothing was further from the thoughts of the commission, nothing was further from the thoughts of parliament, nothing was further, I am sure, from the thoughts of the leader of the opposition—until the idea occurred to him to-night—than that this commission should enter upon an investigation under oath as to the cost of producing any particular article. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has repeatedly referred to a combination in regard to these agricultural implements. I do not think that is a fair way to treat the question. Speaking from memory—one does not like to be too positive in a matter

which occupied a number of months and as to which volumes of testimony was re-received—but speaking from memory, I do not think it was represented to the government that there was a combination among the manufacturers of agricultural implements. I do not know that anybody alleged any such thing. Wherever a man pays a higher price than he thinks he ought to pay, he is apt to say there is a combination, but I have no recollection of any such representation having been made. Certainly, no such representation was ever made in a form which called for any serious inquiry, and I have no reason to believe there has been any combination at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not assert there was. I was asking for information, and particularly in view of the statements which have been made that the manufacturers got out price-lists of exactly the same character, and quoting the same prices for these implements. I do not know that that is the case.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend thought it was the duty of the commission that there was not—in other words, to a prove a negative.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, to find out the facts.

Mr. FIELDING. I think there should be a fair presumption that there is a combination before we undertake to find out that there is not. However, to the best of my knowledge and belief, no representations of that character were made to us, and I have no reason to think that there is a combination. My hon. friend has referred again and again to the alleged high price at which these goods are sold. There is no evidence that the price is excessive. I think the evidence has shown that the price paid in Canada is the American price plus the duty. I always assume that when a manufacturer has a duty on an article corresponding to what he makes, he will take advantage of the duty: I do not expect him to do anything else, and I have no doubt that the Canadian manufacturer takes advantage of the duty, and that the price at which these articles are sold in Canada is the American price plus the Canadian duty. But does that produce an excessive price? If so, there has been no evidence presented to us to that effect. Indeed, the only reference made specifically to the price to-night rather leads to another conclusion. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) referred to the inquiry which took place in regard to the Australian tariff, and, if I quote him correctly, he said that it provided that where a binder is sold at £70, the duty is at a certain figure, and that when it is sold at a less price, there is a reduction of the duty. At all events, the price of a binder in Australia, which was made the subject of legislation, was the price which my hon. friend quoted, being from £65 to £75. I do not know whether a binder in Australia is different from a binder in Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me? What I had reference to was what is called a stripper harvester. It is a machine driven through the wheat, and it strips the head off the wheat, threshes the wheat, cleans and bags it, and prepares it for the market. It is a very costly machine. I was not comparing prices at all. I was simply showing the nature of their tariff, which provided that if the manufacturers did not on a certain day bring down the price of the machine to a certain figure the duty would be reduced.

Mr. FIELDING. The representations made to us by a member of the firm of the Massey-Harris Co., representations which I have placed in the hands of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, were in general terms that there is no country in the world where agricultural implements are sold cheaper than they are in Canada, except in the United States.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He does not say that, he does not make any exception.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps I am reasoning from an impression I got generally.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can the Finance Minister name any other country in the world where such implements are made or sold?

Mr. FIELDING. They are sold in all the countries in the world. It is the proud boast of the Massey-Harris Company that they supply agricultural implements made in Canada to every country in the world.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When the hon. minister was inquiring of the Massey-Harris concern, why did he not ascertain the cost of these implements made in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. I have already explained; and I do not mind saying to my hon. friend that no matter what the implements cost, the duty we impose under this tariff is a fair and reasonable duty, and there is no more reason why we should hold an inquest as to what it costs to make agricultural implements than we should as to the cost of any other article.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why do you give rebates on the iron and steel that enters into the machines?

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend looks at the drawback schedule he will find that we give rebates to a number of industries in Canada. Then, it is assumed that this duty of 17½ per cent is a high duty, and it is said that we give the manufacturer his materials free. That also is to some extent a mistake. It is true, we allow the

manufacturer a drawback on several things, and by a careful calculation we are advised that the drawbacks we allow are somewhat less than the disadvantage under which the manufacturer is placed by the reduction of the tariff. But it is a mistake to suppose that he has everything free. He still has to pay duty on all the machinery he uses, on his coal, on his paint, on his oils, on his varnish, on some kinds of wood, on bolts and nuts, on malleable iron.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Cannot these goods be made in Canada ?

Mr. FIELDING. In some cases they are, but he has to pay duties on quite a wide range of things. So that the idea that he has a duty of 17½ per cent on the implement and has all his materials free is a mistake. Even suppose for a moment that he got everything free and had a duty of 17½ per cent on the implement, would that be an extravagant duty as things go in this country ? Take, for instance, the woollen industry. The woollen manufacturer gets practically all his imported wools free, and yet he has a minimum duty of 30 per cent. While we are advocates of a moderate tariff, I for one do not hesitate to say that I have no desire to see any established industry in this country injured. We have tried, in the arrangement of all these tariff schedules, by patient examination and inquiry, by keeping the matter open sometimes perhaps for a little longer than we should have done, in order to enable all parties to be heard, to avoid doing injustice to any established industry. I believe this proposal of the hon. member for Souris, if adopted, would do an injustice to an established industry. Perhaps, as the leader of the opposition is going to support the government in this matter, I ought not to dwell too strongly on the objections I have to the amendment, but I wish to point out that the agricultural implement industry is one that is widely distributed in Canada. There are several large factories, and a considerable number of small ones. The manufacture of mowers and binders is a large part of the business, and if you made the duty on these so low that the business would be seriously affected, you would be injuring an established industry in a way that this government certainly has no desire to do. I do not see my hon. friend from Hamilton in his place to-night. If I followed the example of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche), I suppose I would say that he had dodged in and out, but I presume that my hon. friend is out for good reasons.

I would like to know what my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) thinks of a motion which runs the risk of closing up one of the great industries of his town ? The International Harvester Company in Hamilton to-day pays out, I am advised, $1,000,000 a year in wages to its employees, to the mechanics of Hamilton, and mowers and binders are large items in their production. My hon. friend by his motion says that that great industry, which has only 17½ per cent duty, while some other industries have 30 per cent, is to be put in peril. My belief is that if this motion were passed —and I am glad to know that it is not going to be supported even by all the hon. gentlemen on the other side—we would strike a severe blow at one of the great industries of the country. I believe the International Harvester Company would find it to its interest to close up its business in Hamilton, at least so much of it as is devoted to mowers and binders, and have them made at the American branch and bring them from the United States. The factory in Hamilton is an American concern. With a moderate duty we have induced American capital to come into Canada and to establish that great industry, and after we have brought it in and established it in Canada I believe that if we were to pass this resolution the company operating that industry would find it profitable to close the Hamilton factory and bring in goods which they make in the United States. I rejoice to know that the motion of my hon. friend is not going to receive the assent of even all the hon. gentlemen opposite. On behalf of the government I wish to say, following the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), that while we are not advocating a high tariff, while we are not advocating Chinese wall tariff, while we are not seeking to shut everything out, we are willing that a moderate degree of protection, if you care to use the word, arising out of a tariff designed for revenue, but incidentally giving some protection, in some instances a considerable measure of protection—we are willing that where there is a great industry in Canada it shall receive a fair measure of consideration, which we have given by this tariff on agricultural implements, and so I must ask the House to reject the amendment of the hon. gentleman from Souris (Mr. Schaffner).

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister say that the duty put on has no relation, and is not intended to have relation to the price at which the article shall be sold ?

Mr. FIELDING. My view is that all duties have a relation to the price of the article, and therefore when the duty is reduced by 2½ per cent I believe it must lead to a reduction, if not at one moment at another, to that extent in the price of the article.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to argue that it had no relation to the price, but was intended to be moderate pro-

tection. If that be so why did he find it necessary to put a provision in the tariff law that where it was proven to the satisfaction of the government that by any combination or other means the price of an article was unreasonably enhanced the government should have the right to take off the duty ?

Mr. FIELDING. That provision was put in the tariff ten years ago and fully explained then ; it has been discussed occasionally since, and I do not think that I can now give any new reasons.

Mr. SPROULE. I assume that is the correct reason for which it was put there and it was intended for that purpose by the minister of finance, but the line of argument that he has adopted, to-night would entirely negative that intention with regard to that provision.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think so.

Mr. TURRIFF. I regret that owing to absence from the city I did not hear the motion of my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner)) and I mention this for fear that my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) may also say of me, as he has said of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles), that I was dodging this question. This is not a question that representatives of the farmers from the west at all events, need to dodge, and I wish for a moment to state why I purpose to vote for the tariff as it has been brought down by the minister. If I could believe that the members on the other side were in earnest, that if they came into power they would make this reduction in the duties, I would perhaps be inclined to give it some consideration ; but the whole history of the Conservative party on this question, is against that supposition altogether. We find that even to-night they are not at all agreed. The hon. gentleman from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) proposes to make a reduction of 7½ per cent. I think that same hon. member supported the Conservative party all through when they had a duty of 35 per cent on these goods. I think he supported Hon. Hugh John Macdonald in 1900 when he advocated free agricultural implements at a time when every other Conservative leader throughout the country was advocating higher duties than the government had at that time. Then we have the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to-night saying he is not altogether in favour of reducing the duties as suggested, so that we see that if the Conservatives did come into power it is altogether unlikely they would make this reduction. We all remember very well that in 1900, when the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald in the County of Brandon advocated free implements, the farmers did not believe that he was in earnest.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How much did it take to convince them to the contrary ?

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman knows probably better than I do how much it cost to get the vote given to his candidate in that constitutency.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. $1,200 a head.

Mr. TURRIFF. But that has nothing to do with the question.

Mr. SAM HUGHES.—Hear, hear.

Mr. TURRIFF. The farmers of that constituency at all events were not very much impressed with the idea of free implements. Now coming to the present day the tariff commission got information all over the country and I do not think the farmers of the west at all events, asked for a great reduction such as is proposed by this resolution on agricultural implements. What the farmers of the west were afraid of was that the manufacturers, organized as they were, would be able to get at the ear of the government at all times and to bring a great deal of influence to bear on any government—and we all recognize that fact—and they felt that the tendency would be that the duties would be increased and they were afraid this would occur on agricultural implements and everything else which the farmer requires to use. They therefore asked that the duties be left alone, to use a slang phrase, they asked the government to stand pat on the tariff they had and that is practically what the government has done, and I am pleased to see that in some respects, on a good many things that we have to use in the west, there has been a reduction of duties. I would very much rather trust to the government that has carried out a low tariff on agricultural implements all through and that has come down at this session and made a reduction from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent. Some hon. memmber stated that this was only a fractional reduction, but 2½ per cent is a reduction of over 10 per cent of the amount of duties that we have been paying in the past, so I say that this is not a matter that any member from a western constituency, any member representing a farmers constituency need shirk—I have the honour of representing a constituency that is absolutely and altogether agricultural, with no other interest whatever, except the mercantile supplying the farmers, and during any visits I have made in my constituency, during and since the last election, there has been no demand made to me for free implements. As a representative of those farmers I say that I am justified and would much prefer to stand by and support a government that brings in a general low tariff and which this present session has made a considerable reduction in the duty on agricultural implements and other reductions, than put any dependence in the resolution moved by the

hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) for a general reduction, as it appears to me that this is done largely for the purpose of catching votes at the next general election. I doubt if it will be any more successful than Mr. Hugh John Macdonald's advocacy of free agricultural implements.

Let us see where another prominent member of the Conservative party stands on this question. We do not need to go back ten years, or five years, or even one year. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in October or November last the Manufacturers' Association made a trip to the western country. They were handsomely treated in Winnipeg, I understand, and, at a banquet held there, Hon. R. P. Roblin, the Prime Minister of Manitoba, made a speech. I cannot pretend to give his exact words, but he pointed out how much money had been paid out by Canadians during the foregoing year for agricultural implements coming from the United States, and said, not exactly that he was ashamed, but that he did not like living in a country that sent out so much money to bring in implements that ought to be made at home. And he advocated a higher duty on agricultural implements in order that they might be manufactured in Canada. Now, it is reported in the papers that Mr. Roblin is to be brought down here to Ottawa to lead the Conservative party. If that should come to pass, hon. gentlemen opposite will be in a strange position advocating a reduction of the duty from 17½ per cent to 10 per cent, while their leader would be in favour of increasing the duty very largely.

Now, the farmer is not worrying very much to-day about whether the duty on agricultural implements is 10 per cent, 17½ per cent or 20 per cent. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) said something about $50 on the price of an implement. The highest-priced implement we are now dealing with is the self-binder, complete with bundle-carrier and trucks. The value of that implement for duty is $97, and the total duty under the present tariff is something under $17. So it cannot make such a difference as has been suggested. What the farmer is worrying about to-day is the transportation question and the possibility of getting his wheat sold and getting his money for it after he has grown and threshed it.

I say nothing further except that I shall give the government hearty support on this question, for I believe that the policy of the government is in the interest of the country. It is not only on agricultural implements that the farmer pays duty. I entered this Chamber a few minutes before the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) sat down. He read a long list of exports and imports. Among other things he showed that Canadians imported $17,000,000 worth of woollens, also millions of dollars worth of cotton goods and about $1,500,000 worth of agricultural implements. So, if you are going to make goods cheaper for the farmer, it would be better instead of trying to wipe out one industry altogether to make a general reduction. That course would be more in the interest of the farmers and more in the interest of the manufacturers generally.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) resumes his seat I wish he would answer a question. If the hon. gentleman endeavoured to establish anything whatever in his remarks it was that the farmers of his constituency were absolutely satisfied with the present tariff. I have the honour of representing the district adjoining his. I would ask the hon. gentlemen: If the farmers are absolutely satisfied with what they have got, will he explain how my motion for a reduction of this duty to 10 per cent would be a vote-catcher ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not think it will be, but I say that it was introduced with that intention.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has addressed a very amusing argument to the committee. He contended first that the farmers of the west were not specially desirous of a reduction of this duty, but that they desired that on this duty the government should 'stand pat.' What was that duty ? It was 20 per cent. According to the hon. gentleman the farmers were content that that duty should continue. But was it this government that gave that duty ? No, it was their predecessors, and all they did was to continue the duty on agricultural implements established by their predecessors. So if any credit was to be given for that duty it should be given to the Conservative government. The hon. gentleman followed that up by saying that the farmers of the west were perfectly satisfied that the government were desirous of helping them because they reduced the duty by 2½ per cent, which, he said, was a change in the right direction. But he says they would not be satisfied if the government reduced the duty to 10 per cent. What kind of logic is that? If a reduction of 2½ per cent would do good, surely a reduction of 7½ per cent would do more good. The hon. gentleman seems to have no idea except to support his party, and I am satisfied that he would be equally desirous of supporting them if they had proposed to take the duty off altogether. Or if they had increased the duty to 35 per cent he would have found arguments to prove that the farmers of his constituency would be perfectly satisfied. The hon. gentleman's idea seems to be summed up in

this: Keep the present government in office.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to return once more to 'Hansard.' I will quote just a few words to show that the expressions I used had no reference to manufactured goods and had no reference to the question before us. We were discussing the question of agricultural protection and I said what I have said on many occasions, that I do not care how high the duties on agricultural products are made. Speaking of the duty on fresh meats other than lamb and mutton:

Well, I think that three cents a pound is fairly adequate protection on an article that costs about six cents a pound. It is very good protection, and that is the protection that we believe in giving the farmers of this country. Not that we say for one moment that we are going to help the farmer to get two prices for his article, that is not the meaning of it, but we say we will put a Chinese wall right around this country, and we will not allow these Americans to come in here and monopolize the markets of this country when they do not contribute anything towards the expenditure of this country. The Canadian farmer is entitled to this market, and we put that duty on to enable him to get this market and to retain it.

So the whole thing had reference to the protection on agricultural products, and I stand to-day, where I stood then on that subject.

Amendment (Mr. Schaffner) negatived, yeas, 22; nays, 56.

Bill as amended reported.

Amendments read a second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the motion passes I wish briefly to move an amendment with relation to that portion of the Bill which provides for an intermediate tariff. There are a good many clauses in the Bill which confer upon the Governor in Council power to legislate. I might refer to clause 4a, which enables the government to extend the benefits of the British preferential tariff to certain other British possessions; section 4b, which enables them to withdraw the benefits of the British preferential tariff from the countries already named; section 5, which provides that the Governor in Council may fix a date after which the British preferential tariff shall extend only to goods shipped direct to Canadian ports; section 6 subsection 3, which provides for action of the Governor in Council in connection with evasion of the dumping duty; sections 8, 10 and 12, which also confer power of regulation or action upon the Governor in Council in connection with certain items in the tariff. Now some of these provisions have been continued from previous legislation; some of them, in my opinion, are justified upon the ground of necessity or very great convenience. Some of them I would not be inclined to think are justified by any such urgency.

But so far as the intermediate tariff is concerned, the government has taken a step in advance of any thing that has ever been proposed to parliament in this line. They have taken power by section 4 of this Bill to eliminate the general tariff altogether and substitute another in its place; they have taken power to do that in whole or in part. They have taken power to apply any one item, or any dozen items, or any fifty items, or any hundred items of the intermediate tariff. They have taken power to apply that intermediate tariff to goods imported from any particular country; they have taken the widest possible power with relation to this intermediate tariff, and they have not given us the slightest information as to the policy or principles on which they propose to act. Now it seems to me that this is an extreme power for the government of this country to ask from parlament. They are in fact asking this parliament to delegate to them power to abolish the general tariff altogether and to substitute for it an intermediate tariff. They are asking for power to do that without any discussion in parliament or throughout the country; they are asking for power to do that after a secret debate around the council board; they are asking for power to do that which could not fail to have a very disturbing effect upon the business interests of this country if that power were exercised to the full, or in any important measure. Yet they have not given us any information as to the principles upon which they propose to act. They have not said to us; we will apply this intermediate tariff to any country whose tariff towards Canada is at least as low as this intermediate tariff. They have not given us any idea as to the concessions which they will demand from any such country, or from any country with a higher tariff, before they shall, by order in council, bring this intermediate tariff in effect. It is in effect a power which may be exercised inopportunely and without discussion, and in such a way as to disturb business interests to a great extent.

But there is more than that; it is a power from which, it seeems to me, any government should shrink because it gives them the authority to deal with business interests in which their political opponents or political friends are concerned, and to use that power oppressively if they desire to do so. Suppose some important interest in this country, on the eve of a general election, should be told by the government of Can-

ada, if you oppose us in this election we shall see to it that the items in the intermediate tariff are applied so far as your industry is concerned; therefore look to it that you either support us, or that you are neutral in this contest. Is that a power which any government in this country should desire to take under existing conditions? My hon. friends on the other side may say that it would be impossible for them to exercise the power in that way, that public opinion would not support them in doing so. But I reply to them that there will always be the suspicion in the minds of the people, and especially of businessmen, that that power will be exercised in that way if they see fit to express their political opinions as their judgment dictates. Further than that, what urgency is there by reason of which the voice of parliament and the discussion of parliament should be eliminated from the consideration of this intermediate tariff? It has not been discussed in this parliament as a tariff which is likely to be of immediate application. We could get no information from the government on that point, we could get no information as to any particular country to which it is to be applied, as to any particular trade to which it is to be applied. What, I ask, is the urgency with regard to this intermediate tariff? If the government propose to enter into negotiations, let them submit their conclusions to parliament when once they have made up their minds as to what the proper course is to take? Between the conclusion of any session of parliament and the opening of the following session, a period of not more than six months, or seven and a half months at the outside, will elapse; is there any urgency in present circumstances which makes it proper for the government to ask parliament to delegate to them power to deal with this intermediate tariff? It seems to me that there is no such urgency, at least no such urgency has been disclosed by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs who have for the most part dealt with the tariff questions. I venture to think that the taking over by the government of an extreme power of this kind is not justified by anything that has been advanced, or by any condition in the country at the present time. I think that the delegation of powers which are essentially legislative should not proceed further than it has proceeded in the past. Parliament is the proper tribunal under our constitution for dealing with matters affecting the tariff; and parliament is the tribunal which has dealt with all such matters except in so far as necessary convenience or extreme urgency would make it proper, under certain restrictions, to confer some such powers upon the Governor in Council as those which have existed upon the statute-book of this country during some years past.

No such considerations seem to apply to the present proposals. Then there is this further consideration which it is not out of place to mention that the government take from their own supporters any practical voice in this matter. We speak of responsible government in this country. We have as a matter of practical politics a government which is more particularly responsible to its own caucus where, as we know, the most important debate very often takes place as to whether or not a particular measure or a particular proposal shall come before parliament and be carried through by a government majority. What is the result of such a proposal as that which is made by the government in this instance? The result of it is that the government apply their intermediate tariff, in whole or in part, bring it into force, by order in council and proclamation, then come down to their supporters who are thus muzzled in advance as to any opinions which they might otherwise be inclined to express and who will be told after the government have once taken action that the fate of the administration depends upon the ratification and approval of the action which has already been taken by the government. Is that a desirable condition in this country? Is it wise to extend that principle in view of conditions such as those to which I have just now alluded? I will not elaborate this point at the advanced hour we have now reached but I affirm most deeply and sincerely that this is a proposal from which parliament should shrink and one which should not be embodied in the tariff as now proposed. I therefore move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be resolved as follows:

That the power of legislating with respect to the tariff belongs of right to parliament and ought not to be delegated to the Governor in Council except in cases of obvious necessity.

That the said Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by striking out of said Bill all provisions which empower the Governor in Council to bring into operation the intermediate tariff in whole or in part without the further authority of parliament.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, we have had a somewhat full discussion of this matter at an earlier stage when the Bill was in committee and I do not think from either side anything material can be added to what has been said in regard to it. I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) magnifies entirely the danger, if there be any danger at all, in this intermediate tariff. The principle that he lays down that all tariff matters should be dealt with directly by this parliament and by this parliament only is a theory which has never been adopted, at all events for many years, by the parliament of Canada and I do not hesitate to say that the best interests of

the country would not be advanced by the adoption of that theory, plausible as it may seem, as stated. Particularly I object to the suggestion of my hon. friend that this intermediate tariff gives to the government some political power which it might exercise to the disadvantage of some industry with which its opponents were connected. In the light of the manner in which the tariff question has been treated by this government I think my hon. friend might well have spared us that criticism. We have had large powers under the Tariff Act in the hands of the Governor in Council for many years, and I think I am justified in stating that after ten years experience in dealing with tariff matters which called from time to time for action by the Governor in Council I have yet to hear the first criticism in this House as to any improper or unwise act done by this government under the powers so conferred. We have had powers vested in the Governor in Council in connection with tariff matters and it is to the advantage of the public that we should have. My hon. friend says that we have the power to reduce some duties. Any reduction that we can make under this tariff is an exceedingly small one. But, we have had the power to absolutely abolish duties by order in council to a considerable extent. We have had that for ages I might say, or ever since we have had a tariff. No harm has come from that. We have had the power to abolish duties on certain articles which are used in the manufacture of goods. I admit at once that if we were open to the suspicion of being actuated by unfair political motives that power could be so exercised. We could say: We will allow some article to come in free for the good of some manufacturer but we will not allow some other article to come in for some other manufacturer. But, I can point with some satisfaction to the result of ten years administration of the Act by this government and down to this moment nobody has raised a question in this House as to the propriety of any action taken under that authority. I ask the House to accept that record as a guarantee that whatever else may be said as to the wisdom of any action of the Governor in Council there is not a shadow of ground for suspicion that there has ever been anything but an administration of the tariff without fear or favour, without the slightest regard for politics. We have the power to put certain articles on the free list, we have the power to reduce the duty on certain articles, and no harm has come of it. We have the power to impose export duties by order in council and that power has never been exercised rashly. We have the power to grant a remission of duties and under the general provisions of the Consolidated and Audit Act the Treasury Board has the power to make a remission of duties. Large powers are given to the Governor in Council necessarily and proper and pointing to the ten years' record of the administration of these powers by this government I assert that there is not a shadow or ground for any suspicion that the Act has been administered in an improper way.

Then, the hon. gentleman says that we are taking enormous powers under this intermediate tariff. I take the sheet of the tariff which happens to be open. It is the sheet containing item 445, mowing machines, harvesters, &c., which we were dealing with to-day. I commence at the top and I find the item of stereotypes. The duty under the general tariff is one-eighth of a cent for a given quantity and the duty under the intermediate tariff is one-eighth of a cent for a given quantity. No great danger of this government exercising that power to the disadvantage of anybody or by adopting the intermediate tariff. The next item is half a cent under the general tariff. It happens to be the same under the intermediate tariff. Nothing alarming in that if we adopt the intermediate tariff. The next item is 30 per cent, general tariff, and 27½ per cent, intermediate tariff, a reduction of 2½ per cent. Would it be an alarming thing, if, for adequate consideration given by any other countries, we should reduce that duty to 27½ per cent? Is there anything very dangerous in giving the government that power? You are not giving the government unlimited power to reduce duties. You are giving the government no power to impose duties and in regard to the reduction of duties you are giving the government a very small power indeed—the power to reduce within the limits of this schedule. The next item happens to be a larger one. Under the general tariff the duty is 35 per cent, and under the intermediate 30 per cent. Does anybody suppose that if we were to reduce the duty from 35 to 30 per cent for good reasons, for concessions to be granted to the trade of Canada, there will be anything alarming in that? The next is general 30 per cent, intermediate 27½ per cent, and next general 35 per cent, intermediate 30 per cent.

And so we go through the list, and we find that except where the duty is on the highest scale of 35 per cent (in which case the proposed reduction under the intermediate tariff would be five), but leaving that high rate out, we find that on all the other lines where there is a difference at all, the outside reduction we could make would be 2½ per cent. Therefore, the idea that some dreadful power is given to us, some power which may be used to crush some manufacturer in the country, is not sustained. And why do we want to take this power? We think it is desirable in dealing with other countries that we should be able to hold out to them an indication of the limits

beyond which we cannot go. If we come to negotiate with the representatives of other countries as to getting better terms for the products of Canada, and as to getting some concession for Canada we want to be in a position to say to the foreign country: This is the limit beyond which we are unable to go without coming back to parliament. If in any given case something arises for which we have not made provision, then undoubtedly we must come back to parliament. And in most cases, I do not hesitate to say frankly, we shall be obliged to come back to parliament, because, as I stated in the budget speech, while we can make arrangements for reciprocal legislation from year to year, we cannot make a treaty; we cannot arrange with any foreign country that we would give them the benefit of this tariff and get from them the benefit which they might wish to give us for a given period of years. We would be obliged, if we wish to make an arrangement for more than a temporary period, to come to parliament. In any case, it is probable that any foreign country with which we might enter into negotiations would probably not be disposed, if they were told that we could only make a temporary arrangement under this tariff, to enter into such an arrangement. Then we would be obliged to negotiate a treaty and bring it to this parliament for approval. Therefore the powers which we take with respect to this intermediate tariff are very moderate indeed. Its chief purpose is to indicate to foreign countries—rather should I say to such a foreign country as we may feel hopeful to deal with—the lines within which we feel free to deal with them. Reference was made in the earlier discussions to the United States as a country which might be brought under the operation of this tariff, and I stated to my hon. friend then, and I say it now that we have no expectation that any arrangements will be made with the United States by virtue of that intermediate tariff. I do not say that such an arrangement would be undesirable. On the contrary, if the United States would give us concessions which would be a benefit to Canada, it might be well to give the United States the benefit of the lower rates of duties for concessions given us in return. Therefore when I say I do not anticipate anything will be done with the United States under the tariff, I mean that I do not regard it as likely, because I see no indication on the part of the United States to-day which would justify us in the expectation that we would ever do anything with them under the terms of this tariff. If at any time any offer was made by our brethren to the south which would lead us to believe that such an arrangement is possible, it would have to be some special arrangement outside of that tariff altogether, and we would be obliged to come to this House and to submit it for the approval of parliament. I am satisfied that the alarm which my hon. friend has manifested as to the tremendous power which the government are taking under this intermediate tariff, is entirely unwarranted. I think the manner in which the powers given to the Governor in Council have been used in the past, should be accepted as a guarantee that the powers conferred by this legislation will be used wisely and well, and I have not the slightest anticipation that under the operation of the intermediate tariff anything will ever be done which will call for the disapproval of this House.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The Minister of Finance has told us to-night, just what he told us some months ago when this particular matter was first discussed. I had hoped that in the meantime the Minister of Finance would have seen fit to have foregone this intermediate tariff. I had hoped that when he got some light on the question he would have thrown it over. But, his purpose evidently is to push it through. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that legislation like this is not good in principle or in practice. Within the last five minutes the Minister of Finance has tried to make every statement he possibly could to show that this was simply a thing upon paper, and that he never supposed he could make any use of it in the wide world. The very best reason he gave why he cannot make any use of it, was, that he would find it very difficult to discover a country so foolish as to enter into an arrangement which he could only assure them would be good until parliament next met, and had a chance to go into the matter, and declare its position with reference to it. That argument shows the uselessness of the legislation from a practical point of view. The Minister of Finance has cut out the ground from under his feet as to any useful object this legislation could be put to. But we must not only look at legislation with regard to its practical side, but we must also have some regard to the principle upon which parliament legislates. On the other hand, the argument of the Minister of Finance, followed to its extreme, would simply say to this parliament: Gentlemen, you come here once a year, and just pass a law with one clause in it giving the government power by order in council to do the whole of the executive and legislative work of this parliament for the Dominion of Canada for the coming year. That is the logical conclusion of the argument of the Minister of Finance. Now, he proposes to justify this legislation by saying that Canada has always recognized the principle, and that there always has been legislation of this kind on the statute-book. That is true and it is not true. It is true that there has always been some power

given to the Governor in Council, but that power has in the main always been special in its nature, and restricted so that it would be impossible to abuse it to any great extent. In these special instances, in nearly every case, that legislation referred to subjects which had been discussed, and the theory upon which all this special legislation was passed was quite well understood. In the event of certain things taking place, we gave the Governor in Council some liberty of action, but there is a wide difference between that and providing, as is done here, that the government may go to work and revise the whole tariff from day to day, and every item in that tariff. That is the legislation which is now asked for and which if the House grants will be placing in the Governor in Council the power to absolutely revise this tariff from beginning to end. To-day we discuss each item as we pass it through, and having looked at all the conditions, we place on each item a certain tariff rate which we think it is wise and just to place upon it. Parliament takes the circumstances of each case into consideration, and it legislates on it and declares what the rate shall be in each particular case. That is very different from leaving it to the Governor in Council, to make 100 or 500 or 1,000 changes in the tariff, with reference to circumstances and conditions that parliament does not know anything at all about. If it were proposed to allow any country to come in under an intermediate tariff, we could discuss what the effect of that would be upon our trade, and we could decide whether it would be wise to do so or not. Suppose we came to the conclusion with reference to the United States for instance, that it would be wise to let certain goods in for certain concessions under a certain tariff, we could discuss the subject, measure the conditions, and we could then decide as a parliament that such could then be done. But that is absolutely different from the course which is proposed by the government now. I might be very willing that an intermediate tariff less than the general tariff should be applied to Holland and Belgium, but I might be very much opposed to its being applied to the United States or some other country. But this intermediate tariff in so far as it is given over to the Governor in Council, is not to be applied simply to Holland or to Belgium or to a country whose trade we have analyzed in its relation to its competition with our trade.

You might be perfectly willing to do that with reference to one country, and you might be absolutely opposed to doing it with reference to another country. But, in addition to that, when you fix the general tariff, you know exactly what each country is getting, and what it has to pay when it brings its goods in; but in the case of the intermediate tariff, you leave that for a certain hour and a certain number of people, the hour being sometimes set by the cabinet, and the country to which it shall apply and the conditions under which it shall apply, you leave to a committee of this parliament. Moreover, when parliament passes an item of the tariff, we know exactly what we are getting for that tariff. For instance, we place in the tariff an item of 30 per cent on goods coming from the United States. We know exactly what we are getting from the United States when our goods go into that country. We legislate having both of these things in our minds. Here we go it blind. We give to the Governor in Council the authority to say arbitrarily what we shall give for the limit of concession that we get from any country in the wide world. We abrogate and throw aside entirely that function of parliament which is one of its earliest and greatest functions, to be the judge of what shall be the trade conditions and the trade tariff between this country and another. It does seem to me that a proposition of this kind, so baldly and plainly put, if made by a Conservative government in a time when old Liberal doctrines had real force in this country, would have caused something very like a revolution. The newspapers, the public men and the public sentiment of the country would have cried out against that assumption of authority, and I think they ought to cry out against it in just the same way now. If parliament has any function at all, it is to look after its finances, and to fix the conditions of its trade, and this is a function which ought not to be taken from it. In this case it is taken from it, and both the amount of the taxes which you wish to put on in the shape of customs duties, and the limits and givings backwards and forwards between the countries affected, are absolutely taken from parliament and its discussion and decision, and are handed over to the Governor in Council to do as it pleases with reference to one country or fifty countries or all the countries in the world. I say that that is an abrogation of the duties of parliament which every member of parliament ought to question very seriously before he gives his adhesion to it. Where are you going to end if you go on that principle? You end just where I stated at first, you make parliament a mere echo of the opinions and the actions of a committee of itself. You take away from parliament its duty of looking into and legislating upon this matter, and hand it over to the Governor in Council. Now, what is the necessity for this legislation? The Minister of Finance stated to-night, as he stated before, that they do not to-day see any available opening or any possibility of applying this intermediate tariff. They do not think the United States can be brought in under it at all. They have no country in view which they think can be brought in under

it. What, then, is the necessity for having it ? As my hon. friend pointed out, parliament has only an interregnum of five or six months. No negotiations in the way of general trade conditions can surely be so pressing which would not be the better and the more mature by waiting until parliament did meet and take up the whole subject and make its own decision on the general principle and on the general conveniences and benefits to trade. Is it wise for us to deprive parliament of that function ? There is no reason given why it should be deprived of it. But there is another point of view. This is mischievous legislation. It is mischievous because it unsettles the basis of trade. How often have we heard these gentlemen say : We do not want to have this dickering over the tariff ; we want to have permanency in it ; and yet you have introduced one feature which is an element of doubt and anxiety in every branch of business in this country and with every country with which we are doing business, more particularly Great Britain. What have you done ? You have established the principle of a preferential tariff with Great Britain. What is the use of the Minister of Finance getting up and straining his eyes over a column of this tariff, to read that it is one-eighth in one case and one-eighth in the intermediate, that it is one-half in another case and one-half in the intermediate, and then finding where there is a difference of 2½ per cent, and then admitting that there is a difference in one case of 5 per cent. We have seen to-night these gentlemen laying a great deal of stress on 2½ per cent. They have met the farmers of this country with the proposition : You have asked us for a boon, and we have given it to you—we have given you a reduction of 2½ per cent.

It looms up great when it helps them, as they think in that respect, but it is nothing, and 5 per cent is nothing when it comes to a matter of international trade. When the Finance Minister was reading it over he knew two things, that there is enough in that intermediate tariff, if it is put into effect with reference for instance to the United States to destroy the efficiency of the preferential tariff with Great Britain almost entirely. He knows also if he understands the course of business and has any faith in all he has been preaching, that what we want is a stable, permanent tariff, that men in this country who manufacture and men in Great Britain who look to opening up a preferential traffic with this country desire a permanent tariff, but if it is thrown into their faces that whereas to-day they have against the United States a preference of 2½ per cent or 3 per cent or 5 per cent, at any moment, by the sweet will of the Governor in Council, they may be subjected to a tariff that will entirely abolish the benefit they now enjoy. This will make it impossible for them to work up a permanent preferential trade. That is a menace which it is mischievous to hang over any attempt to increase the trade between Great Britain and this country on a preferential basis. You say that you want a considerable tariff to protect our own industries which are competing for their existence, we will say with an industry in the United States or any other great manufacturing country, but if these manufacturers may at any moment by order in council, on any article or on dozens or hundreds of articles, by the intermediate tariff, lose all the benefit and be exposed to a much greater competition, these industries may suffer very severely. Is it wise to hold that menace over both those branches of our business? over the extension of the industrial business of this country and over what we have all professed to be willing and anxious to have carried out to a greater extent, British preferential traffic. Is it wise to thus promote uncertainty, which, as everybody knows, in tariff matters is a ban to progress and well-measured development in the manufacturing industries of the country. I would think that public sentiment, business sentiment and newspaper sentiment which keeps close to the business sentiment would have something to say condemnatory of this legislation. But the minister says : You want to show your hand. I always thought that in a bargain a wise man did not show his hand in advance, that he would go up to another and talk to him about a trade but that he did not commence by showing everything that could be given. I do not think that is wise as between nations and I think there are strong reasons which could be shown against it. You advertise to every country in the world just what you are prepared to do, but you might by approaching each country separately on a basis of give and take be able to get more for what you are prepared to give. Anyway I do not think that is a strong argument, that you should pass this because you want to show your hand to every country in the world. I find here a quotation from a report on the German Tariff Bill which it seems to me is in point in regard to this. This extract says :

> A considerable advantage in negotiating tariff treaties would be lost if a foreign country were to know from the very beginning up to what limits the government was willing and able to make tariff concessions.

This I think hits the matter on the head and I should think was rather against the putting up of an intermediate tariff in this way. I would think that the government had a better chance to negotiate with each country if it went into the negotiations without having shown its hand than if it went into the negotiations after having shown its hand. Nothing alarming has been done said the Finance Minister, heretofore, and therefore nothing alarming will be done

hereafter, you have trusted us in the past, trust us in the future. But you are giving a power absolutely different from the powers given before. These powers in the past have been special, restrained, and under certain conditions well known in the House and have not been given otherwise, they have not been the general power to legislate on the whole range of the tariff at any moment behind the back of parliament. I should hope that parliament would guard very jealously and very closely its own powers with reference to the levying of duties of customs and with reference to these trade negotiations. Our trade is an important thing, our manufacturing business is an important thing, our industrial development is an important thing and it seems to me that if parliament has any duty at all, surely parliament has the duty to carefully canvass and carefully legislate upon these items and to take the responsibility therefor rather than to hand that responsibility over to the Governor in Council, however, wise or careful that Governor in Council may be.

These are points that it seems to me ought to be considered and I do hope that the Finance Minister, after having reflected upon this matter, and after the discussion we have had in so many cases in reference to this giving of power to the Governor in Council, would have come to the conclusion that it would have been wise not to have invaded the province of parliament in this respect, and to have left to it, at all events, one of its oldest and most precious functions.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON. I want to go to bed and out of sympathy for myself, if not for others, I will say but a few words. The picture presented is one that is not alarming. I do not think that is a departure from parliamentary government. Every one of the items in that intermediate tariff has been submitted to the scrutiny not only of the Governor in Council, but of every member of this House. The fullest latitude of discussion has been allowed.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) wants to argue fairly. Let me put the case to him this way: If this government had come here and said that a certain country, let us say the United States of America, was willing to give us certain concessions if we would apply this intermediate tariff to them, does he not see that as soon as that practical proposition was brought down this House would look into the conditions of trade and see how trade between the United States and ourselves would be affected? And if the proposal were made with regard to any other country, would not this House immediately examine and discuss how the application of the intermediate tariff to our imports from that country would affect our trade development, so as to ascertain whether it would be wise to grant this concession or not? In that sense parliament has not given any examination or discussion to the effect of the intermediate tariff as applied to any country. Is not that a clear statement of it?

Mr. PATERSON. I have no objection to it. But as a matter of fact we have no such proposal to make and have not been in communication with other governments. That is a matter that will have to be considered when any application of the intermediate tariff is made. But so far as fixing rates are concerned, in making trade arrangements with any other country, parliament has given us permission to go as far as it thinks it desirable to go—we may apply the whole list or only part of it. In many cases there will be only a partial list. But in any case any arrangement made must come before parliament within a few months at the outside.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How?

Mr. PATERSON. The government's action in making the reciprocal arrangement can be criticised in parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. After the arrangement is made and in effect?

Mr. PATERSON. But the parliament will have the power to condemn the government and rescind the arrangement. Now the leader of the opposition sees, or thinks he sees, this difficulty: While the House will be advised of the arrangement made, the government will not leave members free to express their opinions. I cannot see the difference between our procedure in this matter and the British parliamentary procedure which we have always followed in relation to tariffs. Of course, no minister is at liberty to give even the slightest hint to even the government's most cherished followers—if there can be a distinction as between followers—of tariff changes that are to be made. It would be a terrible scandal if any one outside knew of a meditated change and availed himself of that knowledge. Therefore, it is of the essence of British parliamentary government that tariff matters must be kept quiet before they are announced in the House. The argument of the leader of the opposition would tell against that as much as against the preferential tariff——

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. PATERSON—because these resolutions come down without their nature being made know in advance to the House. In this case also the government will be in a position to say to its followers: You must stand by us in this case; we have introduced this proposal and must put it through. And I do not think there is any danger ex-

isting in one case that does not equally exist in the other. Now, as to the disturbance in trade. As a matter of fact you do not find it. We have adopted the principle of a maximum and a minimum tariff, besides maintaining the preferential tariff as a domestic arrangement of our own. Almost every nation has the maximum and minimum tariff, and even the great republic to the south of us is doing what we are doing. Yet they do not consider that it is going to disturb the conditions of commerce. And here in Canada this tariff has been law since the 29th of November. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) I suppose reads the 'Mail and Empire' as I do. At any rate he reads the Saturday page of 'Industrial Canada.' And as he reads his paper does he not see that since this tariff was introduced more companies have been formed——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mining companies?

Mr. PATERSON. No, not mining companies only, but industrial companies. They are taking out letters patent under the Ontario law. And in each paper to which I have referred you will read a list of companies formed with capital amounting to millions.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, in Cobalt, $364,000,000—I read that to-day.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not talking about that, but about industrial concerns, just such concerns as the hon. member (Mr. Foster) thinks will be made uneasy by this legislation. There has never been a period in Canada, so far as I know, when so many industrial concerns have been formed as since this tariff came into effect. Hon. members opposite may set their fears at rest. As to the danger of it being used politically, that is not to be thought of. To do that would be to do what is not right—and the hon. gentleman knows that this government could not do that.

House divided on amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Bennett,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Brabazon,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christien,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Foster,
Fowler,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Morin,
Northrup,
Paquet,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox and Addington),
Jackson (Elgin),
Lake,
Léonard,
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka).—36

NAYS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carney,
Cash,
Conmee,
Copp,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Harty,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville)
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Law,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Oliver,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Power,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Rivet,
Robitaille,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew)—84.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
McColl,	Ward,
Pardee,	Lennox,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Haggart,
Emmerson,	Ganong,
Dyment,	Seagram,
Johnston,	Lewis,
Sifton,	Osler,
Belcourt,	Boyce,
Lemieux,	Bergeron,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	McCarthy (Calgary),
Devlin (Nicolet),	Monk,
McCool,	Lancaster,
Hughes (Kings),	Martin,
Béland,	Forget,
Galliher,	MacLaren (Perth),

Guthrie,	Alcorn,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Elson,
Grant,	Gunn,
Clarke,	White,
Gordon,	Pringle,
McIntyre (Strathcona),	Clare,
Adamson,	Armstrong,
Zimmerman,	Cockshutt,
Hall,	Porter,
Stewart,	Perley,
Boyer,	Bristol,
Carvell,	Ames,
Miller,	Kemp,
Wilson (Russell),	Smith (Wentworth),
Devlin (Wright),	Lalor,
Walsh (Ste. Anne),	Marshall,
Girard.	Macdonell.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has not voted.

Mr. BERGERON. I am paired with the Postmaster General. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. SPEAKER read the following message from His Excellency the Governor General :

GREY :

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the period of nine months ended on the 31st March, 1907, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, April 2, 1907.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the said message, together with the estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

MILITIA PENSION ACT—AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Militia Pension Act and to provide that its provisions shall extend to officers who are seconded.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The meaning of the word 'seconded' is to retire temporarily without pay and without loss of rank, as in the case of members of the Royal Artillery or Engineers when they accept civil offices. We have a pension law which provides that members of the permanent force and staff shall pay 5 per cent of their salaries into a fund which shall constitute a pension fund, and after a certain number of years service they shall be able to retire at a certain rate of pension not to exceed 35-50ths of the whole of their pay. It happens that an officer may be seconded, that is, an officer may be temporarily appointed to some other service. For instance an officer of the permanent force might be sent to serve in the Northwest Mounted Police, when he would be no longer paid by the Militia Department but would get his pay in the police. He might be, and there are two cases of the kind, sent to serve in Australia or in India in exchange for an Australian officer or an officer from India, and in that case he would not be receiving pay from the Militia Department of Canada but would receive his pay from the government under which he was serving. The object of this law is to enable such an officer to keep up his connection with the pension fund by enabling him to continue to pay his 5 per cent upon the amount of his pay at the time he was seconded from the Canadian service, to any other service. Then there is another condition. Suppose an officer of the permanent force should be appointed to a position in the civil service ; there is a case of that kind now in my own department. An officer of the permanent force, Colonel Fiset, who had contributed to the pension fund for several years, was appointed to the Civil Service as Deputy Minister ; this Act will enable him to continue to pay his 5 per cent into the pension fund so that he will not lose his connection with that fund, and will have the right, when he retires, to be pensioned under the pension law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is, his service as Deputy Minister will count.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Precisely, and it will be perfectly fair in the particular case I have referred to, because as a matter of fact, under the Civil Service Act, as amended, he is required to pay 5 per cent into a special fund. He pays 5 per cent now, he will not pay twice ; that is, the Act will enable him to pay that 5 per cent into the pension fund just as he has been doing, and enable him to benefit by the money which he has previously paid into that fund.

Mr. BERGERON. In the case of Colonel Fiset, will he pay twice ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN : No. I will read the clause which refers to that particular case :

If, by reason of the position in the public service of Canada to which any officer is seconded, he becomes subject to the provisions of part 2 of the Civil Service Superannuation Retirement Act, the reservations out of the salary of such officer by the said part 2 requiring to be made, shall, instead of being transferred to the credit of the retirement fund, form part of the Consolidated Revenue

Fund of Canada, and be treated in all respects as deductions under section 8 of this Act, and as constituting a contribution which such officer is, by the two last preceding subsections, required to make.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144) to amend the Militia Pension Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second times, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The expression 'seconded' has a different technical meaning from the expression 'retired ?'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, it is so well known that there is no need of specially defining it. This Bill was drafted by the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, who gave a great deal of care to it, and I believe it meets the requirements as stated by me and that it is in the public interest.

Mr. BERGERON. Col. Fiset will not contribute to the Civil Service Superannuation Fund ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, instead of contributing his five per cent to that fund, it will go to the fund to which he has been hitherto contributing and he will get the benefits of that fund while getting nothing whatever from the Civil Service Superannuation Fund, Class II.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And he continues under the pension fund on his salary as a member of the militia force ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And not under the larger salary of deputy minister of militia ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, although he would benefit by the larger fund.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When he retires from the service he will be entitled to a pension on the same scale as if his salary as a member of the force were the same as the salary which he would enjoy as deputy minister of militia ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is it.

Mr. BERGERON. Which is the more advantageous ? The militia pension is more advantageous than the civil service superannuation, is it not ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is entirely different. I suppose it is more advantageous. But he is only paying the same amount of money. There is no charge upon the public service. The Militia Pension Act was very carefully calculated by an actuary and it has been more than self-sustaining, I believe, up to the present time. It was calculated that the Militia Pension Fund would be self-sustaining by making an allowance of one-tenth for each year of the salary which each officer was receiving upon retirement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He will get this pension proportionate to the larger salary ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will he contribute in proportion to the larger salary ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He contributes five per cent upon whatever he receives—$3,500 this year, $3,600 next year and up to $4,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He will contribute just as if the salary which he enjoys as deputy minister of militia were the salary which he receives as a member of the force; consequently, he will receive a pension based upon his salary as deputy minister of militia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Exactly. It is the same as if he had remained on the militia force and had been promoted to a higher rate of salary.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This Bill says five per cent, and is not the militia pension one-tenth ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, the militia pension is at the rate of as many fiftieths of the salary enjoyed as he served years up to 35.

Mr. BERGERON. What were the conditions applying to deputy ministers who some years ago were active members of the militia force ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is a different case; there was no fund then. The pension fund was only established seven years ago.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

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

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that we are to meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING. No, this morning.

Mr. BERGERON. There are committees called for ten and eleven o'clock. I think we might as well adjourn.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I was rather anxious to go on with my estimates and I want to make a statement in regard to them as brief as possible but perhaps it is too late to go on to-night.

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

Militia—pay and allowance, $1,400,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it better to say what I have to say in connection with this one item, and at this late hour I shall endeavour to condense my remarks. The first statement I wish to make is with reference to the very large increase which has taken place in the militia estimates during the last few years. I think the estimate is smaller for the year 1907-8 than for the year 1906-7, but there has been an increase comparing the year 1905-6 with the year 1895-6, and that increase amounts to something like $2,500,000. As unfavourable comment has been made upon that fact, it is desirable that a short explanation should be made of the reasons for this increase. The expenditure upon militia on revenue account in 1895-6 was about $1,150,000. In that year, there was no annual drill, or rather there was less than $100,000 spent on annual drill, and as this was abnormal, it is only fair to add $300,000 to the estimate for 1895-6, on account of annual drill, which took place in 1906 and which did not take place in that year. That addition would bring the militia expenditure for 1895-6 up to $1,500,000, whereas the expenditure in 1905-6 was about $4,000,000 (I am speaking in round numbers). There are some items in the expenditure for 1905-6 due to the taking over of Halifax and Esquimalt which were special in their character, and which would bring the expenditure up to $4,300,000, but the normal expenditure was about $4,000,000.

We have therefore to compare an expenditure of $4,000,000 in 1905-6 with an expenditure of $1,500,000 in 1895-6, making a difference of $2,500,000, which seems a very large increase, it representing about 166 per cent. I shall state briefly the causes of this increase. The first and chief cause is the taking over by Canada of all responsibility for expenditure in connection with the maintenance of the fortresses at Halifax and Esquimalt, thereby relieving the British exchequer entirely from all expenditure of any kind for military purposes in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. How much does that represent ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $1,250,000 in round figures. The headquarters staff and the district staff on which was expended, in 1895-6, $40,000, cost in 1905-6 $140,000 and in that item you find an explanation of an increase of $100,000. The extra pay and better rations account for an increase of about $250,000. The committee will remember that about three years ago when the new militia law was passed the pay was increased from 50 cents, by a sliding scale, up to $1, for active militia, and from 40 cents to 75 cents for the permanent force. That item, as compared with 1895-6, would amount to close upon $250,000. The increased number of men in the active militia annually drilled, from 10,000 to 15,000, will account for an increase of $300,000. The Dominion arsenal which in 1895-6 produced between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 rounds of ammunition, has grown to the very creditable output of between 12,000,000 and 13,000,000, and it now costs over $200,000 more than it did in 1896. The maintenance of military properties will account for an increase of about $100,000. The military properties in which the permanent force is housed are the chief item of that increase. Having increased our permanent force from 1,000 to 3,000 the cost of maintaining the buildings in which they live has proportionately increased. The clothing and stores for the largely increased number both of the permanent force and the active militia figures up to an increase of about $250,000. The Royal Military College, the number of whose students has increased in the interval from between fifty and sixty, to between ninety and one hundred, accounts, for another $50,000 increase. We get in these figures I have given $2,500,000 of increase.

I had intended to go somewhat elaborately into a justification of these increased expenditures, but at this hour of the night or the morning I will forbear. I think, however, speaking generally, that no one will take exception to any one of them. I believe that the whole people of Canada approve of the taking over of Halifax and Esquimalt, thereby relieving the British exchequer of this large expenditure of between $1,000,000 and $1,500,000. I would like to say a word as to the headquarters and district staffs, as I think some question has been raised in certain quarters as to whether the expenditure of that large amount of money is justified. Well, the very fact of taking over Halifax and Esquimalt, of bidding goodbye so to speak to the last of the British soldiers as such in Canada, has made it necessary to organize more thoroughly and completely these staffs. While the British soldiers were here, an imperial officer was always stationed at Halifax, and it was one of the most important garrisons of Great Britain. There were always at Halifax the heads of the different departments which would be necessary in the event of war, and which would be able to take the field and organize throughout the Dominion all the departments of a complete army. When the British soldiers withdrew, it became necessary in the militia of Canada to organize all the departments of an army. This has been done. The criticism has been made that we have quite as large a staff as there is, for instance, in Switzerland. This is not true ; yet, as a matter of fact, it is necessary to have practically as large a staff for an army of 50,000 as it would be for an army of 250,000. You must have the heads of the different departments. No

matter how small the army is, it must be as an army complete in all its parts in order to take the field successfully. I do not believe there is a single department or a single officer in the different headquarters or depots or in the large commands who could be dispensed with. The different departments which have been established are as follows: chief of the general staff and under him an intelligence branch, the ordnance corps branch, the medical service, the engineers, the signalling service, the army service corps, the pay corps, the school of musketry, and the inspector general's department. I mentioned a moment ago the case of Switzerland. I noticed recently in the newspapers and journals some very interesting and able articles on this subject—one written by Col. Merritt, of Toronto. I have looked somewhat carefully into that matter, and I find that in Switzerland the annual cost of the staff is very much greater than it is in Canada. According to the Swiss Army Budget of 1907, the cost of maintaining the headquarters staff in Switzerland is $168,-289.65, which does not include the pay of the chief instructors nor that of the head of the topographical bureau. As the highest rate of pay in Switzerland is about $1,800 per annum, it is fair to assume that if the above staff were paid at Canadian rates, the cost would be about double the above.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the total force of Switzerland ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 250,000 on the first line. In Great Britain the figures are very much higher than ours. There the number of staff officers of the Imperial yeomanry and volunteers is 550, or one to every 1,129 men, whereas in Canada there is one officer to every 1,138 men, taking the permanent force and the active militia of the country. In the United States there is one to every 626 as against 1 to every 1,139 in Canada, so I think it is clear that so far as the staff is concerned we are very much below that of Switzerland, Great Britain or the United States.

I wish to refer to the improvements that have been made during the period of the last 10 or 12 years. I have referred to the fact we have relieved the mother country of all expenditures for the purposes of defence in Canada. We have made a thorough reorganization of the department and large commands. We have passed a pension law and a militia law. We have established a Militia Council. We have greatly improved the facilities for the education of officers, particularly by arrangements made with the War Office by which we have the right to send and are sending two officers each year to the Staff College in England. We have established a school of musketry. We have established rifle associations, which are rapidly increasing. We have constructed rifle ranges on which we have spent over $1,000,000 in the last ten years. We have established a central camp with an area of over 100 square miles. We are establishing a reserve of equipment and of stores. We have developed the Dominion arsenal enormously; the output a few years ago was less than 2,000,000 rounds per year whereas to-day it is between 12,000,000 and 13,000,000 rounds. We have greatly added to materiel, including artillery, and we hope that in the not very distant future, we may have etsablished in this country a factory which will manufacture our own artillery.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has there been any improvement in the output of shells from the cartridge factory ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, a very large improvement. Last we have established in Canada a rifle factory about which there might be some difference of opinion. However, I believe that will prove to be one of the most important things that has been done for the militia of the country and for the country itself. The Royal Military College has grown so that to-day the number of students is 90 as against less than 60 ten years ago. While 10 or 12 years ago there were not more than three or four graduates of that college in the permanent force of Canada or on the staff, there are to-day 60 graduates of that college occupying important positions on the staff and in our permanent force. That, of itself, seems to me to be such a radical improvement in the condition of the militia as should give gratification to everybody. Criticisms were made against the Royal Military College and possibly to some extent they were justified, to the effect that we were spending a good deal of money on that college and getting none of the direct benefit ourselves. It is true that a large number of the young men were going to serve in the British army and indirectly of course that was an advantage to Canada. To-day we have the satisfaction of knowing that at least for every two officers who have been sent from the college into the imperial army there is one in the army of Canada.

I had intended making some reference in detail to the suggestion that the Swiss method might be applied to Canada. I would like to point out the difficulties in the way. First, Switzerland is a country of 16,000 square miles. The distance across it at any point is not more than 150 miles; it is not one quarter in area of the province of Manitoba. Conditions are entirely different, physical conditions and the condition of the population, and still more important, in Switzerland they have compulsory service. Every man in Switzerland is compelled to serve and to serve without pay. I have made a calculation to show that if the rates of pay

in Canada were applied to the Swiss militia it would cost $12,000,000 a year instead of the small amount it does cost. That is nearly three times what our militia costs us. I am informed, however, by the chief of the general staff, General Lake, who has given careful study to the matter, that he thinks there are some ideas and methods followed in Switzerland, which might be profitably adopted in Canada; that we might considerably reduce the permanent force and extend the time of annual drill in the camps and pay the men who go into the camps very much larger rates so as to get the best class of men in the country. That is being worked out and possibly something may come of it.

When I made my last statement two years ago, I said this:

I propose at the earliest possible moment to have a conference with the representatives of the different provinces to see whether anything can be done in this direction.

That referred to securing the training of children in the schools, physical training of the young children and of the older children from twelve years up, military training and the teaching of musketry, rifle drill, etc.

I intend to do this before another session of parliament comes around.

I was not able at the last session to bring down any fully-considered measure with reference to this. I have seen, either the Premier or the Minister of Education of every province in Canada, and I am happy to say that without exception, all agree that it would be possible to make some arrangement by which we should have a universal and uniform system of physical training of the young children in the schools, both male and female, and of military drill for the older boys from twelve years up. In this way, I think a magnificent asset might be established for the future militia of the country, and I believe that the health and strength of the children and of the next generation would be enormously improved and increased. I think it would be a magnificent thing to have a uniform system in all the schools of the country; I belive it would be difficult to over-estimate the advantage it would yield to the whole people. In this connection, I would like to read—and with this I shall conclude—a few quotations from recent speeches and letters of distinguished men in the United States and Canada. When I made my statement, two years ago, I had the honour to read an article in the XIX Century written by the Right Honourable Earl of Meath and also letters of Lord Roberts on this subject. If the committee will bear with me for a few minutes, I will read very briefly from a letter written recently by Dr. White, of Cornell University who had been charged in one of the journals of the United States of being opposed to the system of education in Cornell, which, to some extent, follows military lines. He says he regrets having been misunderstood:

On account of the fact, which I have often stated in public addresses here and elsewhere, that a great republic like this is not to escape civil commotions from time to time, and that the more of its educated men who have some knowledge of military tactics and some military spirit, the less likely a mere wild unthinking mob is to terrorize our various communities.

Third—I have steadily supported the military department on account of its value to the young men themselves. The students of Cornell are largely from the people of comparatively small means. Very many of them come from the farms and the counters, and though as a rule the very best of fellows, they are often, when they reach the university, careless and rather 'slouchy.' Military drill 'sets them up,' makes them stand straight, makes them look a person to whom they are speaking straight in the face, enables them to give and take the word of command, and if I were called upon to name the one thing which I think we should not dispense with in Cornell University, it is this same military drill which your article charges me with opposing and criticising. So far from opposing it, I have always supported it, and I never uttered a word of criticism regarding it in my life—for the simple reason that, as a civilian, I do not feel competent to criticise it.

I go so far in this matter that if I had my way military drill would be required during the first years at every university in this country. I believe that American liberty would be far better secured thereby.

I have, at all suitable times, taken occasion to proclaim this faith, and every old graduate of Cornell under my presidency will remember that again and again I have publicly preached the doctrines above laid down against short-sighted grumblers who cannot see the value of military training or who begrudge the time it requires.

Your article states that I allege that the military course is interfering with the academic course. Any such charge is utterly baseless. There is no study in the academic course which I would not suppress sooner than give up the military drill, which I believe in so fully and always have believed in.

My experience of over forty years, since I took part in founding Cornell University, shows me that young men who go forth from the institution with good military training are at an advantage in comparison with those who have shirked or slighted it. There is a certain something about the man who has done military duty which gives him, in the struggle for existence, a better chance than the man who has simply 'slouched' it. He is more of a man among men.

And I have an authority here, which, I think, will carry a great deal of weight with this committee. Mr. Goldwin Smith, so late as February 2, 1907, wrote as follows:

I cannot help expressing my pleasure on finding that military drill is not to be abolished at Cornell. Military training is and always is likely to be indispensable to those

who are charged with the defence of public order and the defence of the commonwealth. I always advocated it at Oxford. In our case it was the sinister attitude of the French emperor that produced a national call to arms. In your case, there is no special call, but there is a general and permanent necessity. You are receiving a vast inflow of alien immigration, some of them from questionable sources. Apparently you feel unable to close your gates. Your great cities will soon be hardly American. A large and increasing number of immigrants now bring with them from the scenes of political and social conflict in Europe tendencies adverse to the principles of American civilization. At more than one point there has been disturbances arising from that source. It is surely to be desired that at the critical moment calling for military action in defence of public order the republic should feel safe under the protection not only of paid soldiery, but of her loyal citizens at large.

And now one more quotation, this one from President Hadley, of Yale, whose name is widely known. He says:

We take it as an auspicious and significant coincidence that within the space of a single month two of America's most distinguished educators, Hon. Andrew D. White, of Cornell University, and President Arthur Twining Hadley, of Yale University, have publicly declared in favour of more general military training for the young men upon whom the nation must hereafter depend for the maintenance of its peace and honour. Doctor White's utterance, it will be remembered, appeared in a letter published in the 'Army and Navy Journal,' of January 5, in which he strongly contended that a course in military training should be made compulsory in all American colleges. Doctor Hadley's views were expressed in the course of an address on 'Intelligent Preparation for Public Service,' delivered before the Yale City Government Club, the following extract from which appeared in the 'Independent' of January 3:

The man who would fully prepare himself for public service must not only do his duty in time of peace, but must be ready for the possible exigencies of war. The fact that for forty years we have not had a war which has seriously strained the powers of the nation should not blind us to the need of preparing to meet the dangers of international conflict from without and the still greater dangers of anarchy and lawlessness from within. If in the places where you settle there is any militia organization really worthy of the name, identify yourselves with it. If there is not, try to etsablish one. It may be that you will not be called upon for anything heroic in the way of military service. I certainly hope that you will not. But if you are ready to meet the danger in advance you will lessen the liability of its coming; and if it does come you will have prepared yourselves for the performance of the most vital of all public duties—the duty of protecting your country against imminent destruction.

Now, I wish to say—and I am glad to be able to say it—that the president of McGill University is taking a great deal of interest in this subject and that the presidents of other universities and the principals of high schools in Canada have been corresponding with me upon the question. The president of McGill, while not authorizing me to say that the university will take the matter up, has authorized me to say that, so far as he is personally concerned, he is favourably disposed and anxious to introduce some branch of military training in connection with the university.

I apologize for having detained the committee so long, and express my gratitude to my patient friends who have remained to hear me.

Mr. BOLE. Will the minister state the number of the permanent force and active militia and also the expenditure upon each?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The permanent force is something less than 3,000 and the active militia something less than 49,000. The total militia estimates this year are something like $4,000,000.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the item pass?

Mr. SPROULE. I think there will need to be some little discussion on this.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would suggest that we might pass these items, as we have done in other cases, with the understanding that one item shall be left upon which every branch of the service can be discussed.

Mr. SPROULE. It is now one o'clock, and if we are to get back here for a sitting at eleven o'clock in the morning, and with committees meeting an hour earlier, it is time to adjourn. It is not reasonable to ask us to consider these items now.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We might pass this first item, No. 71.

Mr. SPROULE. If we have the same right to discuss anything we like on 72 it doesn't make any difference.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, certainly.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Public Accounts Committee is taking up military matters to-morrow morning, and if the minister is going on with his militia estimates in the House there might be a clashing of interests.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Ross rifle?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.50 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 3, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Is Geo. P. Ward, Geo. A. Johnston, H. W. Ross, L. J. Kehoe, and Jas. P. White, in the service of the Department of the Interior as immigration agents ? If so, what salary are they being paid ?

2. Have the services of any or all of them been dispensed with ? If so, when ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Geo. P. Ward, Geo. A. Johnston, H. W. Ross, L. J. Kehoe, and Jas. P. White are not now in the service of the Department of the Interior as immigration agents, and are not being paid any salary.

2. Yes, all of them, in November, 1906.

GATHERING OF SEA-WEEDS IN PARISH OF ISLE VERTE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is the government aware that the inhabitants of the parish of Isle Verte, in the county of Temiscouta, have for the past twenty years extensively gathered the sea-weeds that collect on the reefs around that parish, and that the sale of those weeds thus gathered affords them a means of livelihood for their families ?

2. Is the government aware that one Anthime Roy, pretending to be possessed of the right to collect a tax of fifteen per cent on the profits which the said inhabitants of Isle Verte derive from the industry, has instituted one or more law suits against the said inhabitants who gather the said sea-weeds, to make them pay that tax ?

3. What conclusions has the government reached regarding that pretended right of Anthime Roy ?

4. Has the government intervened in the case or cases taken out by the said Anthime Roy against those who gather the said sea-weeds ?

5. Where are those suits or that suit at present ?

6. What will the government effectively do to protect the people of Isle Verte in their rights to gather freely the said sea-weeds, as they have done in the past ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The department is aware that a considerable industry is carried on at Isle Verte in this connection ; but so far as the rest of the questions are concerned, this department is not affected and has no knowledge thereof.

MILITARY FORTS AT LEVIS.

Mr. CARRIER asked :

1. Is the government aware that the Military Council of the Department of Militia has recommended the clearing of the land in the neighbourhood of the military forts Nos. 1 and 2, at Lévis ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to have that clearing done during the course of the coming summer of 1907 ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1 and 2. It is the intention to have the clearing done gradually. Part will be done during the present year.

ST. JOSEPH DE LEVIS CAMP—HUTS.

Mr. CARRIER asked :

1. Is the government aware that, in the month of September last, 1906, three military cabins had been burned in the Royal Engineers' camp at St. Joseph de Lévis ?

2. Did the government receive a report from the military commandant of the district of Quebec, recommending the rebuilding of those cabins ?

3. Is it the government's intention to rebuild those cabins during the course of the year 1907 ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). 1, 2 and 3. The Department of Militia and Defence is aware of the burning of the huts referred to, and also that the district officer commanding has recommended that they be reconstructed, but as it is not the policy of the department to provide such buildings in connection with the training of the militia in camps of instruction at other places, it has been decided not to reconstruct the huts this year.

PETAWAWA CAMP—COMPENSATION FOR TIMBER.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government by order in council, assumed certain lands in the townships of Petawawa and McKay, in the province of Ontario, for military camp purposes ?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to compensate the owners of the timber licenses covering the area of said lands, and the Ontario government, for the timber thereon ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. Yes.

2. The government has not taken the interest of the lumber licensees, and they have, therefore, no claim to compensation. The Ontario government is not by the British North America Act, entitled to compensation, and it is not intended to pay that government any compensation.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is the Grand Trunk Railway Company in possession of and using cars and other railway equipment purchased or constructed for the National Transcontinental Railway ?

2. If so, upon what terms ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The Grand Trunk Pacific have made purchase of rolling stock which is in use on the Grand Trunk and such other lines as it interchanges business with.

2. Per diem rates according to car service rules.

PRIVILEGE—CHARGES AGAINST CERTAIN MEMBERS.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker before the Orders of the Day are called, in order clearly to define the ground upon which I desire to bring up the matter of privilege which was discussed on the 8th of February, and which, by common consent was adjourned for future consideration, and in order to show that the phase of the question I wish to develop to-day before the House is different from the motion I made before going into Supply two days ago, I will read the motion I intend to present in closing my brief remarks to-day :

That on February 19 last, the member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Fowler), stated: 'I shall discuss the character of hon. members opposite, whether they be ministers or private members, and their connection with women, wine and graft;'

That the hon. member stated further that he had 'data' and 'material' at his disposal with respect to his charges ;

That such a statement, undefined as it is with regard to the parties concerned, reflects on the honour of the House and of the government ;

That the hon. member for King's be therefore invited, either to name the ministers and members of the House to whom he was referring on February 19, and to specify his charges against them, or to withdraw his accusation ;

That unless the hon. member complies with that request and adopts one of those two courses, he stands censured by this House.

I may just state that from my point of view—

Mr. SPEAKER. Having heard the terms of the motion, it seems to me that it cannot but revive the discussion previously had on the same question in the House ; and, under the rules of the House it would be out of order. I am prepared to hear discussion on the point of order.

Mr. BOURASSA. On the point of order, while, of course, I am prepared to bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and while I agree with the principle which you have just laid down, at the same time, I think I might state that the question of privilege which I raised on the 8th of February was that the accusation of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) being indefinite as to persons and charges, it ought to be taken up so that the accusation might be made definite. On the suggestion of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the taking up of the question of privilege was postponed until the report of the Insurance Commission was down. When I raised the question on the 8th of March, the position taken by the Prime Minister was that he saw nothing in the accusation made by the hon. member for King's, because it was too general. I could quote the words of the hon. gentleman, but I do not think it is necessary to do so at the present juncture. So, when I brought the subject up, later on, it was not upon that matter of privilege but upon an amendment to go into Supply, quoting the words of the hon. member for King's, and adding—

That these statements have become a matter of general comment and have aroused public opinion throughout the country, so that an immediate inquiry is imperative.

The point I took was that there had been enough accusation on both sides and sufficient comments in the newspapers of this country for several months to warrant an immediate inquiry. The House judged—and of course I am not going to discuss that judgment—that the accusations were not specific enough to warrant an inquiry. Therefore, the question of privilege raised on the 8th of February has never been dealt with and adjudged by the House—that is, the question whether the hon. member for King's should or should not be called upon to specify his charges or withdraw them. The House has taken the position that these accusations were too general to be acted upon immediately by way of inquiry, but the House has not decided finally the first point of discussion, which is whether the hon. member for King's should be forced to define his accusations or not. I admit, of course, that my position to-day deals with the same question as before, but it is a different phase of the question. It seems to me it is similar to a case in which an amendment to a motion has been disposed of and and the discussion of the question may be resumed until the main motion is disposed of. The question of privilege which I wish to bring forward is : That the general accusation of the hon. member for King's should be sufficiently defined, both as regards persons and facts, so that it may be adjudicated by the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I should think it unfortunate if any technical consideration were to prevent the discussion of this question to-day The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Labelle is in a rather curious form—he proposes to pronounce censure in advance upon an hon. member of this House. I do not remember any English precedent for that. Apart from that consideration—and, of course, it is a matter to be dealt with later on—it would not seem to me wise under the present conditions to put aside any fair

opportunity of discussing these matters that have been the subject of debate in this House and of very general comment throughout the country.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand my duty as presiding officer of the House, that duty is to enforce reasonably the rules, practie and procedure of the House. The present motion has for the very gist of it the quotation of the same words quoted in a former resolution, and the debate upon it must necessarily cover the same ground as the other. As to the question of privilege, that seems to have been fairly involved in, discussed upon, and disposed of by the previous motion. I think my course is plain in the matter—that I should, subject to what action the House itself may see fit to take upon the question, rule the motion out of order as covering ground as to which a debate has already occurred. Therefore, the motion must be ruled out of order.

Mr. BOURASSA. I should have thought that the government would have something to say in this matter. In view of the position taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and of my own opinion, with all respect to your decision, Mr. Speaker—which not only I am bound to accept, but with which, as a matter of strict principle, I agree—I must say that I think that at the present juncture I should ask the House to pronounce itself upon it, not by way of revision of your decision, but that as a matter of deep public interest is involved. Therefore, I appeal to the House not on the ground that your ruling is not correct, but on the ground that the public interest demands that the first question should be immediately dealt with.

Mr. SPEAKER. Government orders.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the matter is now finally disposed of? I know that you have given your decision, but I suppose that in the statement you have just made you were giving your views to the House to open up the question of order and that opportunities would be given for discussion. I certainly thought that we should hear from the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on the case. With that view I did not rise at the time, but it certainly was my intention to say something on the motion. Am I debarred from doing so at the present time?

Mr. SPEAKER. Well, I had supposed I had given an opportunity to discuss the point of order. I do not desire to prevent any member who wishes to discuss that question.

Mr. FOSTER. I would add my view to to that which was taken by my colleague the leader of the opposition. It may be that, from a strictly technical point of view, this matter having been referred to and discussed on a resolution which included it, may be considered as having been disposed of by the House, and therefore cannot be brought up again as it relates to the same subject. But I do think that under the present juncture of circumstances, in the present feeling that there is undoubtedly in the country with reference to the whole matter, it might be wiser to abandon the strictly technical view and take the broader ground, that under the circumstances the House should hear what the member for Labelle has to say, and that so far as possible it should give an opportunity to set at rest finally if possible the series of insinuations, of reports, of half vouched for statements, and of vouched for statements, if it comes to that, which are current in this House and in the country. Don't let us imagine for a moment that we are getting out of this set of circumstances in which we are placed, by technically declaring against a discussion in this House on a ruling of the Chair. Is it not better for us to take the broader ground?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is really not discussing the point of order, but something else. The question of course I have to deal with is whether the point of order which was raised against the motion is a proper one or not. The discussion I think must be confined to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then coming back to the question of order, the strict point of order, it does seem to me that there is something in the pretension of the member for Labelle. Inasmuch as this matter was brought up in a definite way, though inclusive of a great many others, on a preceding occasion when it was discussed in the House, there may be ground for saying that, being included in the general motion, that is, the subject matter of this having been included in the general motion, it was discussed and disposed of. But I think you will see there is a difference. A part of the general motion is now taken out and set by itself, and the member for Labelle proposes to treat it in a different way. Having had the decision of the House that a committee should not be appointed to take up the charges amongst which was the subject matter of this present discussion, and the House having decided that that should not be done, he takes it up now by itself, and does not move for a committee to be appointed to investigate the question, but he takes up the question as one of privilege. In this light it so remains, it is on the records, it is within the knowledge of the House and of the country, and no decision of the Chair and no decision of this House can take it out of that category. Seeing that is the case, and that the House has decided that it shall not be dealt with in a certain way, and the member for Labelle questions as to whether that can be dealt

with in a different way, he proposes as a member of the House, and guarding the honour of the House, and careful for the reputation of the House, to ask the House to state that these charges shall be further carried out or that they shall be disavowed, and that the House shall take certain action if either the one or the other of these things are done. It seems to me that that is putting it on a better basis, and ranges it in a different category. As I said before, if the Speaker can see that even approximately that is the case, may be it would be much better for the Speaker and the House, though I do not wish to dictate, not to push our repressive power to the point of absolutely shutting out in this House from this time on and for ever, the attempt to clear up what in my belief had better be cleared up, and as quickly as possible; for the longer it stands in the condition in which it is to-day the worse the matter grows, and the worse I think it is for the reputation of this parliament. We cannot afford to do anything in this House, even coming down to strict technicalities, which will show to the country a desire to put our strong hand upon any proper investigation into the charges and insinuations which are now current coin throughout the country.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). As I am somewhat intimately concerned in this matter, perhaps it is well that I should say a word or two with respect to it. I think the hon. member for Labelle has had every opportunity to be heard in connection with this matter, but when the matter was brought up before by the member for Labelle it was absolutely out of order. The hon. gentleman had an opportunity then of discussing this thing, everybody who wanted to speak upon the subject had an opportunity to discuss it. Now it is brought up again for the second time, I do not know for what purpose. The hon. gentleman has used me, I think, with scant courtesy in this matter. When the hon. gentleman was going to move a resolution in which my name occurred, I would have supposed that he would send me a copy of that resolution. I have not received a copy of it. I heard the terms of that resolution for the first time when this House opened this morning, although yesterday I sent the hon. gentleman a note asking him to be here in his place at three o'clock when the House opened in the afternoon in order that I might know the terms of this resolution to see whether and how it affected myself. This resolution contains two sections. It asks for a vote of censure upon me by this House in the event of my not doing such and such things. It purports to contain a quotation from a speech which I made on the 19th of February; but, Sir, it takes only a portion of that speech, separating it from the context, and giving it a different meaning altogether from the meaning which I meant to convey in my remarks on that occasion. It does not give the condition which I set out in those remarks. I want to say just here that I have no objection, in one way, to the discussion of this motion. But I say the hon. gentleman is entirely out of order because, in the first place, he has no right to embody in a resolution words which he takes from the 'Hansard' which are supposed to have been uttered by me, words which were not taken down, and which must be taken down in this House before they can be used against a member on a motion requiring him either to retract or withdraw them, or to substantiate them. Upon that point certainly the hon. gentleman is out of order. I object to the latter part of his resolution as containing, if it passed this House, a censure upon myself. I say this House has no power to do that.

Mr. SPEAKER. That of course is starting another discussion on another question. The question before the House is whether this motion is in order, and whether my ruling intimating that it was not in order, is correct.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). May I rise to another point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. This point of order will have to be disposed of before another is taken.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I want to read the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member proposes to discuss the point of order under consideration he is in order.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Rule number 12 provides:

> A member called to order shall sit down, but may afterwards explain. The House, if appealed to, shall decide on the case, but without debate. If there be no appeal, the decision of the Chair shall be final.

My hon. friend from Labelle appealed from the decision of the Chair that there should be no debate, and that the House should decide immediately.

Mr. SPEAKER. There has been no definite ruling yet and until the ruling is given of course, there can be no appeal from it.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on your ruling. The usual and what I regard as the proper custom is that when the Speaker gives a ruling the rule under which he gives it should be read to the House which was not done on this occasion. Bourinot, speaking of the right of the House, to consider a question after it has once been dealt with, uses the following language:

> It is, however, an ancient rule of parliament that 'no question or motion can regularly be offered if it is substantially the same with one on which the judgment of the House has al-

ready been expressed during the current session.'

The question is whether this is substantially the same motion that was decided the other day or not. If I understand it correctly, the first motion was to the effect that the government should appoint a Committee of Inquiry so that the allegations or insinuations which were made might be investigated. This House decided that such a committee should not be appointed and therefore that might fairly be taken as the judgment of the House. Then, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) says: In view of that decision I move that the hon. member who made or insinuated these charges be called upon to name the parties to whom he referred or to withdraw his statement. It seems to me that this is substantially different from the other motion, and therefore I think the hon. member is quite within his rights and within the rules of the House in proposing the motion which he has presented.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, as I have been appealed to, to express my opinion upon this question I have only to say that I consider it my duty as the leader of the House always to support the chair, and that is a rule that I would not vary under any circumstances unless, in my judgment, the ruling of the Speaker were grossly wrong. There is a good deal to be said, not as to the technical meaning of the rule, which is quite clear, but as to the ultimate effect of it. The Speaker has taken it upon himself to maintain what he considers to be the traditions and rules of the House. These rules are not the result of a momentary impulse; they are the result of long experience applied to an assembly which has proved to be the wisest of all deliberative assemblies. I think we can never err in applying these rules. If the object of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is to clear the atmosphere of the House, there are cases and cases showing how this is to be done. The House has affirmed, and it is also the rule of the House which has come to us from the mother of parliaments, that the conduct or standing of any member of this House cannot be impugned except upon cause being shown and until a member rises in his place in the House and says: I have reason to believe and I can prove such and such a thing against a member. Otherwise there is no occasion to go into this general inquisition which is proposed by the hon. member for Labelle. Under such circumstances it seems to me that the course taken by the Speaker is the correct one and we have nothing to do but stand by the ruling of the Chair. If, at a later period, the hon. member for Labelle or anybody else, thinks there is in this House any member who ought not to be a member of it, who has disgraced himself, or whose conduct ought to be investigated, it is open to him to demand such an investigation, but the House, I hope will not depart from the sound traditions which have come to us from England and according to which there could be no inquisition into any man's conduct or standing except on charges made specifically. If, unfortunately, there are members of this House who are not fit to be associated with gentlemen, who are not fit to be members of this House, whose conduct ought to be investigated, it must be the painful duty of the House to make such an investigation, but only under the safeguard which has been provided by the House. I think the common sense of the House will not allow a departure from what is a well known law of parliament, or from the rules which would be applied in England, if cases of this kind were to arise, and therefore it seems to me that we have only to maintain the traditions and rules of the House and of parliamentary government. If there are cases which arise and which call for the application of disciplinary measures, I am sure, from experience that we have had not very far back, the House will be equal to the occasion every time.

Mr. BOURASSA. Will the right hon. gentleman allow me to put a question to him? I would like to ask where, in this motion that I have given notice of, there is one word indicating that I want an inquisition. The remarks of the right hon. gentleman might apply to the motion I made the other day but there is not a word in this motion asking for an inquisition into the character of anybody. It is simply asking that the general statement of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) should be made definite. There is not a word as to an inquisition or a Committee of Inquiry.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, there is not a word as to an inquisition, but if the motion means anything it leads to an inquisition.

Mr. BOURASSA. It leads to the hon. member for King's being called upon to define the charges or withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER. Having heard the discussion upon the question I am more than ever confirmed in the view that the ruling is a proper one and I therefore rule the motion out of order.

Mr. BOURASSA. Therefore, as I stated a moment ago, and with all respect for your decision, I appeal to the House from your decision.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that he did not appeal on the question of order, but on the question of principle.

Mr. BOURASSA. I stated that I did not appeal against the ruling of the Speaker,

in regard to the general principle, but on the ground that the general principle does not apply under the circumstances because the question that I raise, is a question of privilege, which was not dealt with by the House at all in the discussion that took place on the motion I presented to the House some days ago. I appeal against the decision of the Speaker, not on the question of principle, but against the application of the principle.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to appeal on the ground that the ruling of the Chair is wrong?

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, under the circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion of Mr. Bourassa is as follows:

That on February 19 last, the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Fowler), stated: 'I shall discuss the character of hon. members opposite whether they be ministers or private members, and their connection with women, wine and graft';

That the hon. member stated further that he had 'data' and 'material' at his disposal with respect to his charges;

That such a statement, undefined as it is with regard to the parties concerned, reflects on the honour of the House and of the government;

That the hon. member of King's be therefore invited, either to name the ministers and members of the House to whom he was referring on February 19, and to specify his charges against them, or to withdraw his accusation;

That unless the hon. member complies with that request and adopts one of those two courses, he stands censured by this House.

The Chair rules that this motion is out of order because the subject matter to which it refers has already been dealt with, discussed and decided upon by the House. In the course of the debate reference has also been made to the fact that, according to the rule, the words complained of, having not been taken down at the time they were uttered, they could not now be taken as a basis for a motion of censure.

The question now is: Shall the decision of the Speaker be sustained by the House?

House divided on the question.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Black,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carrier,
Cash,
Conmee,
Crocket,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Devlin (Nicolet),
Devlin (Wright),
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Greenway,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Harty,
Hughes (Victoria),
Hunt,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lancaster,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Law,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Morin,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Power,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew)—104.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Bourassa,
Brabazon,
Clements,
Daniel,
Foster,
Henderson,
Herron,
Jackson (Elgin),
Lake,
Lalor,
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Leonard,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Northrup,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Worthington.—37.

Motion that the ruling of the chair be sustained agreed to.

Mr BERGERON. I desire to say that I am paired with the Postmaster General. Had I voted I would have voted nay.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish, as a matter of privilege, to allude to an incident which occurred

yesterday. When the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, (Mr. Emmerson) was speaking on the question of his resignation, I did not think that was the proper time to call attention to certain language uttered by him, and which, however, I noted at the time. I regret that the hon. member for Westmoreland is not in his place now, but I shall take the opportunity of alluding to the matter again when he is present? The words of the hon. gentleman to which I refer are set forth in the unrevised 'Hansard' page 5690 and are as follows:

I will be here to declare that, if political warfare is to be carried on with weapons from the gutter of slander and personal gossip—if the political warfare of Canada is to be degraded to that level—those on this side of your chair, Mr. Speaker, will not alone suffer in that warfare. And, if the country would know the facts; if the public press—which has had detectives on my track and on the track of other ministers of the Crown seeking out matters that are of private moment—would know the facts, the employment of detectives is necessary as aginst those on this side, but, without stooping to secure evidence in that way, there is evidence in existence against others, evdience that has not been purchased, evidence that will be strong, powerful, cogent. And if the great public press of Canada and the people of Canada want that evidence, it is within their grasp; it is within the grasp of this House; it is within the grasp of the country.

Now, the language of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) is not very definite but it is definite enough to cast aspersion upon some 70 or 75 members on this side of the House. I desire to say that the hon. member for Westmoreland has said either too much or too little, and I desire to say further to him, that I think it is his duty either to say more or to withdraw what he has said. I desire to say now, and I shall take opportunity to say it in his presence that if he has any charge or any evidence to sustain any charge against the honour or status as a public man of any gentleman on this side of the House, I will give him every assistance within my power to press that charge. I think it necessary to say this much at the present moment. I have not the slightest conception of what the hon. member for Westmoreland has alluded to. If there be any such charges, or even rumours connected with the name of any gentleman on this side of the House, they have not come to my ears. If the hon. member for Westmoreland has anything which will enable him to substantiate that which he has said by way of insinuation in this House, I trust he will take an opportunity to make good his insinuation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The observations which we have just heard from the leader of the opposition show conclusively the wisdom of the ruling of Mr. Speaker and which the House has just sustained; that is to say, that language which is out of order should be taken notice of at once, the words recorded, and then the member using the language can be called to account for it. But, if the House allows these words to be passed over, they should not be referred to afterwards, as has been ruled by Mr. Speaker, and sustained by the House, and properly so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as I am concerned I do not agree with that view, when we have a revised 'Hansard' and when the words imply a charge against a member on either one side of the House or the other. I think that rule is altogether too technical to be applied when dealing with matters which concern the honour of this House. It is not only members of this House who are concerned, but we are having suggestions of this kind throughout the public press of this country. In a journal of this country which has a large circulation, it was stated only the other day:

That there is an organized understanding between certain members of both sides to hush up the business; and, worse than this, there is a determined effort on the part of some members on one side of the House to threaten members on the other side with contrary exposures if any are made against their friends.

I desire to say from my place in the House that I have not heard of nor do I know of any such understanding, and if it were brought to my attention I would not sanction it. I believe that these words are absolutely untrue so far as the members of this House are concerned. I have not heard of any such understanding. If there be any evidence to sustain such a charge within the knowledge of the public journal to which I have referred, it seems to me proper to have that charge brought to the attention of the House in the proper way, and that the hon. member of this House who is said to be closely connected with that journal should stand up in his place and make his statement to the House himself, and not repeat it outside of the House in that public journal. That would be the fair way, and the manly way, and the proper way to deal with this matter. I for one protest against these insinuations inside the House or outside of the House against the honour of parliament, and I am prepared to go to the utmost limit of parliamentary usage, or even to go beyond parliamentary usage, in order that men, either within the House or out of the House, who are making insinuations of this kind may be brought up before a tribunal, and asked to make good their charges or forever after to hold their peace.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think that the editor, proprietor, or manager of the journal referred to should be brought to the bar of the House and asked to explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What journal is it ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know, I am sure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a well known rule of the House, which, if any person transgresses, he may be brought to the bar of the House and made amenable for his conduct. We had a case of that before us last year, and the rule can be called into operation at any time. But, with regard to what transpires in this House, the rule which has come to us is a sound one, and it is, that offensive words should be taken notice of at once, and that if not taken notice of immediately they should not be recalled afterwards. That is the rule which has come to us from the British practice and I think it is a perfectly sound one. What takes place in this House every session shows how sound the rule is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I could understand the wholesome nature of that rule at a time when the debates of the House were not reported. It is of course a rule technically still in force. I would not be inclined—and I say this with all deference and respect to the opinion of the Prime Minister, who has had greater parliamentary experience than I have had—I would not be inclined to attach very much importance to the circumstance that the words were not technically taken down, when we have a 'Hansard' reporting the utterance of each member, and a 'Hansard' which each member has the opportunity of revising. I think that old rule to a certain extent, to a very great extent, lost its usefulness since 'Hansard' was introduced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That we have a 'Hansard' does not alter the fact that the rule is in existence, and it is a sound one. We know that words are spoken in the heat of debate which should not be uttered, and these are the words which are to not be taken down at the moment. Sometimes they are not taken notice of because the House does not think it worth while to order that they should be or for some other reason ; but the rule is there and it is a proper rule. As to revising 'Hansard,' no member has a right to alter what he has said on the floor of this House.

Mr. BERGERON. But they do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then it is against the rule if they do so, and the rule ought to be enforced, and if the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) brings it to the attention of the House it will be enforced. No member has a right to change what he says on the floor of the House; he can revise a clerical error but he cannot alter the substance of his speech.

WINNIPEG TERMINALS—CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals) moved third reading of Bill (No. 128) respecting the Winnipeg Terminals of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There was a promise given the other day that the plans of the terminals should be brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand they have not been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. My colleague the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) wished to see these plans, and as he is not here just now I would ask that this order be allowed to stand.

Mr. FIELDING. Very well ; I will see the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) before I move again.

REPRESENTATION OF SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into committee on Bill (No. 51) to readjust the representation of the province of Saskatchewan and Alberta in the House of Commons, and to amend the Representation Act. He said: This Bill was introduced according to the provisions of the Act creating the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and it was referred to a special committee of five members to delimit the constituencies for representation in this House, to which each province is entitled. I am glad to say that the members of the committee have made a unanimous report and have given an example which is worth following, when, at a later period, after the census, we have to recast the boundaries of the constituencies in the other provinces. The members in this House from the new provinces, to whom this Bill was referred, have I repeat given a most notable example, and one which is worthy of imitation. I do not know what their deliberations have been, but they have no doubt adopted the policy of mutual forbearance and mutual concession, and they have made a unanimous report to the House. It is therefore my duty simply to move that the report of that special committee be adopted, and made part of the Bill.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, in view of the stress which has been laid by the Prime Minister upon the unanimity of the report, and in view of the great stress which has been laid by the public press of the country on that fact, I think it is just as well that I should say a few words on this subject lest there

should be some misunderstanding. Especially do I wish to do so as there are certain features in this redistribution which are certain to call for considerable comment in the western provinces. For instance, there is a very uneven distribution of population, especially in the province of Saskatchewan. I may say that the committee was composed of three gentlemen supporting the government and two to occupy seats on this side of the House. The two Conservative members would certainly have wished for very considerable changes in the distribution which has been suggested in the report of the committee, and they urged such changes ; but after a fairly full discussion, and in view of all the circumstances and of the attitude which was taken by their Liberal colleagues, they considered that they would be scarcely justified in bringing their differences of opinion before this House and throwing the whole matter into the full committee of the House. especially after they came to the conclusion that their Liberal colleagues on the committee were not likely to give way on the points which the Conservative members raised. In my view, the principal gain which can be looked for from arranging a redistribution by parliamentary committee is that discussion can take place amongst a few members each of whom probably represents the views prevailing on his side of the House, and the matter can be fully threshed out without taking up the time of parliament. I do not wish to suggest that there is any more likelihood of the views of either party being absolutely met in a parliamentary committee than there is in the House ; but there is more opportunity for give and take, and I am willing to admit that there was a certain amount of give and take in this particular case. At the same time, to my mind the only really satisfactory method of distribution of constituencies would be by a judicial commission. That is a view which I hold now even more strongly than I did when the question was up in connection with the distribution of the constituencies in the two new provinces under the Autonomy Bills. To deal with the Bill at issue, when the committee met for the first time, proposals were brought down by the government members, as would no doubt have been done in Committee of the Whole House, and they made it pretty clear that while they would be willing to accept some slight modifications in the plan they proposed, the general scheme would have to stand as it was. Now, I frankly acknowledge that the proposals were based on the same principle on which I should have made my own proposals. I believe they were based on a correct principle, that is, that the convenience of the people in the Northwest should first of all be consulted—that the constituencies should be mapped out in such a way that if possible there should be railway communication between the various parts of those constituencies. I thoroughly agree with that part of their proposals. But it was in the working out of the details that considerable differences of opinion arose. With regard to the province of Saskatchewan, my view was that there was too much discrepancy between the populations of the southern constituencies and those of the northern constituencies ; that is to say, that the representation given to the northern parts of the province, where the scandals recently occurred in connection with the provincial elections, was unduly great, and I proposed certain modifications in the general scheme, which I think would have evened up these matters considerably and would have left the smallest constituency with a population of about 22,000 and the largest with a population of a little over 30,000. But these suggestions, in the whole, were not acceptable by the committee, though I must admit that some of them were accepted. The concessions both in Saskatchewan and Alberta were sufficient, in the minds of my Conservative colleague and myself, to justify us in the course we adopted, that is in bringing in no minority report, but agreeing to allow the report which has been brought down to be laid before this House as a report of the committee. I may say further that I consider the distribution which has been brought down an immense improvement upon the distribution which was made of the local constituencies of the two new provinces in the year 1905; and I will pay this tribute to our colleagues, that I think they have worked on the right lines, that their proposals were fairly and honourably put before the committee, and that they were willing to make some concessions to our views. I do not wish it to go forth to the world, however, that the Conservative members on that committee are satisfied with the distribution which has been brought down, though we know in a matter of this kind there must be some give and take.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, there is practically nothing in the remarks of the hon. gentleman to which I can take any exception. The Liberal members of the committee discussed the matter with the hon. gentleman and his colleague and we thought that was the best way for us to make the proposition. We agreed that when that proposition was brought down we would allow whatever length of time they desired to elapse before calling the next meeting of the committee. We brought down the proposed redistribution and the whole object we had in view was to endeavour to outline the constituencies in such a way as to make them run more with the lines of railway so that there would be a community of interest all through the same constituency and not as

it is at present where we have constituencies with several lines of railway running across them and one part of a constituency has no connection with another. We brought down what we thought was a fair and reasonable proposition, and after it had been looked into for a week or so our friends on the other side of the House brought forward some suggestions as to improvements. I am bound to admit that they brought them forward in a fair and reasonable spirit and as far as I could see on neither side of the committee was there the slightest effort made to obtain any political advantage. One very good reason for that is that in that country it would be a very difficult matter to say what the political advantage would be because when the constituencies were formed five or six years ago some of them had a small population and that population has doubled and trebled so that no one knows practically what the political aspect of these constituencies will be. The suggestions that the hon. member and his colleague made were fair and reasonable suggestions along the line of making the constituencies better and more workable and as we told them we were prepared to consider them. We adopted several of them and several we were not able to adopt. The result is that we have a redistribution that I think is by all odds the best redistribution we have ever had in the west. While it does not exactly meet the views of our hon. friends opposite it does not meet the views of all the members of the committee on this side of the House either, but taking it all around I think it is a fair and reasonable redistribution and I am very pleased to give credit for the absolute fairness with which the matter was dealt with by members on the other side of the committee.

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

On section 2,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it necessary to read the schedule ?

Mr. SPROULE. Does the schedule represent the conclusion which the committee reached because in so far as it does not agree with the decision of the committee it would have to be amended. I take it that this is the original Bill that was submitted to the committee and that in some respects they proposed to amend that Bill. In such respects as it is proposed to amend the Bill it will have to be amended there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Bill is reprinted as reported by the special committee to which it was referred.

Mr. LAKE. There are one or two verbal mistakes. I do not know that I have noted them all. I do not know whether the chairman of the special committee knows what they are, but unless the constituencies are delimited very carefully there may be trouble. We should have a map showing the different constituencies.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. On the 28th line, page 3, the words 'fourth meridian' should be replaced by the words 'third meridian.'

Mr. TURRIFF. A map was handed to an officer of the Interior Department who is familiar with the surveys, he prepared the schedules and they were checked by the law clerk of the House, but although that was done there were one or two errors that were subsequently discovered and which have been rectified in the copy of the Bill in the hands of the chairman.

Mr. SPROULE. I would respectfully submit that it is very difficult to compare them and be sure that this is correct. It would be well to let the Bill stand for a short time and have a few copies of the map provided, so that members could compare the map with the Bill to ascertain if the Bill is correct because if it is passed it cannot be amended afterwards.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I apprehend that there are few members of this House who would undertake to deal with that matter except the members of the committee themselves. I think we might pass the Bill through committee and reserve the third reading until to-morrow so that the Bill can be looked over by the members of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. The members of the committee, with the map in their hands, could make a revision of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, so that if there are any errors we can correct them to-morrow before the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. If there was a map available they could compare it with the map.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is a map on the table with the report.

Mr. LAKE. I feel quite sure that there are several amendments to be made to this schedule. I did not expect this Bill to come up and I have not all my papers in my desk.

Progress reported.

YUKON ACT—AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 109) to amend the Yukon Act.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 1,

1. Section 6 of the Yukon Act, chapter 63 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection :

2. The Governor in Council may, from time to time, appoint an acting commissioner to execute the office and functions of the commissioner during his absence, illness or other inability.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. When this Bill was up before it was stated that the acting governor had been auditor of the Territory, and I do not think the minister gave a very satisfactory explanation as to who had audited the accounts before, and who was likely to audit the accounts he was making while acting governor. The same man ought not to hold the offices of governor and auditor.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I hardly stated the case correctly when I spoke of the acting commissioner as auditor. He is comptroller, not auditor.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What does that mean?

Mr. OLIVER. It means that he has control especially of the finances of the territory. If it were a responsible government, his position would be that of Minister of Finance. I presume the auditing of the accounts is under his control, just as is the accounting for the expenditure of money.

Mr. SPROULE. Who audits the accounts?

Mr. OLIVER. I may say that I made inquiries, and the information I got was that Mr. Lithgow, Comptroller of the Yukon Territory, is authorized to sign letter-of credit cheques for the Commissioner of the Yukon, and that Mr. G. I. Maclean countersigns with Mr. Lithgow. The accounts received from Dawson have been examined or audited by Mr. Maclean as auditor, and approved by Mr. Lithgow as acting commissioner. In regard to the Yukon Council accounts, they are not received by the Department of the Interior, but are sent direct to the Auditor General. On inquiry it was found they were audited by Mr. Maclean before being sent. Apparently Mr. Maclean is auditor and Mr. Lithgow Minister of Finance, but during the absence of the commissioner Mr. Lithgow acts as commissioner.

Mr. LAKE. Is there any audit of the lump sums placed at the disposal of the Yukon Council? There ought to be an audit of these sums at Ottawa. This government nominates half the members of the Yukon Council and also the chairman of the council, in the person of the commissioner. Therefore, it is the government who are responsible for the expenditure of these sums. But in the Auditor General's account they appear as lump sums granted to the Yukon authorities.

Mr. OLIVER. My information is that these accounts of the Yukon Council are sent direct to the Auditor General, but they are audited in the Yukon by Mr. Maclean and approved by Mr. Lithgow before they come down here to be audited again by the Auditor General.

Mr. LAKE. But the Auditor General does not seem to give any account of the expenditure of these items. There are two large sums granted to the local council, one of $125,000, and another granted to the local council for the maintenance of roads, $100,000. Does any audit of these take place by the Auditor General?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, I cannot answer for any supposed dereliction on the part of the Auditor General. My information is that the accounts are audited locally and are sent to the Auditor General. If the Auditor General does not audit them, that does not come within my control.

Mr. FOSTER. It is his duty to audit them, is it not?

Mr. OLIVER. Very likely. They are there for his audit. Being independent of the control of the government, he may audit them or not, and he may account for them in one way or in another way—I know nothing about that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who audits the accounts in connection with the royalties charged on the gold output?

Mr. OLIVER. That, I take it, is a collection by the Dominion government and is audited by Mr. G. I. Maclean, who is auditor of both the local and Dominion governments.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister any record of how the output compares with the amount of royalties levied? In other words, do the accounts tally, or is there a shortage in the royalty?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the reports must tally—that is, the gold we have knowledge of is that upon which the royalty is collected. And certainly those who act for us are not reporting that gold is passing on which we are entitled to collect royalty which is not collected.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have reports sent to me of certain resolutions passed at a large public meeting in Dawson, and it is stated that copies of the same were furnished to the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), as well as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and some other hon. members on this side. I will take the liberty of placing this before the House and the Minister of the Interior for his consideration:

The accompanying resolutions were passed at a public mass meeting held at Dawson on February 4, 1907.

These resolutions were all passed without a single dissenting voice and the meeting was large and representative, and over one hundred people were unable to obtain admission.

The first resolution speaks for itself, and it is asked that strict orders be issued at once to the other departments than the Interor Department to order public officials to desist from interfering in politics.

The second resolution is for the purpose, if possible, of convincing the public men and press of Canada that the press of Dawson as at present constituted does not represent or reflect or speak for public opinion in the Yukon. This resolution was carefully drawn by the Rev. John Pringle.

The third resolution simply relates to a Yukon organization for the local Yukon elections.

The fourth resolution asks the government to appoint some other commissioner than Lithgow or Mr. McInnes.

Whereas the interference in politics by any person on the pay-roll of the government or any department or official thereof, is not conducive to the best interest of good government and has been condemned by members of the present government publicly ;

And whereas the acting commissioner of the Yukon territory has lately issued written orders to all the employees of the Interior Department to refrain from interfering in Yukon politics ;

And whereas as the action of officials of other departments of the Yukon administration have been and are just as offensive as the actions of Interior departmental officials upon which this order was based ;

Therefore be it resolved that the governmen of Canada be memorialized by the resolutions of this mass meeting of the citizns of the Yukon Territory and requested to have orders issued at once to all the departments of government having officials in the Yukon Territory forbidding any interference in the politics or political parties of the Yukon Territory on the part of any persons on the pay-roll of any department ;

And that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the acting commissioner of the Yukon with a request that he forward the same at once to the government ;

And also to Dr. Alfred Thompson, M.P., with a request that he draw the attention of the House of Commons to the same ;

And that copies be also sent to the Prime Minister of Canada, and to the leader of the opposition in the House of Commons of Canada.

Certified true copy of original passed unanimously.

THOMAS BABCOCK,
Chairman.

Second resolution :

That whereas the press of to-day owes its great power and influence to an implied agreement with the people to deal wtih the news in a truthful and impartial manner ;

And whereas in the Yukon Territory truthfulness and impartiality in conveying the news are more important than they are elsewhere on account of our isolated situation, and because the two newspapers in Dawson are owned and controlled by the same men, who have made a fortune out of the support and patronage of the people of the Yukon ;

And whereas since the amalgamation of the 'News' and 'World' under the same owners the course of these papers has in many instances not been in accordance with truth and fairness ;

And whereas in ignoring and refusing to mention in any way the crowded mass meeting held in the Pioneer Hall on the evening of the McInnes banquet these papers misrepresent the feeling actually existing in the Yukon Territory ;

And whereas in making false statements as to the speeches made and the vote taken at the mass meeting held recently in the A. B. Hall by the promoters of Mr. J. T. Lithgow's campaign for the commissionership, these papers conveyed an altogether erroneous impression to the people of the Yukon not present at the meeting as to the feeling of the meeting regarding the appointment of Mr. J. T. Lithgow to the office of commissioner ;

And whereas in many other matters and on other occasions they have acted rather as the organs of the administration and apologists for its acts than as the advocates of the interests of the people from whom they received their support ;

Therefore be it resolved that this mass meeting of citizens of the Yukon Territory hereby condemns and repudiates the misrepresentations of the newspapers of Dawson ;

And that copies of this resolution with the vote duly certified thereon by the chairman and secretary, be sent to the Prime Minister of Canada, to the leader of the opposition, and to at least five of the newspapers of eastern Canada in order that the people of Canada may know that the people of the Yukon have no independent journal to express their voice and opinions and that the 'World' and 'News' are to all intents and purposes one paper conducted rather for the purpose of earning by subservience a large government subsidy than of presenting the news and advocating the interests of the people.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was duly put before the mass meeting held in the Pioneer Hall on the fourth day of February, 1907, and that the said resolution was disposed of as follows :

For the resolution—the entire meeting.
Against the resolution—not one vote.
And the same was therefore carried.

THOMAS BABCOCK,
Chairman of the said mass meeting

Certified correct,
A. Libby, secretary.

Third resolution :

Resolved that whereas the two-year term of the present elected members of the Yukon council has nearly expired, and another election of members will be held within a short time ;

And whereas under the amendments to the Yukon Council Act much work will have to be performed in the preparaton of the voters' lists ;

And whereas the only organized regular political party at present in the Yukon territory, are the various subdivisons of the Liberal party called locally 'The Steams', 'Tabs' and 'Stabs';

And whereas it is desirable and necessary that candidates be nominated who are not bound to, satisfactory to, or dominated by any

section of the Liberal party, or by government officials.

Therefore be it resolved that the chairman of this meeting appoint a committee of seven members including therein the chairman and secretary of this meeting and the duties of and instructions of this committee shall be :

1. To consider the feasibility and desirability of completing some organization of the Yukon people who are not in sympathy with or represented by any of the active and organized political parties or factions in the Yukon to-day, into a party, or political association or club.

2. If such a step is considered advisable to the said committee then this committee to draft a constitution and suggest a name and procedure for the completion of the same.

3. To report all their findings and suggestions in writing to a meeting to be called by them for the consideration of their report which shall be in writing.

Certified true copy of original as passed unanimously.

THOMAS BABCOCK,
Chairman.

Fourth resolution :

That this meeting reiterates the expression given at the mass meeting held by the promoters of Mr. J. T. Lithgow's campaign for the commissionership in the A. B. Hall, and which was so misreported in the press of Dawson, and we again say that the appointment of Mr. J. T. Lithgow we protest against as being but a continuation of the unfortunate and unhappy McInnes regime ;

And this meeting memorializes the government to assume the responsibility for appointing a man for the position of commissionership who will not follow the precedents and course of action set up by W. W. B. McInnes, whose chief source of praise is the purchased eulogies of the traitorous newspaper the Dawson 'Daily News.'

Certified true copy of resolution as originally passed.

THOMAS BABCOCK,
Chairman.

These are the resolutions that were passed. Now I have a few words that were submitted to me in connection with the royalty, which I believe will prove of interest to the minister :

ROYALTY UPON OUTPUT.

According to the rates chargeable, and the output of gold in official documents, the royalty up to 1905 should, at a fair reasonable computation, amount to $7,116,930. The government accounts only for $3,298,297.26. A deficit of $3,818,633. What has became of this vast sum ? Was it collected from the miner and failed to reach the treasury, or has the government been so criminally negligent as to fail in securing this revenue to the country ?

The output of gold according to official figures, and the returns of royalty, are entirely out of proportion. $114,000,000 of gold and only $3,000,000 of royalty, although the royalty was ten per cent for a large portion of the time, and as high as 20 per cent, and never lower than 2½ per cent.

During a few years there were small amounts exempted. First the man who only produced $2,500 was exempt from royalty, and afterwards this figure was increased to $5,000. As ten per cent it would require $38,000,000 of output in small exemptions, and at 5 per cent it would require $76,000,000 of output in small exemptions to account for the difference in royalty collected and royalty that should be accounted for, viz.: $3,818,000. It is quite obvious the missing millions cannot be accounted for in this manner.

Yukon was discovered in August 1896—on September 11, 1897—ten per cent was charged upon output up to $500 per week, when the output exceeded that, twenty per cent was charged.

This rate prevailed until March 5, 1898, when the rate became ten per cent upon all amounts over $2,500, and it remained at that until April 17, 1901.

On April 17, 1901, the rate was made five per cent, and it remained so until May 1, 1902, since which time it has been two and one-half per cent, and it so remains to-day.

On April 25, 1906, a reference to 'Hansard' will show that the Minister of the Interior brought down a return in answer to a question as to what had been the gold output of Yukon to date. He said as follows :

Year.	Gold output.
1897	$ 2,500,000
1898	10,000,000
1899	16,000,000
1900	22,275,000
1901	18,000,000
1902	14,500,000
1903	12,250,000
1904	10,500,000
1905	8,327,200
Total	$114,352,200

Upon June 11, 1906, a reference to 'Hansard' will show, that the Minister of the Interior brought down a return in answer to a question as to what royalty had been collected in Yukon from 1897 until 1905 and the rates charged and, when they became operative.

He said as follows :

1897-1898	$ 273,292 82
1898-1899	588,262 37
1899-1900	730,771 99
1900-1901	592,660 98
1901-1902	331,436 79
1902-1903	302,893 48
1903-1904	272,217 06
1904-1905	206,760 87
Total	$3,298,297 26

The minister also said that the following rates were charged :

September 11, 1897, ten per cent on output up to $500 per week, after that 20 per cent.

March 5, 1898, ten per cent on output, less exemption $2,500.

April 17, 1901, five per cent, less exemption $5,000.

May 1, 1902, two and one-half per cent, no exemption.

From the above it will be clear that the rate charged from 1898—until April 17, 1901—was ten per cent, excepting a proportion charged at 20 per cent, and small sums exempted.

From April 17, 1901, until May 1, 1902, the rate was five per cent, small sums exempted.

From May 1, 1902, to date the rate was 2½ per cent and no exemption.

How does this work out when the figures are applied to the output? Up to April 17, 1901, the rate was 10 per cent, and for a portion of the output 20 per cent, what would the royalty be at 10 per cent up to April 17, 1901?

The government returns show the output up to the year 1900 as $50,775,000 made up as follows:

Year.	Output.
1897	$ 2,500,000
1898	10,000,000
1899	16,000,000
1900	22,275,000
Total to 1900	$50,775,000

Ten per cent on this would mean $5,077,500.

The government returns show the output from April 17, 1901, until May 1, 1902, as $18,000,000, upon which the rate was 5 per cent, or $900,000.

The government returns show the output from May 1, 1902, to 1905, as follows:

Year.	Output.
1902	$14,500,000
1903	12,250,000
1904	10,500,000
1905	8,327,200
Total, 1902 to 1905	$45,577,200

Two and one-half per cent upon this would mean $1,139,430.

Recapitulation.

Output to 1905 .. .. $114,352,200

Royalty upon same, according to the rates given by the government as being in force.

Output.	Rate.	Royalty.
$	Per cent.	$
50,775,000	10	5,077,500 up to April 17, 1901.
18,000,000	5	900,000 up to May 1, 1902.
45,577,200	2½	1,139,430 up to date.
Total 114,352,200	....	7,116,930.

Amount of royalty collected by the government as per return, $3,298,297.26. Amount of royalty unaccounted for, $3,818,633.

During the period of largest output the rate was 10 per cent, and the lower rates of 5 per cent and 2½ per cent apply only to the later years when the output fell off considerably. Up to the year 1901, when the rate was changed from 10 per cent to 5 per cent the output was $33,000,000 greater than during the period of time the rate was 5 per cent, and greater by $5,000,000 than when the rate was 2½ per cent.

During the time the rate was 5 per cent the output was greater by $3,500,000 than any year when the rate was 2½ per cent.

The question that gentlemen in the Yukon and other parts of Canada are asking is who got these millions?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Who is the author of that document?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. gentleman question the figures? It is a matter of no importance who wrote it; I am responsible for it. The hon. gentleman may be aspiring towards the Yukon——

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What has that to do with my question?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What has that to do with the case?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It is a very reasonable question.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman has the privilege of rising and pointing out where any statement in this article is erroneous———

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am not questioning the article.

Mr. SAM HUGHES—and then the House will be obliged, but the mere quibble of asking who the author is, so that some gentleman may be hounded by the minions of this government is something for which I will not be responsible. I assume responsibility for this by reading it here.

The population of the Yukon, I am credibly informed by residents there to-day, including the police and officials and their families, is about 8,000 souls, nearly as large as the population of the town of Lindsay where I have the honour to live, and yet I find that millions of money are blown in upon the management of the government of the Yukon. Thousands and tens of thousands of dollars have been spent on government residences and government buildings. The annual cost of government house alone, counting the salary and expenses and outfit has been between $20,000 and $25,000, not counting the cost of the public building—and all this for a little organization of people not as numerous as the population of any first-class town in Canada.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the minister going to give no explanation of the indictment contained in the resolutions read by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), I do not think the minister can afford to allow these allegations to pass in silence.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not understand there were any allegations that require any special answer. I did not gather that there was any reflection on the administration of the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. The figures quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) show that

taking the output of gold, the royalty collected on it should have amounted to a much larger sum than it did.

Mr. OLIVER. I heard no contention raised that any royalty had remained uncollected.

Mr. SPROULE. Based on the figures given by the hon. gentleman, the royalty collected should have been about $7,000,000 whereas it was in fact only about $3,000,000. That requires some explanation.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not hold myself responsible for the figures that appear in the multiplication table; nor can I hold myself responsible for figures which an hon. gentleman may read from any statement. If the hon. gentleman charges that any of the royalty has not been accounted for, it will then be in order to see what foundation there is for the charge.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the duty of this government who are responsible for the administration of the Yukon to explain to the country how there comes to be this apparent deficit of over $3,000,000 in the collection of royalty. As it is now we cannot understand it.

Mr. OLIVER. I hope I am not to be held responsible for the lack of understanding of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. As I heard the statement read, the law did not provide that the royalty should be collected on all the gold taken out, as there were certain exemptions from the royalty. Until it is known what these exemptions amounted to there cannot be any correct conclusion arrived at.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister does not meet the question as fairly as it ought to be met. We are not at present concerned with the statement read by the member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) but we are concerned with the statement made by the minister himself to this House. On April 25, 1906, the minister gave the output of gold for several years down to 1905 at $114,000,000 gross, and on June 11, 1906, he stated that the royalty collected during that same period was $3,298,000. There were some exemptions, but they were not very great, and taking the average percentage of the royalty during the period, the collections showed have totalled nearly $7,000,000. The minister says that $3,200,000 have been collected so that there is a deficit of $3,800,000 to be accounted for. It is the duty of the minister to satisfy the House what became of that $3,800,000, which appears prima facie to be a deficit. We are prepared to admit that there were exemptions, which may explain a certain portion of that amount; but up to this date we have never had a statement from that department, so far as I know, tending to clear up that rather anomalous position of things, which has been commented on in this House, and which was brought to a head last year and the year before, by some investigations made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. What I say is that the Department of the Interior should not have waited a single minute after that statement was made, showing that great disparity, before giving to this House through the minister a statement of all that was collected and all that was exempted, in an endeavour to show to the House, what may be absolutely true, that it can all be accounted for. The House has a perfect right to know how that apparent deficiency of $3,800,000 can be explained. It does not seem reasonable that the whole of it went in the small exemptions, because from year to year the operations in the Yukon have been growing larger, while from 1901 there have been, so far as I understand, no exemptions at all. That is the situation today, and it is not a satisfactory situation; and the minister ought not to accuse people on this side of the House with a lack of brains because they ask for an explanation. He ought rather to complain of the lack of business methods in his own department, which has allowed two years to elapse without thinking it worth while to put an exact statement before this House to enable it to look into the facts, a statement which this House has a right to have.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend wished to be understood as seriously questioning the return, which I did not imagine that he or any other member of the House would do, and he wished to have a proper statement made, it would have been quite in order for him at any time to have moved for a return, instead of taking this opportunity of airing the question in the House. If the hon. gentleman wants the information, he knows how to get it. But I never supposed that my hon. friend was suggesting, either this year or last year, that there was a shortage to the amount of $3,000,000 in the collections of revenue in the Yukon. If there is such a stupendous steal, the greater part of which took place many years ago, my hon. friend and his friends have certainly been remiss in their duty in sitting in this House so long as they have done, and not looking into it. They are waiting long to arrive at a proper understanding of the case. My hon. friend knows, just as well as anybody else, that there might be a hundred million dollars of gold mined in the Yukon, with a royalty of ten per cent against it, and that with an exemption of $5,000 it might not be possible to collect a cent of royalty.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not think that is possible practically.

Mr. OLIVER. It is possible, and my hon. friend cannot dispute it.

Mr. FOSTER. I meet my hon. friend there. I will venture this assertion, that under the practice of mining as it has been going on from year to year, it is absolutely impossible for such a thing to have existed. I can quite imagine that if a man figures out the matter mechanically, he can so distribute the production of a hundred million dollars of gold that no man shall produce more than $5,000. But the thing is not done by that kind of mechanical figuring. Men go into the Yukon and produce gold, and it is practically impossible for a hundred millions of gold to be mined as it is mined in the Yukon without a considerable proportion of that being over the $5,000 minimum. It is conceivable, but not practically possible. Am I not right in that ?

Mr. OLIVER. Surely ; my hon. friend is right and I am right. I admit that his contention is right just as he admits that my contention is right. I am not suggesting the condition which I have sketched, and he should not suggest the condition which he has sketched, as a matter of fact. In the conditions of mining, as they prevail in any mining country, where mining is carried on by individual placer mining processes, the chances are that the gold that is mined is distributed in small sums, and not in large sums, so that the greater part of it is not subject to royalty. That is a matter of fact ; there is no question about it. If my hon. friend wants a statement on the subject, going back through all these years, let him move for a return, and it will be brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A return of what ?

Mr. OLIVER. A return of whatever information there is in the department in regard to it. I may inform the House, however, that it is not the Department of the Interior that has the collection of this royalty, but the Mounted Police.

Mr. FOSTER. The Mounted Police are your officers quoad that.

Mr. OLIVER. No. The royalty is collected by the Mounted Police, and they will be ready no doubt to give the hon. gentleman the information. I cannot answer him off-hand. I never thought of him seriously suggesting, and I do not think he does yet, that there has been any such discrepancy as he mentions. The hon. gentlemen are simply wishing to take up time, and create an impression for which they know there is absolutely no foundation.

Mr. FOSTER. That is entirely gratuitous.

Mr. OLIVER. The thing is so absurd to any person who knows the circumstances that I am sure the hon. gentleman will forgive me in not imagining them to be in earnest in putting forward the statement they did.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister deals with this subject very differently from the way he did last year. He then seemed to think it was of sufficient importance to demand an explanation, and I understood, when I brought the matter up myself, that we would have an explanation. He has allowed a year to go by, and now he says the proper persons to obtain the information are the opposition, although he is at the head of the department which can command it.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg pardon ; I am not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not going to quibble about that. He is a member of the government who can command the information and who are responsible for the collection of the royalty. Either the Department of the Interior or the department in control of the Mounted Police kept an account of these exemptions, or they did not. If they kept an account of them, it would be a simple thing for the government to demonstrate by the returns in their possession that the missing sum of $3,800,000 is really due to these exemptions.

If they did not keep any account of these exemptions all I have to say is that there was opportunity for unlimited plunder in the Yukon. There is no doubt about that and we would like very much to know which alternative we are to accept. Was the administration of the Yukon so lax that we have no account at this moment as to what amount of gold was exempted ? If that is the condition of affairs certainly it does no credit to this administration. It is not worth while for the hon. gentleman to say that he does not suppose that any question is raised ; his own figures raised the question. He has raised the question himself by the information he has given to this House and when he asks us to believe that there is no reason for inquiry, he put too great a tax upon the credulity of men on this side of the House. It is impossible to believe that the loss of $3,800,000 of royalty, being the amount of the discrepancy, was due altogether to these exemptions which extended over only a portion of the period in question. I do not believe it and until I am convinced by the returns I am not prepared to believe it. The hon. gentleman either has the information or he has it not ; if he has it let him assure us that the information is in the possession of the government and that it will be produced, and if he has not the information let us know and understand the methods of administration which have prevailed there.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the minister if the government has made any progress in reference to the very important question as to the appointment of a successor to Mr. McInnes, also to what date was Mr. McInnes' salary paid ? Is the acting commissioner getting his own salary

plus the salary or a proportion thereof of the commissioner? What is Mr. Congdon doing at the present time? Where is he and what amount of money is he getting?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the date, but Mr. McInnes was paid up to the date of his resignation, which took place some time in January. In regard to the appointment of a successor to Mr. McInnes I may say that that question has not yet been decided but it will be decided very shortly—we hope, in time to enable the new commissioner to take office with the opening of navigation and the opening of the season of business in the Yukon. In regard to the salary of the acting commissioner he does not receive any additional salary because of his additional duties. In regard to Mr. Congdon, his position is that of legal adviser in the Yukon. He is absent from the Yukon and I have recently understood that it is his intention to sever his connection with the government.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he not at one time commissioner?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What led to his going out?

Mr. OLIVER. He resigned.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did he resign?

Mr. OLIVER. As he immediately afterwards became a candidate for parliament I assume that it was in order that he might become a candidate.

Mr. FOSTER. And after having resigned and becoming a candidate he goes on and becomes legal adviser to the commissioner. He is at the present time in the enjoyment of a salary of $7,000 of the people's money and he has no one to advise, and is out of the country, in Ottawa, as I understand. Does the minister recollect as to whether he has yet made full inquiry into the charge made against Mr. Congdon by a widow lady whose husband died in that section of the country as to the maladministration of the deceased's assets? How has that been settled or has it been settled up to the present time.

Mr. OLIVER. There was a commission appointed to investigate the matter and the commission sat and reported within the last few days. That is as far as the matter has been gone on with.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister kindly bring down that report to the House before the estimates are through?

Mr. OLIVER. If it is the desire of the hon. gentleman, certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The only remark I have to make is that the sooner you get a responsible man and send him out there as a commissioner the better it will be for Canada. The whole matter has been tied up like a little knot and the tying of it up in a knot has not been for the good administration of the government or for the good name of the country. The sooner you untie that knot and get individual responsible men in their proper places each attending to his own business the better it will be. Why is it that when we have a commissionership there we cannot have a man occupying it who has the confidence of the country and who will devote himself to the duties of the office? Of course, the population is small, but the interests are large and the salary that we are paying ought to be sufficient to enable us to demand the services and attendance in that country of the person who holds the office. I propose to take this matter up when we come to the estimates and I would like the minister to have a full statement as to the royalty. I would be very glad if he could show the exemptions and clear up that whole hiatus between $3,200,000 and $7,000,000 which would have been possible had there been no exemptions.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that it is the government's intention to establish a Department of Mines. Is it a fact that the position of Deputy Minister of Mines has been offered to Mr. McInnes and has he accepted or refused it?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Knowing something about that subject probably I may answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule). There is no truth whatever in the newspaper report that the position of deputy Minister of Mines has been offered to Mr. W. W. B. McInnes, nor is there any truth even in the suggestion that Mr. McInnes applied for or sought such a position. There are in the department men occupying official positions who would fill such a position if needed, and there is not the slightest foundation for the newspaper reports referred to.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to say that this royalty was collected by the mounted police. Is there an inspector of royalties in that country, and if so who has filled that office for some years past and who has been collecting the royalty?

Mr. OLIVER. The mounted police department collect the royalty. I cannot answer as to who has been actually collecting it but I presume the officers change from time to time according to circumstances. The officer in charge of the mounted police in the Yukon is Superintendent or Commissioner Wood.

Mr. FOSTER. When they collect it, where do they put it?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that at the moment but I will have the information. While the royalty collected is a very definite amount and of course must bear a certain percentage to the amount of gold of which the mounted police have taken cognizance, the figures which I gave the

House are not figures of established accuracy as to the total production of gold. I think the figures which I presented to the House on the occasion referred to by my hon. friend—or, certainly, on some occasion, for I remember giving the figures—were received from the Geological Survey Department. And I remember that there was a discrepancy between the estimate of the Geological Survey Department, and—I think—the Interior Department. The figures given as to the total output of gold, are estimates, while the collection of the royalty is an actual amount. There is all the difference between an estimate and an established or known amount. When my hon friend receives the figures asked for and showing both the amount of gold and of royalty paid and the amount of exemption, he may find a very great discrepancy between these figures and the estimated product of the mines.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want that.

Mr. OLIVER. But these are the figures which my hon. friends have been using before the House to-day, they have been comparing the estimated output of the mines with the royalty collected.

Mr. FOSTER. Estimated by whom?

Mr. OLIVER. In this case, estimated by the Geological Survey Department. But the same would apply to any other estimate. Of course, in case of a discrepancy, it is a possible thing that the royalty may be wrong, but it is more likely that the estimate is wrong. But that is a point which, in the nature of things, cannot be absolutely established with any means in our control.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would depend upon the way it was done, and whether there was a record kept of the exemptions and the practical working of the system. If the department kept a record of the exemptions, and of the royalties, they would have a complete return of the total output. Has no record of the exemptions been kept?

Mr. OLIVER. If you have a record of the exemptions and of the royalty, you have an accurate knowledge of the amount of gold that has come within the range of vision of the authorities. But that is not an absolute guide as to the estimate of the total production of gold which may be made, let us say, by the officers of the Geological Survey Department or by the collection of information from mercantile establishments, banks or other sources of information. Now, my hon. friend is making comparison of the amount collected and the estimated output without taking into account the amount of exemptions. Of course, if they consider the matter, they will see that there is no reasonable ground for the assumption that there has been a shortage in the payments of royalty on the returns they have before them. In regard to the return of which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spoke—as to an investigation,—does he wish to have the evidence, or merely the report? The evidence is pretty lengthy, and of course, the preparation of it would mean some delay, whereas the report can be furnished in a short time.

Mr. FOSTER. Bring down the report first, and then we will see. And there is one other point to be mentioned before the estimates come up, with a view to facilitating the discussion of them. I find in the Auditor General's Report—beginning page L—39—an itemized statement until you come down to two items as follows:

Grants, $225,000.

Grant to local council..	$125,000
Grant to local council for maintenance and repairs to roads.	100,000

But no items of these grants are given. That would indicate either that our Auditor General considers that he has no right to audit these expenditures—which I scarcely think probable—or that for some other reason he has not audited them. Would the minister please find out, for the information of the House whether these vouchers audited passed by the Yukon Council through their auditor, Mr. Maclean, are audited by the Auditor General here?

Mr. OLIVER. The point was raised by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and the information I have is that the accounts of the Yukon Council are not referred to the Department of the Interior, but are sent direct to the Auditor General. These are first audited by Mr. G. Maclean and approved by Mr. Lithgow, as acting commissioner. I assume that the Auditor General has not seen fit to specify the items in his report——

Mr. FOSTER. But may have audited them?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I suppose that is it. The accounts are available for his audit.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to be particular about that.

Mr. SPROULE. As to this royalty on the output of gold, the information we now have is that the statement of the output was an estimate. But, it was given by the minister himself, and I understood that it was a matter of record, and certainly the House wanted to know the facts. There must be—certainly there ought to be—some kind of bookkeeping in connection with the collection of royalty. A man presents himself for the payment of royalty. He must satisfy the officer before whom he appears that his production of gold is limited to so much. Of course, he knows the regulation providing for the exemption of a certain amount and he pays royalty on the

balance. Is it a fact that no record is kept showing the name of the man paying royalty, the total amount he returns, the amount of exemption and the amount of royalty he pays? If so, what check have the government upon their officials, to know whether they are doing their work faithfully and honestly or otherwise. If the government has that information, it is information to which the House is entitled in view of the heavy expenditures taking place up there which seem to be absolutely unaccountable. We ought to have something to enlighten the House as to whether there is an improper expenditure of money up there, whether there is any proper account kept of it, whether there is any proper bookkeeping, whether any proper returns are made, whether any proper audits are made. Take the case of the auditing in that particular instance. The man who is charged with the expenditure of the money is the auditor of his own accounts. Am I correct in that understanding, that it is the acting commissioner, Mr. Lithgow, who is responsible for ordering the expenditure, and he is also the auditor of his own accounts? Does the minister think that is right? Does he think that is a sufficient check upon the expenditure of public money?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think in the early days there was no account taken of the exemptions. To-day there are no exemptions, but there is a royalty of two and a half cents on every dollar's worth of gold raised. This royalty is collected by the controller at Dawson, through the channel of the Northwest Mounted Police. The Northwest Mounted Police have men stationed at the ports of exit who examine the passengers to see that no gold is taken out of the territory except that for which a certificate has been given by the controller of the territory, showing that the royalty has been collected upon it. The passenger must have a certificate or else the gold found on his person is confiscated and not returned. So there is now an exact accounting of the amount of gold raised per annum in the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not each producer bound to make a return to the government?

Mr. THOMPSON. No. Comparatively few of the producers to-day make a return. To-day the amount is ascertained by the Bank of Commerce or the Bank of British North America, who buy the gold from the miners, or the trading companies buy this gold, and when they ship it out it is weighed by the controller and a certificate is given for the royalty paid. The box is sealed and it passes the inspection of the Northwest Mounted Police.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the only real check is at the frontier?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. THOMPSON. The first check is at the frontier. If the royalty is not paid the gold is confiscated. Then to make that check complete the Northwest Mounted Police search every one, practically. They even have a female searcher to search the women going out of the Yukon at Forty Mile and going up the Yukon at Whitehorse, going towards Skagway at the British Columbia boundary. In early years it was hardly possible to get an accurate account, to-day an accurate account can be obtained.

Mr. SPROULE. Then what check have the government had on their officials out there? According to that statement, none whatever. We do not know whether any books are kept or not. If there is no check, it verifies what we have often been told, that the collector of the royalty out there had it in his own hands to allow parties to go free with a payment on a fraction of the output of gold. If he was paid a consideration, the miner could always get off favourably with regard to his royalty. That has been stated over and over again. I think the government ought to be able to tell us who collected this royalty year after year. They must have some return of it. I have heard it said before a number of people that one J. D. McGregor, whom we have heard of before in this House, was collector of this royalty for a length of time. Could the minister say whether that is the case?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not inform the House on that point. I could find out though.

Mr. SPROULE. He was reputed to be the inspector, if not the collector, and I have heard he was both. Whether it be a fact or otherwise, it was stated repeatedly that in every one of his transactions there was a rake-off taken for himself or his friends, and the miner was allowed to go by paying much less royalty than he was entitled to pay. That is the allegation; I do not know whether it is correct or not. But I am endeavouring to ascertain whether it is possible for such a thing to take place without the government having any knowledge of it. There appears to have been some reason for the strong suspicion that exists up there that there was dishonesty at the bottom, and that there were good grounds for many of the allegations that the Yukon Territory was one great source of profit and wealth to friends of the government, if not members of the government, for many years.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what the object is in prolonging the discussion of this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. The object is to get information.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, my hon. friend has been a member of this House ever since

the Yukon has been discovered. Mr. J. D. McGregor has not been a resident of the Yukon, so far as I am aware, for a number of years. If he stole anything in the Yukon it was a good many years ago when my hon. friend was a member of this House, and if he heard these allegations against McGregor at that time he should have spoken on the subject and demanded an investigation.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard of them since.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I would submit to the hon. gentleman that an allegation so serious as that of what took place years ago is scarcely one that he is justified in bringing up now. The conditions we have to-day are not the same as they were years ago. To-day the royalty is collected, as my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) has pointed out, at the outlets of the country by the Northwest Mounted Police. If my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has any allegations to make against any members of officers of the force in the Yukon we will promise him an opportunity to make them good, and to demonstrate that matters are not going on as they should. It is an outrageous proposition that the attention of the House and of the country should be called to a condition of affairs that existed five or ten years ago without the information that it did exist five or ten years ago instead of to-day. Let us consider the condition as it is to-day. If my hon. friend failed of his duty five or ten years ago that is no reason why he should throw foundationless allegations against honest men who are honestly administering the affairs of the territory to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you know they are foundationless ?

Mr. OLIVER. I say they are foundationless as far as to-day is concerned. My hon. friend is in a position to take his stand on it if he likes, but for him to bring up a condition which he alleges existed five or ten years ago, of which it is impossible now to prove the truth or falsity is, I say, an outrage and a breach of parliamentary privilege.

Mr. SPROULE. How long is it since the royalty system was changed ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say.

Mr. SPROULE. And he is at the head of the department and charges me with making charges relating to conditions five or ten years ago when there was a royalty on a portion of the output. If I understood the hon. member it was only last year that the system was changed.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was changed, I think, in 1904.

Mr. OLIVER. There has been no change since I became minister.

Mr. SPROULE. We have tried year after year to get information but the government refused to give it to the House. We have moved for returns that were not brought down in months or years ; it was like drawing teeth to get any information. Are these charges foundationless or not ? I do not say they are correct, but I say that the circumstances justify us in reaching the conclusion that there might be a great deal of truth in them. We know from information that Mr. McGregor left Brandon a very poor man, a horse dealer, which is a respectable business, but a man very much in debt and that in a few years he returned, paid his debts and is wealthy to-day. Where did he make the money? Was it out of his salary ? Am I justified in reaching the conclusion that he did not make it out of his salary and that grave suspicions that there may be some truth in the charges are justified ? We wish to find out whether there is such laxity of management that it is possible for an official to make away with what belongs to the country. When we do that we are upbraided and told : Make your charges. We, as an opposition, are honestly trying to get information from the very men who should desire to give that information if they are doing what is right, but instead of that they withhold that information and throw across challenges of : Make your charges. We are perfectly within our rights ; I know my rights and I shall avail myself of them and exercise them to any extent I desire, regardless of the feelings of the Minister of the Interior or of his sneering insinuation : Make your charges.

Mr. OLIVER. The position taken by my hon. friend is fairly representative of his general attitude since we have had the honour of his acquaintance in the House. He chooses to abuse his position in parliament for the purpose of making what I claim to be unfounded charges against private individuals, in regard to matters that occurred years and years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. To what private individuals does he refer ?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member charges that J. D. McGregor who was a horse dealer in Brandon, had gone to the Yukon, had acted there as an official of this government——

Mr. SPROULE. Was he a private individual then ?

Mr. OLIVER. He is now.

Mr. SPROULE. He was then an official.

Mr. OLIVER. He is a private individual to-day and the hon. member of East Grey (Mr. Sproule) practically accuses Mr. McGregor of stealing from this country. I

say that is an abuse of the privilege of parliament, I say it is an outrage. If my hon. friend has anything to say against any of the officials in the Yukon to-day that is his privilege, but he does not dare to do it.

Mr. SPROULE. If he steals millions of money out of the Interior Department to-day and chooses to get out of the country and become again a private individual, is he exempt then and have I no right to refer to the theft ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly my hon. friend has a perfect right to do it. If Mr. McGregor is guilty of stealing from this government that is a crime for which he can be punished in the courts of law, and if my hon. friend supposes that Mr. McGregor was so guilty it is for him or his friends to take their remedy against him, and not abuse the privilege of parliament by smirching the name of a gentleman who is an honourable man so far as this country knows at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the Minister of the Interior and the government we hold responsible, not J. D. McGregor. We are not private prosecutors, we hold the government and the man at the head of that department responsible for it. We shall continue to hold him responsible for it ; it is his duty to clear the skirts of his officials of these charges if they are not correct and to give the House such information as will enable the House to understand whether they are or are not correct. If he refuses to give that information and falls back upon, I was going to say the flimsy pretext that it is the right of every man to become a private prosecutor if he desires and institute a prosecution, he surely will not claim that that is sufficient to exonerate the department from the charges of want of intelligent business management, and from giving the House information as to its affairs.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to deny here and now in the hearing of this House, that there has ever been any attempt to deprive the House of information. The department of which I have control has given this House all the information that has ever been asked for——

Mr. FOSTER. How about the directors of the North Atlantic Trading Company ?

Mr. OLIVER—as quickly as it could be given. Whatever action was taken by the department in the case of the North Atlantic Trading Company was supported by the House and the department was relieved of responsibility in that matter by the House. So far as this department is concerned, I absolutely deny and challenge the statement on the part of any responsible member of the House that there has been any withholding of information asked by the House. I have said that the information asked for in regard to the gold royalty could have been obtained by hon. gentlemen at any time long ago if they had moved for a return, but the matter is not under the control of my department and I was not able to give them the information as a departmental matter ; but if they wanted the information they could have had it. They did not see fit to ask for it in the proper way and they charge the department to-day of withholding information. I want them to understand that the Department of the Interior has nothing to withhold, that whatever is done there is for the light of day and the information of the public as soon as it is asked for.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister is mistaken when he says we could get the information we asked for. Right across the floor of this House I put question after question in regard to the Yukon and desired information when we were voting supplies, and the answer I got back almost invariably was : Don't know, don't know, don't know. Is that giving information? No ; we had to be satisfied with what information we could get, and it did not amount to much. I regret to say that the present Minister of the Interior is no better than his predecessor in that respect.

Mr. THOMPSON. As to the question of the royalty, I wish to say that I have not the slightest doubt that in the early days a great deal of this gold escaped the penalty of royalty, because in those days nothing was required except an affidavit of the producers ; the tax was 10 per cent on every dollar's worth produced over $5,000 from any given claim ; it was an exorbitant and iniquitous tax, and a great many of the people smuggled their gold out of the country. In those days there were no policemen guarding the frontier. If a man who produced a given quantity of gold should choose to swear that the amount he produced was not as large as the actual amount, the officer in charge had nothing to do but accept his statement. To-day it is different. They have machinery in the head office in Dawson for weighing every pennyweight of gold, and there are policemen at the boundary up and down the Yukon to look after smuggling if it should exist. I wish to say, in justice to Mr. Lithgow, who at present presides over the collection of royalty at Dawson, that I am satisfied that every dollar's worth of royalty has been collected by him. Mr. Lithgow is well known to many gentlemen in this House, and I know that in their hearts they will bear me out when I say that he is an honourable man, and that he is doing his whole duty in the matter of the collection of the royalty. I am not speaking by the book, but I am satisfied that Mr. Lithgow has a set of books that will show every dollar's worth of royalty collected. He is an excellent and most reliable official.

From now on it is possible to get an exact account of the gold produced in that country and the royalty collected thereon, but in McGregor's time that was absolutely impossible, for then nothing more than an estimate could be made. I know that in these days gold was smuggled out, because men have told me that rather than pay 10 per cent royalty, they got men to carry the gold down the creeks at night, load it in a boat and take it down the Yukon river to Alaska, where they were out of the reach of the Canadian officials. So far as I am concerned, I know they had sympathy, because the tax was excessive and unjust.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I knew Mr. Lithgow years ago in Halifax, and I am satisfied that any duties he discharges in Dawson will be discharged honestly and efficiently.

Mr. FIELDING. As I have had official relations with Mr. Lithgow for many years, it is due to him that I should say at once that if any inference can be drawn from what my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) said to the disadvantage of Mr. Lithgow——

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say anything against him.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say the hon. gentleman did, but if any inference can possibly be drawn against Mr. Lithgow from his remarks, I would like to join the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in bearing testimony to Mr. Lithgow's competency and efficiency. Mr. Lithgow was an officer of the Finance Department in Halifax, and he was appointed, not by me, but by my predecessor. He has been personally known to me all my life, and I can testify that he is in all respects a capable and efficient officer. Mr. Lithgow was transferred to the Yukon upon my nomination as a gentleman particularly well qualified to deal with the financial affairs of that new country, and I am glad to know that through all the difficulties, and the complaints, and the grievances, that have been heard of in the Yukon, I have had universal testimony as to Mr. Lithgow's high character. I am perfectly satisfied that so far as he has power to deal with these matters, every interest of the Dominion of Canada has been carefully guarded and faithfully served.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not understand my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) as casting any reflection upon Mr. Lithgow in any way; I only desired to corroborate what was said by my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson), who entertains exactly the same opinion of Mr. Lithgow's qualities as I do myself.

Mr. SPROULE. I made no insinuation against Mr. Lithgow as to the collection of the royalty. I did not even know that it was his duty to collect the royalty. The only reference I made to him was to ask the Minister of the Interior if it was a proper system that the man charged with authority to spend the money should be one of the auditors of the expenditure. I made no insinuation against Mr. Lithgow; I only condemned the system.

Mr. FIELDING. That only arises because of his temporary occupancy of the position of commissioner.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. On the 25th of April, 1906, the Minister of the Interior, in reply to Mr. Blain, of Peel, stated that the statistics compiled in the Geological Survey gave the value of the gold output. Reading that, one would think that this compilation was the result of an exact accounting, whereas it could have been nothing more than an estimate.

Mr. OLIVER. The Geological Survey had no means of arriving at the figures except on an estimate, more or less correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the officers go there and inspect?

Mr. OLIVER. The officers of the Survey engaged in different work through the Yukon acquired the information by such means as they might, and therefore it was only an estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not very satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. When I have been discussing the expenditure on the Yukon outside of this House, hon. gentlemen supporting the government have cited these figures and have told me that we got so much cash out of the Yukon, and that we were justified in making a heavy expenditure in return, that it was more than self-supporting. We are now told that this cash which we were supposed to get out of the Yukon was only an estimate, and so it could be made $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 more if it were thought necessary to do so. My complaint is that these figures should have been used as an argument in defence of the government's management of the Yukon, when they are nothing more than an estimate.

Mr. OLIVER. No one is required to accept them as anything else than an estimate.

Mr. SPROULE. But when the friends of the government get on the platform they always state that it represents the actual amount of gold that has come out of the Yukon.

On section 2,

The validity of any appointment of an acting commissioner heretofore assumed to be made

by the Governor in Council or the Minister of Interior, or of any instructions herefore assumed to be given by the Governor in Council or the Minister of the Interior to any person to act as or for the commissioner during his absence, illness or other disability, shall not be called in question on the ground that there is no authority in law to make such appointment or give such instructions.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister think he is justified in passing such a section? Suppose there should be some heavy lawsuit pending and hundreds of thousands of dollars at stake, are we going to put a man, who has a just claim, out of court by passing such a law as this? Does he think it is a very good principle to legislate in that way?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. It is for the very reason my hon. friend has stated that the provision has become necessary. The administration has been carried on in the belief that there was full authority for the appointment of an acting commissioner. That seems to be now a matter of question, and this Bill is to put beyond question the legality of the appointment and of the actions which have been taken under it.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any suit pending in which this is a question ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say as to that.

Mr. HAGGART. There should be an exception provided as to lis pendens.

Mr. OLIVER. If there were a suit pending which rested on the opinion that the acting commissioner had not authority, that would be necessary, but there is certainly no suit pending of that kind. The question has not been raised, and we desire to have this legislation before it can be raised.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the minister said that the question had been raised.

Mr. OLIVER. Not by a suit. The question has been raised by the Department of Justice as to the authority of the acting commissioner, and it is thought well that it should be cured by this provision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where legislation of that kind is proposed, it is usual to insert a provision that it shall not apply to pending cases. Under certain conditions an action is brought on a well-founded theory that a certain power does not exist, and in such cases parliament always provides, so far as my experience goes, that ex post facto legislation shall not affect pending suits. This legislation is retroactive. It purports to make that good which was not good, or which may not have been good, and it should exempt matters that are already pending for the decision of the court.

Mr. GALLIHER. Would not that be a case that arose under an established law, in which there might afterwards be some change made? Suits that have arisen under existing law should be exempt; but the suits mentioned would be in a different position, because there is a question whether the parties ever had the authority to enter them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not so regard it. I have had some experience in connection with legislation of this kind. In a very important action in which I once went into court, when I was proposing to argue the case before the judge of first instance, after a very long trial, I was confronted with a statute passed behind the back of my client about two or three months before, which took away the right of action. I think it is the safest course, when you are proposing to make that good which is not good, to reserve matters that are already in litigation. If you do not go that far, you leave a party in this position, that he has incurred expense, engaged counsel, gone into court, and, after he has done all that, you pass a statute which not only takes away from him the right of action, and subjects him to the costs which he has incurred up to that time, but enables the costs of the other party to be taxed against him. Unless there are very grave reasons for it, I would protest against that kind of legislation. I do not think it is fair or right. I think it better to safeguard the public interests in that way.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend is content to safeguard an action which rests upon the assumption that the acting commissioner is not legally empowered——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is all it could amount to.

Mr. OLIVER. That would be perfectly satisfactory. There are possibly a number of suits already in progress which were entered on the supposition that the acting commissioner had full authority. If by our amendment we declare that he had not full authority, we disarrange the position which those parties understood they held when they entered the suits. If there is a case based on the supposition that the acting commissioner has not authority, it would be quite proper—in fact the only thing to do—to exempt that case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that would be quite satisfactory, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend considers that essential—though it is not considered essential by the Department of Justice, because we have full knowledge that there is no such case—to safeguard that point, I would hold the Bill and have the Minister of Justice make the provision necessary.

Mr. ALCORN. I understand from the minister's observations that he wishes to

guard against the possibility of its being held that certain powers did not exist in time past when certain appointments were made and certain instructions were given. It seems to me that the wording of this section is quite ineffective to carry out that object. The beginning of the section deals with appointments made and instructions given at a time now past. The operative part of the section, line 15 deals entirely with the present. Would it not be necessary to provide that this section is intended to remedy acts which are past and is not to deal with a state of matters which may exist at the present time? That object would appear to me to be effected by striking out the words 'is no' before the word 'authority' on the 5th line, and inserting the words 'when any such appointment was made or such instructions given.'

Mr. OLIVER. The amendment suggested by my hon. friend from Prince Edward County (Mr. Alcorn) would be quite acceptable and would meet the case that has been raised. If it would be agreeable to the committee my hon. friend could move it and we would have it inserted. I think it would be well also to strike out the words 'assumed to be' in the second line and the same words in the fourth line. It seems to me that these words express a doubt that is not at all necessary to the proper operation of the section. If there was any failure it would be cured by the amendment we are now making.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS.

Bill (No. 114) to authorize the Exchange of Certain Lands.—Mr. Oliver — read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of the Interior might explain this Bill.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). This Bill is to provide for an exchange of certain lands. Sections 29 and 11 in every township are set apart to be used for the benefit of the schools of the various provinces. The government has no authority to make any variation in that reservation. If from time to time it is found that such lands are occupied before survey by settlers or by public enterprises and the public interest requires that they shall remain in that possession or occupation it is necessary for parliament to give its sanction to an exchange. In this particular case the Winnipeg Electric Railway Company have certain works established on one of these sections and the desire is to give the government authority to deed the section to the railway company and to select another section for the benefit of the schools elsewhere.

Mr. SPROULE. How did the railway company become possessed of it? Did they not know that it was school land?

Mr. OLIVER. No, they were in occupation before the survey. I will just read a memorandum that I have on the subject:

By order in council of the 22nd January, 1906, the Minister of the Interior was authorized to sell certain lands to the Winnipeg Electric Railway Company and to grant them certain rights and privileges in connection with the development of their water-power on the Pinawa channel of the Winnipeg river for the purpose of furnishing electric power to the city of Winnipeg.

Official surveys had not then been made of all of the townships in which the lands applied for were situated, but the company submitted plans made by their own engineers which indicated the areas required and which it was believed would nearly coincide with the Dominion lands system of surveys. Pending the completion of the official surveys, the conveyance to the company of the lands applied for was postponed. These surveys have now been made, and it is desired to proceed with the sale to the company of the lands referred to. It appears that among the lands applied for, two sections—11 and 29, township 14-12-E.P.M., according to the official surveys—are school lands, and without special authority they cannot therefore be conveyed to the company. These lands are essential to the completion of the development, as the company's canal runs through deep rock cuts on section 11, and there are further rock cuts on the section for carrying flood water from the control dam and returning the flood water to the main river; and the entrance to the control works is also on this section. As these cuttings and works need constant supervision and repair it will also be necessary to maintain a camp on this section for the men engaged in this supervision. Section 29 is subject to overflow from the company's forebay, and it is therefore essential that the company should own that section also.

Mr. FOSTER. How much land was sold to the company?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not a memorandum here and I am unable to answer that question at the moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know whether the lands were sold just simply for the building of the canal there or to provide for submergence?

Mr. OLIVER. Partly for both. One section is for the cutting of the canal there and for the control works, and the other is to provide for flooding by the raising of the water. And the land was sold for these two purposes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How does the minister arrive at the price of selling to this company?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the price at which we have sold is $10 per acre.

Mr. FOSTER. How far from Winnipeg ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think about seventy-five miles north-east of Winnipeg. They are on the Winnipeg river between Rat Portage and Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is it in the Lac du Bonnet region ?

Mr. OLIVER. This Pinawa channel is the back stream which makes the Isle du Bonnet.

Mr. HAGGART. All that the company ought to have is what is reasonably necessary for their undertaking. They ought to have the user of the land required for the cuts and the easement of the quantity necessary for the overflow.

Mr. OLIVER. The information that I have is that all section 29 will be overflowed. It would be rendered useless so far as providing a revenue for the school fund is concerned, and it would be more desirable that other lands should be taken in place of this if the school fund is to benefit. As to the land for the cuts, whatever the company requires may be taken there. But, as the land is rocky and of no value agriculturally, and as the company is desirous, for the reasons set forth in the memorandum, to have not only their cuts there, but to have their control works and supervision, it seemed to me it would be fair to all parties if exchange were permitted to be made.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. And substitute other lands for the school lands ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the minister any idea where he can get such lands ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have an inspector whose business it is to value the lands for sale and make selections in exchange. It will be for him to select such lands as will yield good value to the school fund.

Mr. FOSTER. Lands of at least equal value.

Mr. OLIVER. Of equal value agriculturally. Of course, these lands are of special value to this enterprise. In this respect they could not be duplicated. But I think we should be safe in saying that, in such a case we would require the lands in exchange to be of not only equal value agriculturally but of superior value.

Mr. SPROULE. Would not you require them to be of equal value commercially ? If you sold them, every dollar you received would go into the educational fund ; and so it seems that you should give to that fund dollar for dollar of the value of the land you are taking.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. OLIVER. I think we shall require more. The value of the lands that we give to the electric railway company will, in all probability, not be as great as the value of those we shall get in place of them.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the minister said that these lands were very valuable to the railway company ?

Mr. OLIVER. For the particular purposes of the company, but not otherwise. The railway company must have access to the water at this place, and, in that view, the lands are of stupendous value. But we do not propose to treat them in that way, because these people were in occupation before the survey was made.

Mr. CONMEE. And, as I understand, if it were not for the works of the country these lands would have no special value ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 135) to amend the Yukon Placer Act—Mr. Oliver—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

1. Section 2 of the Yukon Placer Mining Act, chapter 64 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection :

4. Nothing in this Act shall prevent the enactment by the Governor in Council of regulations under which dredging leases may be issued of the bed, including the shore not beyond the banks, of any river in the territory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the meaning of this ?

Mr. OLIVER. The committee will remember that, last session, an Act was passed called the Yukon Placer Mining Act to deal with the placer mines in the Yukon. But it did not deal with questions of dredging on rivers in the Yukon. These were left to be the subject of regulation.

Mr. BERGERON. Why ?

Mr. OLIVER. Because the conditions in regard to dredging there are not well established, the work being in an experimental stage. But since last session it was believed that it would be well to make changes in the regulations as they then existed with regard to these dredging leases. When we undertook to draft new regulations we found there was a provision in the Placer Mining Act as it stood in which dredging leases were mentioned, but which confined the operation of the regulations to such as then existed, and did not permit the framing of new regulations. Therefore we have come to parliament and asked for an amendment of the Placer Mining Act in order that we

may amend the dredging regulations as they now exist. That is the purpose of the first section of the Act, and it is also dealt with in the third section.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought you had power to make regulations about almost everything, under the Act of last year.

Mr. OLIVER. No, the Act provided that it should not apply to dredging regulations as they then existed, and that as we take it, prevents us from amending these regulations unless we amend the Act. We consider that the regulations at present are not satisfactory, we desire to amend them, and we come to parliament for that authority under section 3. Now section 1 is asked for in order to change existing conditions. At the present time the dredge miner is entitled to everything in the bed of the river below high water mark on a certain date in August. As the water is low in August, that leaves a considerable part of the bar between low water in August and the real bank of the river, which is not available to the dredge miner. It seems if you are going to allow dredge mining there is no reason why the dredge miner should not be allowed to take the whole bed of the river, that is, from annual high water to high water. This section 4 is intended to meet that case. Then section 2 is a new provision connected with the Placer Mining Act, brought in at the suggestion of my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson), and is to meet a certain case which is found to have arisen there. A miner only holds his claim from year to year, and he pays what might be called a rental to the government for each year of holding. His time expires, we will say, on August 1, but instead of paying his rental he has an arrangement with a friend, and before his term expires he goes into the gold office and abandons his claim. So he does not have to pay a rental on it for the next year. His friend, knowing the hour at which he is going to abandon his claim in the office, restakes the claim on the ground, and it appears the revenue is in that way to a certain extent defrauded. This provision in section 2, that a claim that is abandoned may not be relocated until ten days after it has been abandoned, is a provision that all the world may know that that claim is going to be open for restaking at a certain time. It meets this private arrangement between two individuals that one shall give up the claim and the other shall stake it.

Section 4 is to cure a difficulty which arises in connection with the passing of the Act last year. It was intended that it should come into force on July 1, but as a matter of fact it did not come into force until August 1. A great many miners' rights expired on July 1, and they having heard that the Act was going to come into force on July 1, did not renew their rights. So from July 1, when the rights expired until August 1, when the Act came into force, under the law as it stood they were without rights. This provision is intended to cure that difficulty where they have not already lost their rights. Unfortunately some people have lost their rights, and we do not propose to interfere in their case. But we do not think that this condition should continue, and we propose to cure the evil, or prevent it from going any further by this provision in section 4.

On section 1,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know by what authority the Governor in Council is authorized to enact regulations under which dredging leases may be issued. This amendment does not give authority, it merely provides that the Yukon Placer Mining Act shall not prevent regulations. I would like to know under what statute you get that authority, and I would like to know the exact phraseology.

Mr. OLIVER. That authority exists, as I understand it, in the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We would like to know what the exact phraseology is.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot readily turn to it. I am under the impression that it it is contained in some general provision in the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it be section 159 of the Dominion Lands Act ?

Mr. OLIVER. It might be that. I am unable to find any other section. I thought there was something more specific than that but it may be that owing to the revision it was considered that this covers the point. At any rate I am satisfied that it is in the Dominion Lands Act that the authority is contained.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What you wish to do is to get authority to issue dredging leases, which may include the shore but not beyond the banks of any river in that territory.

Mr. OLIVER. At the present time the right of dredging extends only to low water mark, that is to say to the point at which the water of the river stood on the first of August, the period of low water. Between low water and high water in any large stream is the part of a river bed that is most valuable for dredging and it seems unreasonable, if you are to allow dredging on a river, that you should not allow it to be carried on in that part which is most suitable and requisite for dredging operations. We propose to provide that hereafter instead of low water mark the boundary shall be high water mark, and that everything between the actual shores of the

river shall be open to the operations of the dredges.

Mr. HAGGART. The object of the regulations before was to reserve these stretches for the benefit of the placer miner, that is the portion of the river between low water mark and high water mark. Why do you allow the dredges to go there?

Mr. OLIVER. Because we believe that the dredge can work that part of the river to better advantage than the individual miner. As a matter of fact in the Yukon the individual miner does not work there, he works outside the river bed or the creek, in the bottom of the valley or in the hillside. The bar diggings are not attractive to the Yukon miner; although of course they are workable by individual miners it is found that the deposit of gold is not rich enough in comparison with the richness of other grounds and it is thought that as that ground can be worked to better advantage by the dredge than by the individual miner, dredging might reasonably be permitted there.

Mr. FOSTER. The objection to this is that it is driving out the individual miner and putting the work into the hands of large capitalists and companies which would not tend to increase population as it is desirable to do in the Yukon. It takes anywhere from $100,000 to $250,000 to put a dredge and workable apparatus on one of these rivers. That is away beyond the individual miner or a co-operation of individual miners. Has the minister taken up that phase of the question? Take the Guggenheims, for instance, they are getting a tremendous stake in that country and in the course of time, under this extension, they would really get everything, they would get some of the richest placer diggings which the minister might have reserved for individual miners. Is that best for the country? I should like to see a mining industry there which would continue for years. With large capital invested and large dredges at work, you approach every year more closely to the period when you exhaust the diggings and consequently exhaust the population. It would be better to keep as much of that property as you can for the poor man.

Mr. OLIVER. Theoretically, my hon. friend is correct, but we find in practice that the part between low and high water is not being operated by the individual miner, and although we have had dredging leases for many years the dredging operations are very few. Within the past year or two dredges have been put in, but these might be described as dry land dredges, they have just enough water to float them and they are dredging in the dry ground. There is only one dredge in actual operation in the stream. It was thought that if the individual miner was not operating the bars, and as we had not been successful in inducing capital to dredge the river beds, it might be as well to give the dredges an opportunity. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that it is not well to encourage too great an aggregation of capital, and it is certainly not well to discourage the individual miner. I hope I would be the last to suggest anything of that kind. The existing facts are that the individual miner is not operating the strip between high and low water to any great extent, and the dredge man has not found the proposition, as it exists now sufficiently attractive to warrant him in investing his capital. We thought it well to amend the conditions so as to let the dredge man have an advantage which would be useful to him, and which the individual miner is not using.

Mr. SPROULE. How many dredges have been operating there last year, and how many, is it anticipated, will operate this year?

Mr. OLIVER. I think my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) could give definite information on that.

Mr. THOMPSON. There were four dredges in operation during the past year, and we expect to have fourteen in operation within a year from the present time. Nearly all these dredges are operating on dry land away from the river beds; a man will buy a series of claims and just get enough water to float his dredge.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister tell us the area held under dredging leases by some of the larger companies?

Mr. OLIVER. There are very large river stretches held by dredging companies. The Ogilvie Company has one hundred miles on the Stewart river; a number of small leases have been amalgamated, and we understand it is held by the one company. There are plenty of leases but very little operation.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that the Guggenheims have a very extensive tract under lease, and that other companies have some of the most valuable parts of the streams and are acquiring more. If they get control of the streams and the low land extending out on the river as well, they will soon have control of all the mining in the locality.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Guggenheims have chiefly acquired their property by purchase, and it consists of mining claims. Their representative informed me the other day, that they have never put a dollar in dredging leases proper, because they do not think they would be a success under the old regulations. So far as I know their property consists altogether of placer claims.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they working with dredges?

Mr. THOMPSON. Oh, yes, but that kind of work does not come under the dredging regulations at all. It is simply an aggregation of placer claims which have been, or will be, acquired by them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And they can work them in any way they please?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister spoke of a great number of leases and very little operation; is not operation a requisite to the retention of a claim?

Mr. OLIVER. We propose to make it so. In the past it has not been found desirable to enforce all the provisions of the regulations requiring operation, but we think the time has come when we may very well insist either on operation or cancellation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister told us last year that some of the concessions had been cancelled.

Mr. OLIVER. These were hydraulic concessions and are entirely different from the dredging concessions.

Mr. SPROULE. If one of these companies acquires a number of small claims and amalgamates them, will your provision for operation require that the amount of work called for on each claim shall be done?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, so far as the ordinary placer claim is concerned, but it is not absolutely required in the case of the river dredging. We intend to make changes looking in that direction.

Mr. SPROULE. If one of these steamers works out both ways on the banks over what would be otherwise placer claims, do you not give these parties the power to hold a great many such claims without requiring them to do the work that would be required if they were held by placer miners?

Mr. OLIVER. This provision does not permit the dredging leaseholder to go beyond the bed of the river. At the present time he is confined to the bed below low water mark. This provision is intended to allow him to extend his operations to what may be called high water mark—to cover the actual bed of the river, but not to go beyond it, to where the placer claims may be.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you do not require him to do the amount of work on each claim that the individual miner would have been obliged to do to hold it. It seems to me that you are giving him a concession that you are not giving to the holder of the placer claim.

Mr. OLIVER. If the dredging leaseholder acquires a placer claim, he can only hold it by doing the amount of work which the individual miner would require to do in order to hold it.

Mr. HAGGART. Can the minister tell us the difference between high water and low water on this particular work? To what extent does this provision increase the area of the dredge miner? It may increase it threefold or fourfold.

Mr. OLIVER. It gives the dredge miner the opportunity of reaching the river bar, which may occupy one fourth or one-half of the bed of the river, depending on the character of the river.

Mr. HAGGART. On the Yukon river, for instance, what is the difference between low water and high water?

Mr. OLIVER. The difference in area, I suppose, would not be one-fifth.

Mr. HAGGART. You do not know the actual number of feet?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say.

Mr. HAGGART. The land which is now under the regulations that apply to placer mining you propose to put under the dredging regulations, under which they need not do any work at all.

Mr. OLIVER. That is hardly correct. We do not propose to remove it from the placer mining regulations, but we do propose to permit the application of the dredging regulations to it. But, of course, if a placer miner has already staked a claim upon it, the dredging regulations would not apply to that claim.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose he sells it to the dredger?

Mr. OLIVER. The dredger will have to carry out the duties just the same as the placer miner in order to hold the license.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you mean that you are going to have double regulations, which may be applied at the pleasure of the minister or the department—placer regulations or dredging regulations applicable to the same area?

Mr. OLIVER. What we propose is that if the placer miner has not exercised his right under the placer mining law to stake the river bar, then the dredge miner may apply for a lease of that bar and work it by dredging methods.

Mr. HAGGART. In other words, you remove it from the regulations under which the placer miner works to regulations which are applicable only to dredges?

Mr. OLIVER. Provided the placer miner is not using it under the Act. We are not removing it from the right of the placer

miner to stake and work under the Placer Mining Act; he can do that after we pass this provision just as well as before; but if we pass this provision, we may make regulations which will permit the dredge miner to work it as we are not entitled to permit him to work it now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Your placer regulations prescribe a certain area which may be worked, and in which a certain amount of work must be done?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you limit the area in the same way to the man who uses a dredge and insist on the same amount of work?

Mr. OLIVER. It is our intention to require the dredge miner to put a dredge on and to do a certain amount of work each year, in consideration of the lease he holds; but there is no comparison between the claim held by the placer miner and the claim held by the dredge miner.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me there should be some comparison between them, when both are made applicable to the same area. Here you have an area along a river bank above what is at present called low water mark. That can be entered for by the placer miner or by the dredge miner. It seems to me that you might very properly make some comparison between the amount of work that ought to be done in the one case and in the other, or you might be giving a great advantage to the dredge miner over the placer miner.

Mr. OLIVER. As we require to meet different conditions in the case of the dredge miner, we have to make different provisions regarding him. My hon. friend from East Grey has suggested that at the present time there are large dredging leases held upon which there have been no operations. That is a fact. People have held these leases, they have paid their rental for them, and there are no operations upon them. That means that conditions are not sufficiently favourable to warrant the expenditure of the capital necessary to operate them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do you mean by conditions?

Mr. OLIVER. I mean that the product of gold in the river has not been sufficient up to the present time to warrant capital to work it economically. The placer miner cannot work it economically, and the work has not been done. We propose, on the one hand, to make the conditions more favourable to the dredge miner, and then to be more insistent in requiring him to operate his lease.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I am suggesting is that you have a certain area worked by a placer miner, a man of very small capital. He is obliged to comply with certain regulations or else he loses his claim. He must do so much work. The man alongside of him is a man with large capital. The conditions, in so far as he is concerned, would apparently be much more favourable. I do not quite see the reason for that.

Mr. OLIVER. The reason is that in the case of the man who holds the small claim the ground is valuable and in the case of the man who owns the large claim the land is not valuable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If you were always sure that would be a good reason.

Mr. OLIVER. We are always sure because an individual miner would not stake ground unless he was satisfied that there was good pay in it, and as soon as he finds that there is not good pay he abandons it. The dredge miner can only arrive at a knowledge of what the value of the ground is after he goes to great expense to install a dredging plant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The placer miner would not stake a poor claim and the dredge miner would be very sure to stake a good claim, and he would get that claim under more favourable conditions than the placer miner. It strikes me that it would not be fair to the poor miner.

Mr. OLIVER. Theoretically my hon. friend is absolutely right. Were this matter under discussion six or eight years ago I would be inclined to take the same view that he does, but in the light of the experience we have had we find that although the bars have been open to the placer miner all these years that privilege has been availed of to a very limited degree. The privilege has not been of value to the placer miner but the lack of the privilege, we are assuming at the present time, has been a disadvantage to the dredge miner to such an extent that we have not had as many dredges in operation as we might expect to have. We may be wrong in holding that view, but in the light of the experience we have had we believe that it would be well to make another effort to induce capital to come in and develop that country.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the value of the work to be done on a placer mine each year and what is the area of the ordinary placer mine?

Mr. THOMPSON. A placer mine consists of 500 feet up and down the creek by 1,000 feet on each side—500 x 2,000 feet. The placer mining Act requires that the owner of the mine shall do $200 worth of work per year on the claim, the work to be valued according to a schedule which is fixed by the gold commissioner of the

Yukon. That is the ordinary placer claim. Then there is the river claim which is only 500 x 1,000 feet where the river is a large stream but this provision has been somewhat indefinite and it has been suggested that in the regulations that are to be there shall be a limit placed upon the streams on which dredging leases shall be given. At the present time a dredging lease might be given on any stream. A given stream of narrow width should properly fall within the domain of the placer miner and should not be given to the dredger at all unless the dredger bought the claim or acquired it the same as the placer miner did. These regulations are applied to the larger streams. Under the regulations that are to be it is suggested that a given number of feet shall decide as to whether a given stream should be allowed to the dredge licensee or should be retained altogether for the placer miner.

Mr. FOSTER. That is contemplated under the regulations to be made ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, under the regulations for which this Act provides.

Mr. SPROULE. Then there is no specific amount of work to be done by the dredge lessee ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Oh, I think so.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the amount of work necessary to be done ?

Mr. OLIVER. At the present time I do not think that the regulations contemplate that there should be a specific amount of work done by the owner of the dredging lease, the theory being as it only applies to the bed of the river and to low water mark and interferes with no person else there is no reason why he should be allowed to pay rent upon it as long as he likes.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the unfairness of it is in the fact that the placer miner is limited. There must be $200 worth of work put in every year or else he cannot hold the claim, whereas the dredge lessee can take that very same land and hold it without doing a dollar's worth of work in the year. The individual miner, if he handled ten yards of earth in a day—I doubt if he handles more than three cubic yards, he would think he was doing very big work. But an ordinary dredge will handle 1,000 yards a day. If the gravel turned one cent to the pan the dredging leaseholder would make it pay admirably, whereas the ordinary placer miner would not pretend to make it pay with such a low return as that. I think it is held that unless it would pay ten cents or twenty cents a pan it would hardly pay the placer miner to work it, but you give the dredge leaseholder a substantial advantage over the placer miner. The man who has to do the work by hand can only do it in a very limited way and must have a small return, whereas you give the claim to the other who is possessed of lots of capital and you put no obligation upon him to do any specified amount of work. The result is that he may hold it as long as he likes without doing any work and he can buy up placer mines all along the river on either side and stop placer mining altogether.

Mr. THOMPSON. My hon. friend is not quite correct. If the dredger applies for a placer claim he must operate that claim under the same law as the placer miner does and he must put the same amount of work on that claim in order to keep the claim.

Mr. SPROULE. But the minister tells us that he need not confine his operations to the bed of the stream but that he may go on dry land so long as there is water enough to float the dredge. Does not he then work a placer claim ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Not unless he stakes it as the placer miner stakes it.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose he can go to the summit of the bank on each side, and that covers the placer claims, would he not be taking these placer claims without it being necessary for him to do any work upon them ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Not at all. He must still do $200 worth of work on his claim.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister proposes to extend the dredging rights from low water to high water mark. Between low and high water mark are the claims which come under the regulations governing the placer miner. Now it is proposed to give the dredger the right to do this without being obliged to comply with the conditions attached to the placer mining.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would like to ask the minister if the placer miner would have the opportunity of taking up that ground which he has now. Will this exclude the possibility of the placer miner taking up this ground in the future ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, unless the dredging miner has leased it.

Mr. FOSTER. As soon as the dredging miner gets hold of it he holds it for as many years as he likes.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not feel like detaining the House on this subject as long as we understand where we are. We have found in practice that the privileges which have been accorded to the miner in the Yukon have not been such as to induce effective operations under the dredging leases which have been issued.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the river beds ?

Mr. OLIVER. Under the river beds. We believe that it would be better policy and more in the interest of the development of the country, if the placer miner has not taken advantage of his rights and operated the river bars, to give the dredge miner the privilege of operating these bars in the expectation or in the hope that by doing that we will be able to induce the investment of capital in the development of the country. Having given him these extra privileges, we should then be warranted in requiring him to work or cancel. We should have given him something that is or may be of value to somebody else as well as himself, and so would be in a position to say to him : You must make your expenditure and work your claim forthwith or you cannot hold it. We believe that in this way we should be better able to secure actual development of the Yukon than by leaving matters as they now are. However, having placed the matter before the House so fully, I would not wish to detain the House. There are other provisions of the Bill not connected with this, which I would like to have passed, and I would be willing to leave this clause, if it does not find favour with hon. members, and proceed with the others.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The section is open to the suggestions made. Nevertheless there is something in what the minister has said —that condition are not such as to justify cancellation now, but, with added privileges, you could hold these men to an exact performance of the duties required in their dredging leases. The working out of the proposition depends on the way the regulations are framed and administered, and the Minister of the Interior is responsible for that. I would have preferred, as I have already told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), to have a general mining Act covering many matters that are not now dealt with by statute. In the meantime, as far as I am concerned, I would not object to this passing.

Mr. PORTER. Has this idea that the minister has expressed, of encouraging the use of these dredges by extending the area of operation been advanced by those engaged in the dredging business, or likely to engage in it ? Or how has it originated? What assurance has the minister that, by making the extension he has proposed he will obtain the desired object ? Has there been any representation of that view ? On the other hand, has there been any representations? Has the position in which the placer mining will be placed by enlarging the rights of the dredging lessee been represented to the department, and, if so, in what way ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have discussed the matter with the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Thompson) and the proposition as it now appears before the House is in accordance with his view. Of course, I have some knowledge of the facts myself, which I give to the House, setting forth the conditions and the disadvantages of the present situation. My hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) can answer better than I can as to the views of the Yukon.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the richest rivers, the placer miners have staked certain bars which they will hold. But dredging in the river bottoms has not been a success for the reason, I believe, that the dredging leases have not covered a sufficient number of cubic yards of gravel. These dredging lessees have held many stretches of these rivers for years on one pretext or another. This Bill provides that their areas shall be only within the natural banks of the stream, and that if they do not put dredges upon these stretches within a limited time, the stretches will be thrown open. All we want in the Yukon is to have dredges brought in and these gravels worked.

Mr. PORTER. Do the lessees say this will encourage dredging ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the section might be amended, if the principle is agreed to. I am afraid that, as it reads, a construction might be placed upon it which is not desirable. I would move that after the word 'the' in the third line of the subsection the words 'whole of the' be inserted and strike out all the words after 'any river in the territory.' The section will then read :

Nothing in this Act shall prevent an enactment under which dredging leases may be issued for the whole of the bed of any river in the territory.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does that include the gravel bearings in the river at low water ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is part of the bed of the river, and it includes up to high water mark in the bed of the river. But sometimes there is such a flood that 'high water' would be outside the proper banks of the stream. What we want is to confine the operations of the dredging to the proper bed of the river at high water, but not at the limit of high water. I think we have here about as good a definition as we can get.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would it need a definition in the Act of the word 'bed' ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think not.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3,

Paragraph (b) of section 90 of the said Act is amended by inserting in the fifth line there-

of, after the words 'ninety-eight', the words 'or of any regulations now or hereafter passed in amendment of such regulations.'

Mr. SPROULE. What does that refer to ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the section to which I referred to in the first place, to give us authority to amend the existing regulations. The Placer Mining Act, as it stands, does not permit of the amendment of the existing dredging regulations. We desire the power to amend these regulations to bring them in line with what we think will better develop the industry.

Bill reported.

On motion for the third reading,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Bill is read a third time I would like to say, having regard to the very wide terms of the clause in the Dominion Lands Act authorizing regulations, it strikes me there should be an amendment at the earliest possible moment providing that such regulations should be placed before parliament within fifteen days after the opening of each session, and that they should continue in force only until the end of the session, unless approved by parliament in the meantime. There is a provision of that kind under the general Yukon Act. Where wide powers of this kind are given, the exercise of those powers should be restricted in some way, and parliament should at least have the right to consider what the Governor in Council has done and express its approval or disapproval. I do not think that is an unreasonable request, and I trust the Minister will bear it in mind at the earliest possible moment, and have legislation relating to the Yukon amended in that way.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman mentioned this subject when we were discussing the Dominion Lands Bill, and I had a general amendment prepared which would apply to all regulations and meet this case.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime these regulations will be brought down by the minister next year, even if there is no legislation ?

Bill read the third time and passed.

IMMIGRATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 143) to amend the Immigration Act—Mr. Oliver—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,—

Mr. OLIVER. This section makes a complete definition of the word 'stowaway.'

Mr. FOSTER. Was there any definition previously ?

Mr. OLIVER. There was no definition for 'stowaway' before. It was thought that the case of a stowaway was covered by other words, but the steamship companies have represented that they have found in their operations that the word was not defined, and they ask that a special definition be made.

On section 2,

Mr. FOSTER. It strikes me this is pretty drastic legislation in some respects :

Whenever in Canada an immigrant has, within two years of his landing, become a public charge or an inmate of a penitentiary, jail or hospital, or other charitable institution——

Now a man comes in who is perfectly healthy, all his antecedents are good ; he remains in Canada for the first year, and some time during the second year a misfortune happens to him, he gets his leg jammed, or a limb taken off, or the like of that, and goes to a hospital. On what proper ground can you deport that man ? That is what might take place with any resident of this country who has lived here for forty years. It is not a disability he has inherited and brought across the water with him ; it is a misfortune that may come to the healthiest and best after he has been here nearly two years. That seems to me to go a little too far with reference to hospitals and charitable institutions. Then a good immigrant may come into this country and may, after being here for nearly two years, for doing some trifling thing, be sent to jail ; perhaps in consequence of a St. Andrew's night or a St. Patrick's day, he is overtaken and becomes boisterous and is put into jail because of having imbibed too much, or something of that kind. That is scarcely an offence that ought to make a man deportable, putting upon him that disability. He has cut all his connections with the other side, he has come here and made his home as far as he possibly could and yet, just because of a fault of that kind—I take an extreme case, of course—you will nullify his two years of residence here, his efforts to make a home and place for himself and put the companies to the expense of deporting him. I think that is altogether too drastic. In order to make this logical, you have to connect the disability with his previous domicile, it must be something he has brought over with him ; if he were criminal at the start and landed here and we found a proof of that criminality by any criminal act done here, that would be a fair reason for deporting him. If he came here a pauper, unable to work, or if he were a swindler, a loafer, and went on imposing on charitable institutions and the rates of this country, that would also be a good cause, but the others I do not think would be good grounds at all ; I think in some cases it would be an outrage. It is well known that a municipality tries to get rid of a charge on its rates. It would not take into account the equities of the case but would take advantage of the law

and initiate the proceeding which ends in his deportation.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a matter that is quite wide open to argument, there is no doubt about that. The House, however, last year agreed to this principle of the Bill and this is simply the embodiment and amplification of the principle in order that it may be intelligently carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe in the principle.

Mr. OLIVER. We have to embody the principle in words and provide for it in acts or else it is of no use. We have stated the principle in the Bill of last year. However, it was found in practice that full provision was not made for its operation. The only intent of the clause just read is to provide for the operation of the principle that was agreed to last year and which we have put in operation since last year.

Mr. GALLIHER. Would not the following section cover it ? It is left to your discretion after investigating the facts.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly. The question has to be considered in all its phases to arrive at a fair conclusion. I hope the House will understand that I have no desire to assume either arbitrary or unwarranted powers in this or in any other connection. There is no doubt that there is a very strong demand on the part of public opinion for the prevention of undesirable immigration, and if it is desirable to prevent it, and we have taken every means we can to prevent it, but still the undesirable is found in our midst, public opinion seems to demand that deportation should follow. If we are to agree to the principle of exclusion, and then to the principle of deportation we must face the question of how that deportation is to be carried out and on what terms the officials are to act. Although it may look ugly, still it is a question that we must face. My hon. friend has stated a case which is quite possible under the wording of the law, but of course he understands as every one will understand, that such a case does not come within the spirit of that enactment and it is to be assumed that the administration of the law would be according to its spirit.

Mr. SPROULE. If you are going to carry out only the spirit why make the letter of the law more drastic than the spirit ?

Mr. OLIVER. The reason is that if you so frame the law that the right or power of deportation becomes a subject of legal dispute, you might nearly as well not have the power. It has to be in a drastic form, in order that it may be acted upon effectively and satisfactorily. Then if you have it worded in that way you have to trust to the judgment and fairness of the authorities in administering the law. I see no escape from the position. I would be very, very glad if I could. If we could, by putting a law on the statute-book which would only embody the spirit which my hon. friend has quite properly laid down, then if we have only the right to take cognizance of disabilities that arose before the immigrant came to the country, and then attempted to enforce that law according to its spirit, we would have arrived at the point where we would attain nothing. Having carefully safeguarded the right of the immigrant to be deported only because of matters which arose before he arrived on our shores then every step that we make in order to secure the deportation of any person becomes at once the subject of a legal argument and we are blocked at every turn and we find the greatest possible difficulty in carrying out the principle, which is what we are all desirous of attaining.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister take it that subsection 2 is solely permissive and does not impose the duty on him of deporting after the initial step is taken by the municipal authorities ?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that to be the purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. That could be made more plain.

Mr. OLIVER. In subsection 2 it provides that on receipt of such information the minister may, on investigating the facts, order the deportation of such immigrant.

Mr. FOSTER. Sometimes we say that 'may' means 'shall.' You might put in such words as 'is empowered if he sees proper to do so.'

Mr. OLIVER. I think 'on investigating the facts' seems to cover it, but I would, if desired, move to insert the words 'in his discretion' after the word 'may.'

Mr. SPROULE. The first part of the section says that the minister shall be notified, but it does not say what minister. Is the wording plain enough as it is?

Mr. OLIVER. The Interpretation Act defines the 'minister' to be the Minister of the Interior, but it may be just as well to amend this clause so as to have it read that the Minister of the Interior shall be notified.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is an improvement. It does seem to me that the wording of the section requires further change. Speaking from a knowledge of the practice in rural districts, I know that if a stranger takes ill, the first thing that is done is to send him to an hospital, no matter what disease he may suffer from. It would be advisable to have it made clear in the section that under such circumstances it would not be the duty of the municipality to notify the Minister of the Interior so as to deport such a person.

Mr. OLIVER. The section is not very well worded, but I do not think it matters

much because this parliament cannot compel the clerk of a municipality to notify the Minister of the Interior. The intention of this provision is that if the Minister of the Interior is notified by the clerk of the municipality, he may take action.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—THE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS.

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

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton South). My Speaker, before you leave the Chair will you grant me a few moments to bring to the attention of the Minister of Customs more particularly and the government generally, a matter to which my attention has been directed during the last two or three days? I cannot plead that the subject is one which attracts any very general attention or that it should occupy to any great extent the attention of the House this evening, because there is other business of more importance to attend to.

I submit, however, that there is a principle involved in the matter, which should receive attention at the hands of the government, and more particularly at the hands of the Minister of Customs. This matter relates to a suit which has been brought by private parties against an insurance company. The property of the person bringing the action was destroyed by fire. It was insured in various insurance companies; every one of which, with the exception of one, promptly paid the claims against them. One company disputed the payment of the claim, and refused to pay it, whereupon the party took action to recover the amount. I am not going into any lengthy details in regard to this matter. I only rise to point out that the Customs Department of this country has placed itself behind that particular insurance company, and has assisted it as far as it could possibly do so to resist the payment of this claim. I have to complain that the departmental files of the Customs Department were sent to a foreign country without any proper authority, in order to be used by the counsel of the said insurance company in the city of New York. I have endeavoured to find out whether or not any proper proceeding has been taken in order to secure the forwarding of these papers, and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, no steps whatever have been taken to secure the proper presentation of those papers. The Commissioner of Customs has taken upon himself the entire responsibility of forwarding the papers in order that they might be used in the suit brought by the party to whom I refer against the insurance company. It is too late now to urge for any redress in the present case. The matter is now over; but I submit that the Minister of Customs should ascertain whether his Commissioner of Customs should be permitted at his own sweet will to forward at the expense of the government of this country the papers to which I refer to the city of New York to help an insurance company to avoid the payment of a claim which I think should have been paid. The Commissioner of Customs, of course, thinks he has done what is right and proper. It may be that he has; but I think the matter well deserves inquiring into. If it is going to be the policy of this government to permit the Commissioner of Customs to forward from the department any public documents which may be there, or to send the files of the department out of the country, without being asked in any proper way to do so, I submit that the Minister of Customs should at the earliest possible moment inquire whether the action taken by this official is a proper one. I do not blame the Minister of Customs. This matter has not been brought to his attention before, I brought it to his attention to-day. It appears to me that the action of the Commissioner of Customs cannot be excused, either by the Minister of Customs, the government, this House or the country at large. There are other matters in this connection which I intend to bring to the attention of this House later on. For the present I merely desire to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to what I regard, and what all those who are familiar with the details which I have brought before the House, regard as most outrageous conduct on the part of the Commissioner of Customs.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman gave me notice, shortly before six o'clock, that he intended to allude to this matter. I had not then had an opportunity of seeing the commissioner, and going into the matter with him. I shall, therefore, have to content myself with assuring my hon. friend that I will take the opportunity to-morrow, when his remarks will be in 'Hansard,' of discussing it more fully with the commissioner and going more fully into the matter. I had a short discussion with him on the subject, but, as the House knows, we have been very much pressed with business lately. I received a telegram asking me to order back some of the papers which came when the commissioner was in Toronto on Monday; and, not knowing anything of the matter, I said it would have to wait till he came back. The next morning, in the press of business, I did ask him in reference to the matter, which

struck me, from the way in which the telegram was worded, as somewhat unusual. I will not go into it any further now; but I think I ought to say this on behalf of the commissioner, as I understood him then. It may be true, my hon. friend says it is true, that these papers are being used in a suit; but what I gather from the commissioner is that any papers which any of our officers had in connection with the matter were not in any way presented to prevent a company from being compelled to pay a claim, but that there was a question of the smuggling of goods or the suspected smuggling of goods. My hon. friend says that the papers have been sent out of the country. I have inquired about that, and I understood from the commissioner that the papers have been taken by one of our own special officers who was watching this case. Of course, the department is not interested in any way. If the department were interested without any object of their own in a suit between a person and an insurance company, I should think the action taken would not be justified. It may be that, as I understood from the short conversation I had with the commissioner, that it is involved with the suspicion of smuggling and the hope of unearthing something in that way. If there has been anything irregular, I am sure the commissioner will not have done it with a design of injuring any one, as he is very careful in the discharge of his duty. I will say no more because I am not competent to speak upon it. I have never had an opportunity of going fully into it but, as in duty bound, I will take up the matter with him in the light of what my hon. friend has said here.

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

Militia and Defence—chargeable to income—military survey—for pay and subsistence of surveyors and contingent expenses in connecton with the work, $20,000.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I caused a memorandum to be distributed to the members of the House yesterday which may expedite the work of passing these estimates. This is the usual vote for carrying on in a small way, but in a very creditable manner, the survey of certain portions of the country. I have had the pleasure of distributing to hon. members maps of the district of Niagara and of a district in my province which I think show very creditable work indeed. I find that these maps have been very much sought after. Unfortunately we have not money enough to carry on the work at a very rapid rate but we are doing a certain amount of it each year, partly because of its value to the country and also for the purpose of giving experience to the young men who are learning how to do this work.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Chairman, at the risk of incurring the displeasure of some, and a reminder that a man sometimes talks about what he does not know much of, I wish to say a few words in regard to the rapid increase in the expenditure on militia and defence during the last few years. While I am not opposed to any reasonable expenditure for the purpose of making of the militia a defence in reality for the country, yet, I regard with a little apprehension of danger the very rapid increase in the expenditure for that purpose year after year. We have often heard it said, and I think the minister himself made the remark in some of his observations, that it could not be fairly imputed to us that we were following the course of the European countries in our militarism. Yet, for our age it seems to me that we are becoming a very good second to any European country in our expenditures in that line. The minister stated last night that in 1895-6 we were expending between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000 for that purpose.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About $1,500,000.

Mr. SPROULE. About $1,500,000 and for the coming year we purpose to expend between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000. It seems to me that this is a great expansion in that line and whether the interests of the country demand that or not I am not prepared to say, but from my limited knowledge, I am inclined to think we are going too fast. I believe, with a great many others, that we in Canada should seek to avoid the militarism and the glitter of the older countries and which are unfortunately becoming very apparent in Canada. I have never looked with any great favour upon anything that takes from the active operations of industrial life a large number of young men and converts them into the non-paying class of the country but still a class that we are establishing practically as the pensioners of the country and who must be kept up for all time in the future. It seems to me that we ought to exercise great caution and good judgment in our desire to expand in that direction.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. You mean the permanent force, do you not ?

Mr. SPROULE. I mean the permanent force and the other as well. I have heard a good deal of eulogy expended upon the various provinces because they have agreed to the principle of introducing military drill into the universities, colleges, high schools and common schools of our country. I do not regard that from my standpoint as an unqualified requisite. While I admit the necessity of keeping up some standing force that will be the nucleus of an army in the hour of need and will always be available for drilling the forces and preparing

them for active service I have always thought that we ought to keep it down to the lowest possible numbers essentially necessary to our conditions and requirements here. Then again I have noticed that wherever you introduce military training in the common schools of the country—and I frankly confess I am against the principle, because I think it radically wrong to introduce military training into the common schools—you only offer another attraction to draw the boys away from the farm and place before them the glitter of town, city or military life. When a boy gets out to camp once he has always a desire to go back there. It is a lazy, exciting and attractive life to him and the more of these attractions you put before the youth of the country the larger will be the percentage of young men taken from the industrial pursuits, the result being that these young men will be of little use to the country in the future. Therefore, I say I do not regard our system as an unqualified success when it has necessitated the rapidly increasing expenditure which we have been making for the last few years. Whilst saying that I am not opposed to what I regard as a reasonable expenditure for that purpose. But, I think we are going too fast.

Then, there is another thing that I have asked myself about the expenditure of this large amount of money, nearly $4,000,000: Can it be demonstrated to the country that we are getting value for it? Is there not extravagance in many lines of this expenditure? We have not inquired thoroughly into it, and we have not satisfied ourselves in regard to it. It seems to be a very difficult thing to do. We have only the Public Accounts Committee and we have only a few hours in the week to devote to these public accounts and with the obstruction which is constantly offered in the Public Accounts Committee when we desire to get information it is very difficult for the opposition to get information in that way. Therefore, the function of parliament is paralyzed to a considerable extent and I am not satisfied that in many lines we are receiving full value for the expenditure of this large amount of money. If I were satisfied of that I would have less objection to the expenditure. It may be said that we have taken upon ourselves the responsibility of manning two forts—one at Halifax and the other at Esquimalt. I do not object to that because I believe that the Dominion of Canada should expend a reasonable amount of money to provide for the defence of the country.

That is one way in which we have been able to relieve the mother country of a portion of expense which, in the past, she has devoted to our needs. I do not object to this, so long as the money is wisely and economically expended. But I have thought, from time to time, as we have been called upon to vote $100,000 for a drill hall in London, Toronto, Hamilton or some other city, that this seemed a large sum to devote to the purpose, and the question has suggested itself to my mind whether we could not secure in some cheaper form sufficiently commodious buildings for armoury use and as headquarters for the staff. These works seem to be very expensive. We are told that contracts are let to the lowest tenderers. We do not know how tenders are put in, or who opens them, or how they are worked after they are opened; but we generally find the contract in the hands of a friend and a favourite of the government gets the contract. There may be nothing wrong in this, but it creates suspicion; the whole thing leaves in the public mind a fear that the expenditure is not economically made. If we continue for a few years more to increase our military expenditure as we have increased it since 1895-6, the people may come to regard this as a burden. Let hard times come, let values fall, let our public revenues decrease, and there will be a decided difference in the way in which the people will regard these expenditures from the way in which they regard them now, when the public revenue is buoyant and money plentiful. The people will be apt to inquire whether their representatives have been doing their duty in controlling these expenditures, and will ask why more was not done in checking the action of the government. Therefore it is that I speak this word of warning. I may not be voicing the sentiments of the majority of the people, but I know that I voice the sentiments of a very large number, especially of the agricultural and the industrial classes, who have to work hard for their own living and are apt to regard with no great favour this drawing off from industry of so many men who live at the public expense and continuous pensioners of the public throughout their lives. I believe we should consider these expenditures with greater care, and should have more information than we have had as to the need that exists for them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have no fault to find with the spirit in which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has approached the criticism of these estimates. I am sure he is correct in saying that he represents the feelings of a great many people in Canada. But I venture to say also that, if he will study the expenditures more carefully, his mind will be disabused at least of some of the unfavourable opinions which he has more or less clearly formed. He has spoken of the withdrawal of men in the prime of life from the ranks of industrial and agricultural pursuits. If that were true to any considerable extent, I should be entirely with him, for such a

thing would be extremely undesirable, as well as absolutely unnecessary, in a young country like this. But let me point out that the only militiamen who are permanently employed are the members of the permanent force. Of these we have less than three thousand, and do not propose to have any more—very likely the number will be allowed to decrease. One of the greatest difficulties that presents itself in carrying on the militia service of Canada is in securing recruits for the permanent force and of preventing desertions from it. As a matter of fact, we have had an enormous number of desertions, insomuch that we have been obliged recently to bring over from England soldiers who have been discharged owing to the changes that have recently taken place in the organization of the army.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is there any record showing the class of men who desert, their nationality and previous occupation?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know of such a compilation. Last year we had 348 desertions. The reason for these desertions is largely that these men can secure better pay elsewhere. After they join the permanent force they are tempted to go into the factory, or public works, or railway, and so they leave us in the lurch. But even if we were successful in securing the full strength of 3,000 men, my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) would not say that that constituted a very important withdrawal of men from the ranks of profitable employment. The active militia includes some 49,000 or 50,000 of the 52,000 or 53,000 of our militia force, and these men are withdrawn from industry only during twelve days of the year—and only a portion even of this force are thus withdrawn, because the city militia drill in the evening, and so lose none of their working time. During the summer months some 25,000 or 30,000 of the yeomanry of the country go into camp for twelve or thirteen days, and, at most, lose only fourteen days of their time. Thus their withdrawal from industry is not a serious matter.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has spoken of the proposal which I mentioned last evening of introducing into the schools of Canada a uniform system of physical training for the young children, both boys and girls, up to the age of twelve, and for boys above that age, coupling with it some elementary military training and some teaching in the use of the rifle. I am happy to say that in many of the schools of most of the provinces physical training is now a part of the educational course. But I cannot, for the life of me, see what harm can be done by the introduction of this uniform system of which I speak. I do see that great good is likely to result from it to the health, the morale and the character of the young children—helping them to develop into better men and women in every sense; teaching them to obey, teaching them to stand erect, teaching them to walk properly, training them to discipline, improving them in many ways to take better positions in society when they grow up, and to take a more useful part in the life of the country. I would like to call my hon. friend's attention to a fact of which perhaps he is not aware, and of which I was not aware until quite recently, as to the alleged tendency of training of this kind in the schools to draw men away from the farm. Now, my hon. friend may be surprised to learn that in every state of the United States, in every agricultural college, instruction in certain lines of military education is compulsory. Evidently the people of the United States have not seen that danger.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the minister if he has ever thought there might be a connection between such training and the fact that all through the States of Vermont and Maine you will find thousands and thousands of acres of land lying uncultivated, land as fine as can be found under the canopy of Heaven, with nobody to cultivate it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid the same thing will be found in the lower provinces of this Dominion, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and even in Quebec and Ontario. I do not think that military training in schools has any connection with deserted farms. At any rate, for a hundred years or more the United States have had such training, and they would have discovered the fact if there was any such tendency in military training in schools.

There is one other point to which my hon. friend called attention, and that is with regard to the alleged extravagance in the expenditures upon militia. I do not believe there is extravagance. I believe that the Militia Department is getting as good value to-day in the goods and in everything it purchases, as any business institution in the country. The greatest possible precautions are taken, both as to quality and as to prices. I am not afraid, in fact, I would court investigation as to the prices we pay and the quality of the goods we get. As to giving contracts to political friends, well, I am bound to say I do not object to that, if they deserve it. But I would point out that the firm in Canada which has received the largest orders for clothing, and which I am bound to say has done the work very creditably, I will not say better than any other firm, but as well as it could be done, is an institution in Hamilton, founded by the late Senator Sanford, who was one of the most prominent Conservatives in Canada. So far as I know and believe, the majority of that firm to-day are still in the Conservative camp.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to was contracts for drill sheds.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Contracts for drill sheds are given by the Public Works Department, and I believe in every case after public advertisement. I am inclined to agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman when he said that perhaps too large amounts have been expended upon armouries. I do not mean that in the aggregate too much money has been spent, or that there are too many armouries, because there are altogether too few. But I do think that in many cases much larger amounts have been expended than should have been. That has been done, and I am sorry is being done. But it has been done, I am bound to say, in justice to myself, against my advice, in many cases. A large building is to be constructed in a certain ambitious town, and influences of all kinds are brought to bear to induce the government and the minister to make a handsome and pretentious building; and very often I think twenty-five per cent, thirty, and sometimes fifty per cent more money is expended on those buildings than needs to be expended having regard to the requirements of the militia. I would like to see cheaper buildings and more of them, it would answer the needs of the militia very much better.

Mr. FOWLER. Are those buildings erected by the Public Works Department?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. The hon. gentleman spoke of the increase in the total vote for militia in ten years. I anticipated to some extent his remarks last night, and I am not going to repeat what I said then. The expenditure on revenue account in 1905-6 was about $1,200,000, and if there had been annual drills in camp that year, it would have been about $1,500,000. The estimates this year are about $4,000,000, which includes a sum of $850,000 for annual drill. The difference is $2,500,000. I pointed out last night how that difference was made up. giving the principal items. Taking over Halifax and Esquimalt involved an increase of 2,000 men in the permanent force, amounting to over $1,250,000. The increase in pay of the active militia is practically doubled, and the pay of the permanent force has risen from 40 cents a day to 75 cents, both items amounting to about $250,000. Then there is an increase for clothing, due to greater numbers. With an increase in the active militia of some 10,000, that amounted to something like $250,000. Then there is an increase in the Dominion arsenal of some $200,000, to pay for the enormously increased output from less than 2,000,000 cartridges a year to over 12,000,000. There are some other minor details, such as the Royal Military College, which has increased $50,000 in ten years; we have there now 90 students instead of 50 or 60. There is an increase in the annual upkeep of the barracks and buildings in the permanent force. All these items make up, roughly speaking, about $2,500,000, and I really cannot see how it would be possible for us to cut out one dollar. I hope, however, the expenditure may be kept near where it is now, and I think it can be.

Mr. WARD. I am not inclined to agree with the hon. member from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in his objection to the introduction of physical training and military training in the schools.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not object to physical training, I drew a distinction between the two.

Mr. WARD. Then my remark applies only to military training. It seems to me that the cadet corps now being formed in the public schools and allowed the use of the rifle ranges in the districts in which they are formed are a very valuable adjunct to the militia forces of the country and that the more young boys attending the schools who receive instruction in the use of the rifle in that way the better for the country at large. I know that in my own district there is a very large cadet corps which uses the rifle ranges there and a large number of boys over 14 years of age are being thus instructed in the use of the rifle. Another cadet corps is now being formed in the town which will also have the use of these rifle ranges and it seems to me that it is one of the first principles of defence that these young boys growing up should gradually be taught the use of the rifle, so that when they are called upon which I hope may never happen, they will come into service with a knowledge of the use of the rifle.

I desire to call the attention of the minister to a matter in connection wth the pay of the troops. It does not appeal to me on any personal ground at all but in the interests of the force at large. I refer particularly to the pay of commanding officers both of regiments and of companies or units. The pay has been altered in this sense that officers commanding companies are allowed pay only for the number of men they take into camp for the annual drill. That works a considerable hardship in a great many cases. If the minister will scan the Militia List and see how difficult it is to procure officers for the different regiments he will, I think, see that the officers deserve some consideration in order to induce them to enter the regiments. In my own case the 46th regiment is recruited from a very small county. In that county there are two batteries of artillery which are largely recruited from the six small townships. There are also two troops of cavalry recruited there and it is very difficult indeed

for the officers commanding companies in that regiment to get the necessary quota of men to go into camp. Officers who have done their duty for a great many years now find that if they cannot get the full complement of men to go into camp they are only allowed $1 for each man and if their companies are only half strength, which is the case in a great many instances, they have to do all the work and considerably harder work than they used to have and they only receive one half the amount of pay that they formerly received under the regulations. Not only that, but under a recent rule, passed I think in May last, those commanding officers of companies who have their arms and accoutrements in a drill shed with a caretaker are not allowed the care of arms at all. That has further cut down the pay of officers commanding companies, and I might call the minister's attention to this fact that those commanding officers of companies at headquarters are the officers of the regiment who do the most work. It is quite true that they have their arms and accoutrements taken care of by the caretaker of the drill shed, but in every other sense, looking after the mess of the regiment and the band fund the officers at headquarters are the ones who do the work, and as a consequence of that late rule they are only drawing one half the pay of the country officers who simply look after their companies. I think this works a great injustice and that if the minister looks into the matter he will be prepared to do justice to those who are at headquarters.

Another thing to which I might refer, which is perhaps in a way personal, is that the commanding officer of a regiment, no matter what difficulties he may have to contend with in getting a full turnout of his regiment, if the regiment cannot be recruited up to its full strength suffers in the same way. These are matters which I think should be considered by the minister and although the men have been given every consideration—and I think that is only right and just—in having their pay increased, the officers are suffering a corresponding decrease. I would simply ask the minister to take this matter into consideration and see if something canont be done, because it is with the greatest possible difficulty that we can get officers for the different regiments. I am sure I speak for other commanding officers of regiments when I say it is not easy to get officers who will give their time and attention to recruiting companies as well as bearing the cost of uniforms, &c. I therefore ask the minister to reconsider that portion of the regulations regarding officers. A change would result in making it much less difficult for commanding officers of regiments to recruit not only their men but their officers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am very glad that my hon. friend as a militia officer of long experience has expressed his views. We will find them in 'Hansard' and the headquarters staff will give due consideration to anything he says. The rules and regulations of the Militia Department are not like the laws of the Medes and Persians, fixed and unalterable; we change them from time to time and try to improve them. The rule to which my hon. friend referred was made with the expectation that some officers—because there is a very great difference in officers—some officers who were apparently giving little or no attention to their companies might be stimulated to do so from the fact of being paid only when they got results, and as to the other point which my hon. friend referred to, the pay of a caretaker, I doubt whether my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) would approve of the suggestion that the Militia Department should find men to take care of the arms, relieve the company officers practically of the work, find a room to place them in and still pay the old fee for care of arms for which many of the country regiments to-day are finding their own buildings, and also taking care of the arms themselves. We cannot very well do both. If we furnish an armoury and men to take care of the arms, accoutrements and clothing, surely we should be allowed to withdraw a portion of the money we are paying these officers.

Mr. WARD. All the arms of the 46th regiment are kept in the drill shed. That has been done since the new rifle was issued, and there is no distinction as far as I know between one commanding officer of a company and another. The arms have all been kept in the drill shed and attended to by the caretaker, but the caretaker does not receive a very large and handsome allowance from the government. Of course I am not objecting to the allowance because the man has accepted it, but every one of the officers pay to the caretaker a certain amount from his pay. The rifles are kept in remarkably good condition as I am sure you will find by the reports to headquarters, but there is no distinction whatever as to the different officers of my regiment, because every one of the rifles is kept at headquarters and taken care of by the caretakers.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) has eliminated the patriotic idea altogether. I was rather surprised to hear the hon. gentleman speak as though our militia officers entered the service merely for the money there is in it. I always understood they joined from patriotic motives.

Mr. WARD. Did you ever command a regiment?

Mr. FOWLER. I never had that honour, but I have served as an officer in a regiment and I know that the pay was the

last consideration of the officers. In most regiments the pay received by the officers is put into a fund for the benefit of the regiment or the support of the band; and the officers devote their time, without remuneration, to endeavouring to make the regiment efficient. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend, who commands a very excellent regiment, plead for greater pay for his officers. The departmental rule of paying the officers according to results is an excellent one, and I think it would be a great mistake to change it, notwithstanding the eloquent plea we have heard on behalf of the 46th regiment, from its commanding officer.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to ask the minister if the rates of pay for training and allowances set out in page 13 of the memorandum respecting the estimates, are the whole pay given for the service during each day in camps. The memorandum does not state whether the per diem allowance is the whole pay, or whether it is additional to the pay of the rank of the officer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It covers the full pay and any special camp allowance.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I wish to express my endorsation of any scheme which may be adopted by the department with the view of encouraging military drill in the schools. It tends to the moral and physical upbuilding of the youth of our country. In the public schools of Toronto the pupils have been drilled for upwards of 30 years, and the system has had a most beneficial effect on the moral and physical well being of the boys. My brother happens to be the chief inspector of schools in Toronto, and I can say that there never was a boy who went through that course of military instruction who had to be sent to the industrial school at Mimico, or who in any sense had to be publicly corrected for bad conduct. The training which these boys get in the schools enables them to step right into the ranks of the regiment without undergoing recruit class drill which is a necessary preliminary in the case of those who have not been so trained. I would like to see also that in the camps of the country our young men should not only be trained in drill, but that they should be trained to drill. I wish the minister would call this to the attention of the military officers of his department. Nothing puts so much confidence in a man or fills him with so much pride as to have him stand in front of a squad, and give the word of command. I agree with the member for East Grey, that so far as the permanent corps is concerned the men have too much time on their hands, but his remarks about the lazy life of a soldier would certainly not apply to the volunteers in camp. One reason why so few young Canadians desire to become regular soldiers is that there is a lot of spare time on the hands of men in the permanent corps. Did time permit, there are a great many details in connection with our militia system which I would like to dwell upon, and as to which I think I could suggest improvement. As to the cost of the militia of this country, I would point out that our neighbours to the south who are a democratic people spend a great deal more per capita on their military system then we do. I would like the Minister of Finance to listen to this, because I know he is an ardent volunteer at heart and is desirous of spending the last dollar he can get for the purpose of keeping the old flag flying. The people of the American Republic, who are a democratic people, spend upwards of $400,000,000 a year for military and naval purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. That includes pensions.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How much of that goes for pensions?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. About $100,000,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking from memory, I think it is $300,000,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The regular expenditure on their military system is $300,000,000 a year and including pensions it is $400,000,000 a year. This represents $5 per head of the population of the United States, while in Canada our militia expenditure is only 80 cents per head of the population. If we spent $1 per capita it would be a very small sum, and if we spent $2 per capita it would not be what you might call an extremely large sum. No complaint can therefore be made as to the amount of money we spend for this purpose, and the only question is: Is it well expended? I agree with the member for East Grey that we should have less expensive drill sheds and more of them throughout the country. It would be much better to have suitable drill sheds in different places from one end of the country to the other, than to have a few fancy buildings at favoured points. I am pleased to hear that the Minister of Militia is directing his attention to that. As to a military life drawing boys from the farms to the cities, I may remark that in the United States, 92 per cent of the prominent residents of cities and towns come from the farms, and in Canada the percentage is 94 per cent. There is a lot of room in the cities and towns, and there is not always room on the farms for the boys, so that this result is naturally brought about. If there is any thing that will make farm life attractive for the young man, it is the fact that he has had military training in the public

school or collegiate institute, and that when he settles down on the farm with his certificate of efficiency, he feels himself a man of some importance and he joins the volunteer battalion as a private, rising to be a non-commissioned officer, and in time a commissioned officer. The hon. member for East Grey knows that a young man in the country can occupy no prouder position than to be a lieutenant or captain or major in one of these corps. Besides having the advantage of the training, he is more likely to remain on the farm and become a creditable citizen.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask my hon. friend who has just spoken whether we may take his own family as an example of what he has said?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The history of my own family is that we were too poor to live on the farm, and we had to go out and make a living somewhere else.

Mr. FOWLER. Did the minister explain what was done with that money—what part of the territory of Canada was surveyed?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did; in the Niagara district and at one point in the lower provinces. We are carrying on this survey in a connected way along the boundary line between Ontario and the United States and occasionally in other places. Wherever there is a camp located there is a survey.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you any survey between New Brunswick and Maine?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have not gone that far yet. It is principally in Ontario and I think at some point between Quebec and the United States.

Militia and Defence—annual drill, $850,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is about the same as last year.

Mr. FOWLER. How many men are you drilling this year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 40,000, exclusive of the permanent force.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the total militia force now?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 52,000 or 53,000, including the permanent force. About 49,000 active militia.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may say that the increased pay which the minister has introduced is a very beneficial thing. One point I want to make for the militia who turn out for the annual drill is this, that there is no money which the government expends that is so readily distributed throughout the country as the money paid to the militia in camp. It returns to the pockets of the people at once.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Militia and Defence—salaries and wages, $85,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. These are for civil employees in different parts of the country.

Military properties—maintenance, $50,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In this connection I take the liberty of drawing attention to the movement which is on foot to commemorate the tercentenary of Champlain. I shall be very much pleased if this can be carried out, but the celebration should not be confined to the city of Quebec. I would be willing to give the city of Quebec a fair share of whatever form the memorial may take, but I would suggest that every part of Canada—for instance, certain parts of the maritime provincees, Quebec and Ontario—be included; notably the counties of Simcoe, Ontario, Victoria and Peterborough, where Champlain made one of the most notable expeditions in his career, and where there should be some suitable memorial erected to commemorate his trip.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Prime Minister is particularly interested in this proposed celebration, and I shall be very glad to draw his attention to what has been said.

Mr. DANIEL. For what number of days are the men to be called out?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Twelve days, except the artillery, who are to be called out for sixteen days.

Military properties, construction and repairs, $200,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Has anything been done with respect to the old forts, such as old Fort Cumberland in Nova Scotia, and the fort of St. John in New Brunswick? The last I remember seeing of the fort of Cumberland was that it was used as a sheep pasture. The fort of St. John I think is more suitable for goats than for sheep. In neither case are they kept as they should be. They are very important points in the history of this country, a history of which we need not be ashamed, and it seems to me that something should be done to keep up these old landmarks.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree with my hon. friend entirely. At Annapolis we have spent a good deal of money to restore the old fort, the oldest on this continent with one exception, and it is visited by tens of thousands of people every year. I should be very glad indeed to have my hon. friend join me in memoralizing the Minister of Finance to see if we cannot in another year get a fund for this purpose. Two or three thousand dollars spent every year would in a few years do the whole work.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the way these forts have been neglected in the past is an outrage. I believe a predecessor of the hon. minister sold the old cannon at Fort Cumberland as old iron. Something should be done before the different mounds representing the battlements are completely destroyed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall have one or two of the engineers at Halifax make an examination of all the forts during the coming season, so that we may have a report as to their condition.

Mr. DANIEL. Mention was made of the fort at St. John. I may say that there are two principal forts or batteries there. One of them has been allowed to fall entirely into disrepair, although I take it that it occupies a good strategical position. I refer to the old Redhead battery. It is all grass-grown. There is no attempt to keep it in any kind of repair. I do not think there is a dollar being spent on it. I think the government is not giving as much attention to Fort Dufferin, which is used annually for the carrying out of firing practice, as it ought to. I think that the government ought to pay more attention to the Redhead battery which is really the only fortification on that side of the harbour if they are going to keep it up at all. It has simply fallen into decay. Nothing is being done. I might also remind the minister that we have the very slight remains of the celebrated old Fort Latour in the harbour, and I certainly think that the least the government could do with that would be to inclose what is left of it and put a monument or something there to show what the place has been and commemorate the occurrences at this point in the early history of Canada. Those who have read history at all know that it was the scene of a very gallant exploit by Lady Latour who took the part of commanding officer in the absence of her husband and conducted a well known and historical defence. So that, in regard to the city of St. John there are two forts which should be kept up as modern forts, or at all events, kept in repair and then there is this old historical place, Fort Latour, which the government could preserve at slight expense and which ought to be maintained in order that the deeds of the past may be kept in the memory of present and future generations. There is no doubt that the history of Canada is full of thrilling incidents and I think we should at least commemorate them so that present and future generations may not be entirely unmindful of the history of their country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall be very glad to include these forts in the list of those which will be looked after. There is a distinction to be made between historical forts and those which were constructed at a certain period and found afterwards to be in the wrong place or unnecessary. This whole question is one of sufficient importance and interest to be gone into carefully and I will see that it is done. It will be good practice for our engineering officers at any rate and very interesting indeed to get such information, and in another year I hope we will renew this interesting discussion.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. In that connection I would ask the minister to consider in addition to those forts which are mentioned what is known as the Old Fort at Toronto. That fort is famous in the history of this country more especially in connection with the war of 1812. On two occasions it was besieged and unfortunately on both of these occasions it was captured. But it was the scene of two very stout defences and it is to-day a standing landmark in Ontario and in Toronto. It is in what might be said to be an excellent state of preservation with the exception of one or two of the battlements. The entire configuration of the fort is intact. A year or two ago a certain society in Toronto volunteered to take it over in connection with certain other historical places in the city because it was threatened with partial destruction by the opening up of a highway for the purpose of running a street railway in that neighbourhood. The opening of this highway and the building of the street railway would have necessitated the destruction of at least one angle of the fort and it would have marred very greatly its picturesqueness and completeness. That, for the moment, has been averted. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) will recollect having received deputations from Toronto on more than one occasion in conection with this matter.

The fort is there just as it was one hundred years ago except that the works are dilapidated and the pickets on the fortification are falling away in decay but the earthworks and the conformation of the fort are there. The people of Toronto are deeply interested in this matter. It is all government ground and requires no expense on the part of the government to protect this relic. There is no purchase necessary, the Crown owns the land and it is merely the watchfulness of the Crown that is required to protect this relic from invasion. If the government will have an eye on it and prevent what I might term vandalism—they will do a great deal to preserve this historical ground. I would consider the destruction of even a part of the fort as an act of vandalism. Its destruction is not necessary to open up new streets through there. There is ample room for any highway for public purposes without in any

way destroying any portion of the fort. What is wanted is simply the watchfulness of the government to see that nothing is done that should not be done with what is now government property. It is really a little park space and some means should be taken by the government to preserve it in its present shape and to preserve the ground immediately surrounding it so that it still may be a little park for that portion of the city. I think it is only necessary to mention it to the minister who is aware of the situation and of the romantic history of that old work. I am sure the minister will do what is necessary to protect this relic from destruction or even from injury.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) knows the circumstances in connection with the transfer of the fort to the city of Toronto. The government has sold to that city some 200 acres of land including this fort.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Including the old fort ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Including everything, and I wish to add that I took the greatest pains to guard the safety of the fort in making that sale. According to the terms of the sale which will be incorporated in the deeds of transfer it will be absolutely impossible for the city, if it were disposed to do so, which I think it is not, to permit any act of vandalism in connection with the fort.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. That is precisely what was asked of the minister. Assurance was given us to that effect and I am glad to hear that this condition will be inserted in the deed.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think it would be well to consider the question of what should be done with the old cannon, rifles and swords which the government have stored in out of the way places and which are going to rack and ruin for want of a proper place to store them. We have very fine armouries all though Canada and there is nothing that would make a finer decoration than these old arms, swords and cannon. I think that the Hamilton regiment have applied at different times for a supply of these old arms and that the government are inclined to grant this request, but it requires a little energy on the part of those who are interested in the matter to secure a proper distribution of them. I think that every regiment in Canada would feel very proud indeed to be the possessor of these old arms.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are giving away the cannon, and we are giving away also arms which were sent from South Africa. But, so far as some of the obsolete small arms are concerned, we have been giving those to the schools and cadet corps, in order that they may learn —it may be in an imperfect way, but it is better than nothing—how to use the rifle, at least, in manual drill. The rule we have made, so far as cannon are concerned, is that any one can have them for public purposes who will pay the cost of transportation.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the minister should give these only to permanent institutions, and not to some that may last only for a day and then will sell the cannon for junk.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They only lend them.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister give them away or lend them?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are given away.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understood that they were only loaned.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, well, we never expect to get them back.

Militia and Defence—chargeable to income—clothing and necessaries, $300,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Is there any intention to make a change in the establishment at Fredericton? I have a letter stating that some of the officers and men are talking of removing from Fredericton in June. There have been rumours of some change and of the infantry being replaced by a cavalry or artillery corps.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was the intention to place a squadron of cavalry there, as my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) knows. That was found to be inexpedient, and then it was proposed to send a company of artillery. But for the present, I believe, no change is contemplated.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I would draw the attention of the minister to a matter I spoke about earlier in the session. Before the change was made under which a duty is imposed upon uniforms and equipment, some officers ordered uniforms in the old country. It would seem only fair and right that, if these officers are called upon to pay the duty, some compensation should be made them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In the same connection, I would mention a matter which I have already called attention to. I believe that the Highland regiments in Toronto and Montreal cannot get their regimentals in Canada. And the duty on these uniforms is very heavy. The matter has been discussed to see what is best to be done. The best solution presenting itself, to my mind, is that the Customs Department should send the invoices to the Militia Department and let that department pay the duty and save the money to the regiment.

There are also many individual cases. For instance, a man buys a rifle—nearly all our expert marksmen buy weapons of their own and, up to the present time, they have been using the Lee-Metford rifle. These arms, like officers' uniforms and equipment, are dutiable under the new law. The minister promised he would take the matter into consideration.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. With regard to the Highlanders, whose uniforms cannot be procured in Canada, I am glad to inform the committee that the Militia Council have considered the matter, and have reached a satisfactory conclusion. We are giving these regiments a larger amount of money than before. What has happened in the past is that the value of the clothing they would have worn has been given to the regiments, and they have bought the clothing in England and paid the difference themselves. I am happy to say that the solution we propose of the existing question is satisfactory to the regiments concerned. As to the question raised by my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), that is rather more difficult. I think that consideration should be given in cases where uniforms have actually been ordered under a condition of things which has existed ever since confederation, when, without notice, a change was made in that policy. I think that position should be considered and that the duty should be paid. That matter is being considered now, though we have not reached an actual conclusion. I want to get all the cases together and adopt a line of policy which will be applicable to all.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What about the unfortunate who patronized his own Canadian tailor, and ordered a new uniform before the new order was made? He will be charged the additional duty on cloth, for the merchant will be obliged, as a matter of business, to take advantage of the change.

Mr. LALOR. The new law is very objectionable to the rural battalions. I have a communication from the 37th battalion of Haldimand county saying that the officers have passed a resolution in opposition to the present arrangement. They think it is a hardship that officers of battalions, whose expenditures for military purposes are already greater than their incomes from military sources, should be taxed on uniforms and outfit that they purchase. I think it unfortunate that the government should have made this change in duties. But even though the customs authorities impose these duties, I think the Militia Department should reimburse the officers who purchase military uniforms.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So far as uniforms are concerned, there is no reason in the world why the officers should not get their uniforms in Canada, as the men do. If a Canadian uniform is good enough for the man in the ranks, it ought to be good enough for the officer. I was an officer of the militia in Nova Scotia from 1863—not an officer from the beginning, for I began in the ranks. I bought my own uniforms, and they were made in Halifax. I never bought any other than a Canadian uniform up to the time when I became Minister of Militia.

Mr. DANIEL. Were these uniforms made by a Canadian tailor?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They were made by Campbell, a man who knew how to make military clothing.

Mr. DANIEL. Was it made by one of the military tailors belonging to the military forces?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, but by Campbell, a first rate tailor. He did some work for the imperial officers, no doubt. We talk about a self-contained militia. Thirty years ago we adopted the policy of having the clothing of the men made in Canada, but it seems to be a poor sort of self-contained militia if the officers of the forces are not to wear clothing made in Canada. If the officers will order their clothing in Canada, the enterprising tailors in Canada will soon find the men capable of giving the proper cut and finish to a uniform. Let us have Canada for the Canadians in this respect as well as in every other respect. I have no sympathy whatever with the idea that we must pamper the militia officer who happens to prefer to wear a coat made in England to a coat made in Canada. I except any cases of hardship that may occur; beyond that, I think our friends the officers should make up their minds to accept the situation. If I were going to give any assistance at all to officers, I would prefer to give it to an officer who buys a uniform made in Canada.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Like the minister, I have never had the honour of wearing a uniform that was not made in Canada. The minister knows very well that under the new regulations militia officers patronize Canadian tailors. The old custom was to give a rebate in duty on cloth. Whethere the officer profits by that, I do not know.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would rather add to the pay of the officer, if necessary, than to pay his bills in that way.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am in a position to say that as good militia clothing can be made in Canada as in any other part of the world. I say that with great confidence and from actual knowledge. I know there are members in this House who buy

their clothing in England to-day because they think they cannot get it good enough here. We have officers in the regiments who do the same thing, who feel in the same way. Well, if they continue to feel that way, let them pay for it. I am satisfied that if a man wants a uniform he can get one of any kind as cheap if not cheaper in Canada, and a better fitting garment.

Mr. LALOR. I think the remarks of the minister that he proposes to increase the pay of the officers of battalions will be quite acceptable. They would have more to pay for their clothing at home, and I hope he will act upon that suggestion and increase their pay. Although I am not a military man myself. I sympathize with their desire for increased pay.

Mr. BOLE. I would ask the minister if he knows what it costs to make a uniform? Representations have been made to me from Winnipeg that the uniforms are in such a shabby condition that some of the men have refused to appear on parade. What is supposed to be the life of a uniform, according to the regulations?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Three years, an overcoat is seven or eight years, a tunic three years.

Mr. FOWLER. This matter of officers' uniforms is a rather broad question. My own opinion always has been that there is too much gold lace and trimmings about the uniform of the officers of the different volunteer regiments in Canada. I think all this question about buying uniforms in England, and all this cry of the officers as represented by certain gentlemen in the House to-night on account of expense, would be done away with if the uniform was of a cheaper character, if a great deal of this gold lace and fittings were eliminated entirely. I have always been strongly in favour of that. Take a cavalry regiment for instance, these uniforms are tremendously expensive. When the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman), who I admit has much better knowledge of the subject than myself in the way of clothing, says uniforms can be made better and cheaper in Canada, that hon. gentlemen will find it difficult to get the class of uniform that a crack cavalry corps require in this country. I do not think you can get them made in this country, tailors have not the experience in making them. But I do not think we should have such a uniform as that in our regiments. If you allow one officer to wear them, to wear you might call a swell uniform, why it is going to be general. One man wants to be as well dressed as another; officers of the same corps, all lieutenants want to wear the same sort of uniform, captains the same way. The only way to do is to prescribe a simple and inexpensive uniform for the officers, then let them buy their uniforms in Canada, and nobody will be complaining about the duty, or wanting to increase the pay of the officers in order to enable them to buy uniforms. One reason why the volunteer regiments in Canada have difficulty getting officers is the very fact of the tremendous expense in connection with this silly and expensive uniform. Of course you want to draw a distinction between the uniform of an officer and that of a private, but it need not be a very broad distinction, particularly in a democratic country like this, where the social rank of the private is often and usually quite as good, and sometimes even better than the social rank of his superior officer. We do not want to perpetuate in Canada those old world distinctions that prevail in the old country. Let us have a democratic and simple, inexpensive uniform, and we will find this difficulty disappearing in time.

Mr. WARD. Do I understand the minister to say that in all cases new uniforms are issued every three years?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The regulations lay down what is to be done, they are found on page 18 of the memorandum.

Mr. WARD. The reason I ask is that I have been told by an inspecting officer that all uniforms have to be condemned, not considering their age at all, after they have been used for three years, and if they are not condemned by the inspecting officer a new issue of clothing cannot be had. I understand that recently an issue was refused to one regiment in my district where the old uniforms have been in use since 1903. The last issue was in that year, and an application was made for New York uniforms and it was refused by the department because the others had not been condemned. I have even heard that it is not the intention of that regiment to appear in camp, but I hope that is not the case.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Our custom always was, when I had the command of a regiment, to keep the old uniforms and manage to get a new issue at the proper time for state occasions. I am very sorry to learn that any such rule as the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) mentions should be carried out in this district. The men are now entitled to a new uniform every three years.

Mr. WARD. It was the regiment formerly commanded by himself that I was referring to.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In my time we always had two sets of uniforms. For the information of the hon. gentleman from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) I may say that formerly an officer could not enter the military school without having his full dress uniform, his mess uniform, and his drill uniform. By repeated struggling with former ministers, years ago, that was changed

so that the mess uniform was done away with, and after further struggling the full dress uniform was done away with so that finally all that was necessary for an officer to have in order to attend the military school or to go to camp, was his drill uniform, and I think that is all that is necessary now.

In connection with the coming camps I would suggest to the minister the advisability of having rough but neat tables with awnings over them for the men to eat their meals from instead of having to sit in their tents on the ground. The saving on uniforms alone, I am satisfied, would make up the expense.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are getting them now, tarpaulins and tables.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then in the past large sums were paid to local carters for the transport of baggage, &c., and these men skinned the officers and men as they only know how.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are using the large army service corps wagons now for the transport of baggage.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will these be attached to each regiment ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To the camp.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister now has wagons set apart for every district, and in case of actual service each company will have a certain number of wagons with it. I do not suggest to take all these wagons to camp, but I would suggest that there should be one or two teams and wagons at the disposal of each regiment for the handling of cartage.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that is done now in connection with the cavalry.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I know that but not in connection with the infantry at all.

Mr. FOWLER. It is done in New Brunswick with infantry and cavalry both.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, it is not. Officers report to me and I believe to the department, that in some cases the rationing by the army service corps has not been all that it should be. This is a matter that I suppose could be set right by the inspecting officers immediately.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. On the whole, I think it has been very satisfactory.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In regard to the equipment of the various regiments, I think it would be a wise thing if the department could see their way clear to place the equipment at the disposal of each regiment in their own quarters instead of their having to send to the district headquarters wherever they may be. We have to send to Toronto and it would be impossible to mobilize the troops in our district quickly. We know how difficult it is and the time it takes to get anything through the Militia Department.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is one on us.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If there was a call for troops say at Niagara Falls, we would first have to send to Toronto for tents, cooking utensils, &c. That is perfectly absurd. In the Buffalo armouries they have their wagons, tents, cooking utensils and arms all ready and they could mobilize and be in camp in any part of the city of Buffalo in less than six hours. It would be impossible to get this equipment from the central district to the place where they wished to mobilize in anything like that time.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you an armoury at Hamilton ?

Mr. ZIMERMAN. We have a very good armoury and about 1,300 men in the militia. It is a central point.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They are city corps and never go into camp.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The idea of not having an equipment is absurd. The militia if called out suddenly would be practically helpless and would have to wait until supplies came from the central district. I certainly think the city regiments which are expected to mobilize hurriedly should have everything necessary to place them in camp in a comfortable position. I spoke of this last year and the minister said the matter would be considered. I hope he will consider it further this year and act in the matter which I really think is one of the most important in connection with the city militia.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman) as made a proper suggestion and if there were an unlimited supply of tents I could see how this would be a proper thing to have. Suppose they were kept at Hamilton it would take 100 or 120 tents and these would never be used except on active service. That is the only point I see in the matter.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand it to be the intention of the minister to procure tables and that sort of things for the different regiments when they go into camp ? Are they going to have all the modern equipment of a home when they are at camp ? That seems to be the idea of the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes). I have heard my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) tell many tales of hardships he endured in South Africa.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Neither my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) nor any other man ever heard me tell a tale of hardship in South Africa or anywhere else.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman is so rugged that what would be a hardship

to another man is a pleasure to him. But, it is certain he did not have table napkins and mahogany dining tables on active service.

Mr. CARNEY. Nor finger bowls.

Mr. FOWLER. Nor finger bowls either. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) desires to nuture our militia men in the lap of luxury. Why, on active service they could not carry this impedimenta of mahogany dining tables and pianos, and if for instance our friends to the south were to become our foes, our militia, hampered with such luxuries, would not be able to defend their country. A better use could be made of the money than to apply it in the direction the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) suggests. Do I understand from the minister that it is intended to get awnings under which the gentlemen of the militia may sit so that the sun may not tan their countenances? In the old days when I was in the militia we used to wear a little round cap perched on three or four hairs on one side of the head, and when the twelve days training were up we were as brown as a berry. We had no awnings or other luxuries, but we did very good drill and we were an efficient corps.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In your own opinion.

Mr. FOWLER. In the opinion of the inspectors as their records will show. Our militiamen do not require these luxuries for the twelve days training in camp, and I think the money can be applied to much better purpose.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know how the boys are brought up in the part of Canada whence my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) comes, but I can tell him that in my part of the country they are used to the decent conveniences of civilization. The hon .gentleman says that I have made reference to feather-bed soldiers.

Mr. FOWLER. It was you who said that.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I have no hesitation in saying that it is a disgrace to bring boys from their homes to camps of instruction, and ask them to sleep and eat in muddy tents when for a few dollars the decent convenience of life could be provided. What I want to know is whether it is the intention of the department to provide these conveniences, because if not a great many of the regiments will supply them for themselves. They do not want it to turn out as in the case of the helmets, that many of the men supplied their own helmets, and found afterwards that the government made an issue the same year. These are camps of instruction, to which these young men are brought; they will not be on active service in which case they would be moving along each day, but they will be twelve days in the same tent, and it is only reasonable to ask that some comforts should be provided. I am suprised that any gentleman who ever wore the uniform of a Canadian militia officer, should have the hardihood to stand up in this House and speak as my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) has spoken.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have listened for some time to these militiamen eulogizing each other, and I notice that the minister is no doubt smiling at the fact that no reference is made to his department being one of the most extravagant of all the departments of government. In the list of those from whom supplies have been purchased, I see the same lot who do business with the other departments and who get prices which are considered sufficiently high to allow of a good rake off. There is not the slightest doubt that there are many firms or individuals in Canada who have been made wealthy since the Minister of Militia took charge of this department, simply by the amount of supplies that he has bought from them. In this estimate there are $500,000 for clothing, and year after year, two firms alone supplied half a million dollars worth. The minister tells us that tenders are called for, but the fact is that letters are sent around to some of his political friends inviting them to provide the supplies. In that way the friends of the government are paid higher prices than would be paid if there was open competition. The minister also knows that we have paid $1,128,000 for rifles and that only 5,000 of these rifles are now fit to be used. Another strange thing is, that the parts of this rifle are made in the United States, and that in case of trouble with our neighbours to the south, our supply would be cut off and our volunteers be without arms. Now, I have read in the newspapers that the Minister of Militia is to leave for England to-morrow; that he is going to be our High Commissioner; and that he would not return to this House, so that, not he, but some other minister will have the expenditure of the money we are now voting. If that is the case, the minister will not have the spending of this money. I would like to ask him if that report is true, and if he is likely to remain in England and we are to lose his services in this country. I have heard a great deal about South Africa, and I would like to know whether the people there have ever heard of any rifle like this. Perhaps the minister can give us a little statement as to how our militia did in South Africa, and let us know what he intends doing with regard to trooper Mulloy. He does not hesitate to come down with $4,000,000 expenditure, and yet he has not seen his way to give a pension of a few hundred dollars to this man who met with an accident which left him in a condition in which he is unable to earn his living.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend has given me quite a large order. First, I want at once to set his mind at rest as to whether I shall be here or not. I can assure him that as far as I know I am likely to be here. I have not been offered the High Commissionership, and except for the rumours that I have seen in the newspapers, I know nothing about it. The High Commissionership is not vacant, and as far as I know the noble gentleman who holds it is enjoying as good health to-day as ever, and I am sure that we all hope that he will live for many years to fill the position which he adorns and which he has so ably filled for the last ten or twelve years. As to contracts, I have no objection to giving them to Liberals provided they are good contractors; indeed, I am bound to confess that I prefer doing so. But I will not give a contract to a Liberal simply because he is a Liberal; he must be capable of doing the work. The hon. gentleman says that some of the contractors have got rich. Well, all I have to say is that I hope that every good contractor who does work for the Militia Department is getting a fair return for his investment and his labour; he has a right to it. We do not want any work done for the department that is not well done and we think the labourer is worthy of his hire. I challenge my hon. friend to investigate any of the contracts which have been made by my department in connection with clothing or any other supplies, and I shall be glad to afford him every facility. I am certain that the very best that could be done has been done, and that value has been received for all the money that has been paid out. My hon. friend says that the same contractors receive contracts year after year. Well, we are in the habit of letting contracts for three years at a time. That was a custom of the late government. When we came into power I changed that, and I made a mistake when I did so, and I reverted to the custom of the former administration. We had it threshed out here, and I admitted that my predecessors had pursued a wise course in giving a contract for three years and sometimes for four years, as the best value was got in that way. As to the Ross rifle, it would take rather too long to discuss that fully to-night. I have already taken advantage of two occasions to explain as well as I could what has been done in regard to that rifle. It is not true that we have paid over a million of money and have got only 5,000 rifles. So far as I know, we have got from 25,000 to 30,000 rifles, which are quite fit for service. No country has ever adopted a new rifle without having more or less difficulty during its first issue. There have been mistakes and some defects in manufacture discovered; but we have the written guarantee of the company that every single defect resulting from error in manufacture shall be made good. They are being made good now, and I firmly believe that the service rifle adopted by Canada is and will prove to be one of the best rifles if not the best in the world. My hon. friend has said that we are indebted to the United States for all the parts of that rifle. Well, my hon. friend is drawing too long a bow.

Mr. J. D. REID. Perhaps not all, but the main parts.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not the fact, as my hon. friend will see if he takes the trouble to look at the papers that have been brought down. Unfortunately we cannot get in Canada the steel out of which rifles can be made. That is not the fault of the Ross rifle. We are developing the manufacture of steel in Canada, and in a short time we shall produce the proper kind of steel for rifles. It is no part of the business of the manufacturer of rifles to make the steel. He makes the rifle. Most of the steel which had previously been imported from the United States is now being imported from Great Britain. With the exception of a few springs, which were imported from the United States, and which are now imported from Great Britain, all the work on the Ross rifle is made in the Ross rifle factory, and the different processes there number many hundreds. I wish my hon. friend, who is a good business man, and who is interested in developing manufactories in Canada, would take the trouble to go down and visit the Ross rifle factory. If he does, we shall never hear again observations from him in the line of those to which he has given utterance to-night. The Ross rifle factory, instead of having all the opposition that could possibly be brought against it in certain quarters, deserves the support of this House and of the people of this country, and I am perfectly certain that it will receive it in due time. The rifle will go through the ordeal successfully, such an ordeal as I venture to say no other rifle in any other British country or in any country in the world has ever been subjected to before. I will ask my hon. friend to be considerate enough, to be patriotic enough to at least reserve his final judgment until we have gone through another set of camps and until we have had another opportunity of testing this rifle as it will be tested by actual use.

Mr. J. D. REID. There have been 27,012 rifles issued up to March 2, 1907. They have delivered 9,000 to the Department of Militia and Defence, 500 to the Northwest Mounted Police, 500 to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, 16,500 to the Department of Militia and Defence and 12 to the Department of Justice. The government have bought these rifles at a cost of $25 each making in all $675,550, and in addition to that they have advanced $552,000 more for rifles to be delivered in future.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are 52,000 under construction.

Mr. J. D. REID. From the report which has been brought down to the House I gather that all the rifles have been condemned by the officers in nearly every department.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. J. D. REID. They have been condemned from the mounted police in the west right down to the lower provinces, and that being the case I think it is not fair to the citizens of this country that a rifle of that kind should be imposed upon them. I certainly am just as patriotic as any other man and I would be glad to see them manufactured in Canada taking it for granted that they can be manufactured at or near what they would cost in any other country. The minister knows he can purchase Lee-Enfields at from $7 or $8 less than these rifles are being manufactured for.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not with the duty, the cost of freight and various charges. The Lee-Enfield rifle to-day with 20 per cent added, which is not a very large margin for the manufacture, and the cost of transportation, will cost twice as much as the Ross rifle.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the duty is added, but the government bring in every thing that is required for their own use free.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They do not now.

Mr. J. D. REID. This year they have added the duty, but at the time this contract was made there was no duty collected on anything coming in for this Ross rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend knows that the manufacture of woolen goods, cotton goods and every thing that is made in Canada has received a certain amount of aid by way of duty. Surely he would not deny to the rifle factory the same advantage and that is all that has been given in this case; in fact, much less has been given than has been given to other manufactures.

Mr. J. D. REID. Even with the duty on there is quite an advance in price. What I am particularly finding fault with is the fact of so many of these rifles being in use. In addition the minister states that the Ross Rifle Company are repairing these at their own expense. From the reports that have been brought down the Ross Rifle Company refused to do this unless the government paid them to put the rifles in proper shape. The mark I rifle is being changed to a mark III.

Mr. J. D. REID.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, the sight is a mark III sight.

Mr. J. D. REID. But there is a mark III rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. I saw one the other day with a card on it bearing the words 'mark III' and there is a report stating that there is one now coming out. I saw in the report the other day where the board recommended twenty-three changes in this mark III rifle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, you never saw any such thing.

Mr. J. D. REID. I saw the report in which there were twenty-three changes recommended.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Never in the world.

Mr. J. D. REID. I will have it here in five minutes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not better posted on this subject. I know he is doing his best. There has been a determined set made on this rifle such as never was made in any other country. I do not like to accuse the hon. gentleman of being an agent for any company which desires to kill the Ross rifle.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I say that I do not accuse him of being an agent, but the agents of other companies are travelling through the Dominion of Canada endeavouring to prevail upon members of the force to discard the Ross rifle. There have been 27,000 of the Ross rifle in commission and how many have failed? In the firing of these 27,000 rifles there has been only one injury and that of a slight character to the eye of a sergeant major by the blowing back of the firing pin, the end of which struck him in the face. There were two or three cases where a defect was found in the rifle. There was one rifle in which the firing pin nut came back while the rifle was being fired in the city of St. John and these are the only accidents that have occurred to the Ross rifle.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is not so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We have had it from two witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee and Capt. Drake admitted that he knew nothing at all about rifles. He was an artillery man. The firing pin nut flew back and we know the explanation of that accident. The sergeant major admitted in his evidence before the committee that it was the spring that had blown it back.

Mr. J. D. REID. I did not think that you could refer to the report of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The report was presented here this afternoon. The spring threw it back and no other cause could he show. He imagined that there had been something else but he could not tell what it was that had sent this thing back. I do not know of any rifle which can show so few accidents as this. Take the Lee-Enfield that the hon. gentleman mentioned. The Lee-Enfield had nine marks and the short Lee-Enfield had four changes altogether. As I pointed out not long ago there were over one hundred and twenty changes made between one mark and the other in the English rifle and yet we heard nothing about it. In no country in the world has such an agitation been carried on against a rifle as that which has been carried on against the Ross rifle. The United States discarded over six hundred thousand rifles and my hon. friend will search in vain the records of the United States House or Senate to find any condemnation of the war department for discarding these rifles. When Great Britain imported a lot of pot metal bayonets the matter was referred to a committee and no discussion took place upon it. These matters are always treated without the arena of party politics, but I am sorry to say that a different line has been proceeded upon in regard to the Ross rifle in this country. When once it was proceeded with I insisted that we should have the matter probed to the bottom, and that no possible objection urged against the rifle could be upheld. Even the mark I, if it is properly made, is as far ahead of the Lee-Enfield as day light is ahead of darkness. The mark II has been placed in the hands of our soldiers. Only one accident has occurred in mark I, and none with mark II. In one of these a little piece flew back in the city of St. John and in the other the spring blew back the firing pin and the man who was firing the rifle was hit in the face. It was due to a difficulty with the firing pin collar. There has never been any return ordered of the accidents to the Lee-Enfield rifle, as there have been again and again in the case of the Ross rifle. Soldiers are instructed to report every defect observed in the Ross rifle for the very reason that it is a new arm, and, if there is any defect in it, the department want to know of it, in order that that defect may be remedied. But, although, such report has never been had of the Lee-Enfield, does anybody suppose that accidents with the Lee-Enfield are unknown? Why, many serious accidents have been known with the use of that rifle. A man lies down at the ranges to fire his Lee-Enfield; something goes wrong with the mechanism of the rifle; an accident occurs and the man is blown into eternity. Hundreds of accidents have occurred, in which while men have not been killed, they have been taken to the hospitals to have their wounds dressed. Yet there are no reports against the Lee-Enfield. And Commissioner Perry swore in the presense of hon. members who are sitting here to-night, that he had condemned the entire issue of the Ross rifle in connection with the Northwest Mounted Police, largely because of the accident to the sergeant-major, an accident which the commissioner had not seen, but only heard of. He and the board decided that, owing to this accident they had better discontinue the use of the rifle. Is that a reason for condemning a whole issue of an arm such as this? Why, it shows that these men did not consider the results of handling these modern rifles. You will hardly go down to the rifle range to fire a short match with the Lee-Enfield rifle without having more accidents than this. It simply shows that these gentlemen are not accustomed to consider the matter in the light of general results. It is not surprising to hear that their report was based on this one accident. And this was with the mark I rifle. Mark II, as everybody knows, is infinitely superior. The changes that my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) refers to, are mere trifles—strengthening a pin, fixing the sight centre line, and little petty things of that kind that no one who knows anything about a rifle would urge as indicating defects. I do not want to take up the time of the committee, but I could give quotations to show that Captain Drake shows that he knows nothing about the action of the rifle. He speaks of the pull-off being heavy as one objection. But, it appeared when he was questioned, that he did not know there was a difference in pull-off between a shot gun, a sporting rifle, and a military rifle. I could give quotations to show that the sergeant major said that he thought the accident occurred from the gas coming out of the cartridge turning two or three right angles in the barrel, finding its way finally out through a little bit of a hole and blowing back the pin. Why, the evidence shows simply that the man was excited and knew nothing about the real nature of the accident. No more satisfactory result has ever followed the explorations of any committee of this House than that in the case of the committee examining into this Ross rifle. So far as I am concerned, even if it prolongs this session in to the summer, I want that committee to go on, for every day proves more clearly the correctness of the judgment of those who stood by the Ross rifle from the first. The hon. gentleman asked if this idea had been picked up in South Africa? I can tell the hon. gentleman that I got the idea of a straight pull rifle in South Africa, when I found the Boers that were doing the greatest execution against our own men were using the Mannlicher rifle, which is of the straight-pull pattern. But the recoil was taken at the base of the bolt, instead of at the head of the bolt as in this rifle. But I have gone into that question before, and need not enlarge upon it now.

Mr. J. D. REID. I must say that the hon. gentleman from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is very easily satisfied if he is satisfied with the results of the examination of the Public Accounts Committee as a vindication of the Ross rifle. Why, the hon. gentleman has not heard one witness approve of this rifle. Every one of them condemned the rifle, and declared that it was not a fit rifle for active service.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman name one witness who condemned it?

Mr. J. D. REID. Every one of them condemned it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not a man.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why, let the hon. gentleman read the evidence. Of course, he was there trying to prove that the rifle was the best rifle that could possibly be used. In addition to the statements of witnesses, we have the fact that all the reports appearing in the Blue-book condemn this rifle. It may be Mark I as the hon. gentleman says. I do not know whether they had Mark II or not. Of course, I am not going to condemn Mark II or Mark III, whatever the latest pattern may be, until the reports come in. But certainly the evidence regarding Mark I shows clearly that this is not a fit rifle to be in the hands of the militia of any country for active service. After they were issued, 9,000 were recalled, or are not fit for service.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Have these been recalled?

Mr. J. D. REID. Every one of them. I am satisfied that the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) should defend this rifle. The minister will not do it himself but leaves it to the hon. member for Victoria. It is all the greater condemnation of the rifle in my eyes that the minister is ashamed to defend it himself.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Have 9,000 of these rifles been recalled?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many of them have been recalled? I would ask if these 9,000 Mark I are fit for service in this country?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I believe they are. A portion of them have been issued, and none of them have been recalled so far as I know.

Mr. J. D. REID. Have they been used?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, they are being used now.

Mr. J. D. REID. If my memory serves me well, 1,000 were sent to the mounted police, and the mounted police refused absolutely to use them and reported accordingly—reported that they were not fit for use. I think that came out in evidence; at all events, it is in the report of the mounted police. There at least, is 1,000 out of the 9,000. The hon. minister states that they are all being used, yet here are 1,000 condemned.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Commissioner Perry to-day, swore distinctly that the report was issued practically entirely on the single accident to one weapon at Fort Macleod. And, at the time when this accident occurred, the witness himself was in Ottawa. He never saw the accident.

Mr. J. D. REID. I was not present when Commissioner Perry gave his evidence today. But I take his report, and I assume that his report is true. If he made a report such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) states, he is not fit for his position. Yet, I believe, he is considered one of the best men in the mounted police. And did not the sergeant major state that they had tried more than one rifle?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What about it?

Mr. J. D. REID. And that they could not use them?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Never.

Mr. J. D. REID. He said they did not give satisfaction, and so they condemned the whole lot. That is the evidence. But not a man who has given evidence before the Public Accounts Committee has approved of the Ross rifle. Every one of them stated that the Lee-Enfield was a better rifle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not one man who has appeared before the committee has stated that the Lee-Enfield was a better rifle. I stake my reputation as a member of parliament and an officer of the militia upon that statement. And if one of them did say such a thing, I have no hesitation in saying that he does not know his business. But the words have never been uttered that the Lee-Enfield was superior to the Ross rifle.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I desire to correct an erroneous impression which my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) would leave upon the minds of hon. members. He states that Commissioner Perry condemned 1,000 rifles because of one accident. That is an error; Commissioner Perry never said anything of that kind. But he distinguished between accidents to the man and accidents to the gun. One man got hurt. But Commissioner Perry states that there were about forty or fifty accidents to rifles. So high was the percentage of accidents that, though it was a very serious thing to condemn the rifle, he considered that he could not assume the responsibility of refraining

from condemning it. For that reason he condemned it as unserviceable and unsafe and he recommended that it be returned to the stores.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The hon. gentleman says that Commissioner Perry said that he did not condemn the rifles principally on the evidence of this one accident. Commissioner Perry swore positively, when he was asked if he condemned the Ross rifle for this one accident to the sergeant major that he would. This man said on account of one accident he felt nervous in using the rifle. Commissioner Perry used these very words, that the rifle was condemned, and that the primary cause was the accident to the sergeant-major. When I asked him if there were other defects in the rifle he said that the bolt jams, the three springs in the rifle he thought were weak.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I think my hon. friend is altogether wrong, though no doubt he thinks he is right. He asked Mr. Perry if he condemned the rifle on that one accident and he said, yes; but he distinguished between accidents to rifles and accidents to human beings. He says there were forty or fifty casualties, and that the boards that were held at Regina, Lethbridge and McLeod examined at least two dozen witnesses at each one of them, who gave their account of what happened to their respective rifles. If you go on a little further you will find that on the 27th of January last the colonel of the Royal Canadian Dragoons makes his report to the department, and after naming a number of defects, say the rifle is not a fit rifle for service. That is Mark II. So practically you have Mark I and Mark II condemned by some of the best military men, as we think, in the country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No doubt the hon. gentleman believes the statements which he makes here, but I think they lack the essential element to a large extent.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think that is a fair remark to make towards an hon. gentleman.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Very well, I wish to call the attention of the committee to these facts. Major Perry passed upon this Ross rifle, he was one of the first thoroughly to investigate the pattern of the Ross rifle. The result of his investigation was forwarded to me by Controller White, and in addition to the report which had been made by the first committee appointed by me, Controller White's report was one of the determining reasons that led me to accept that rifle. That report has been laid upon the table of the House. I am not aware that Mr. Perry has ever withdrawn one word from the statement which he made in that report. He made not only one report but two reports. The Ross rifle as such was unanimously approved by all the inspectors and the permanent officers of the Northwest Mounted Police, and there were many of them who had an opportunity of testing it, in cold weather and in warm weather. The Ross rifle was adopted, the Northwest Mounted Police ordered 1,000. Those rifles were delivered. I have a letter from Colonel White, Controller of the Northwest Mounted Police, which is among the papers laid on the table, stating that the inspector who, with Colonel Cartwright, was engaged in inspecting these rifles, and who unfortunately died before his report was made, when passing through Ottawa stopped to see him and told him he was delighted with the rifle. The rifles were sent on. It turns out that there were some defects of manufacture, and there need not be any dispute upon this point. The rifle did not prove to be what was expected, that is, the individual rifle. What happened? When reports were made to the Ross Rifle Company the company said at once: We will replace those rifles. It is not the Ross rifle per se that is at fault, and Major Perry, unless he goes back upon everything he says in these two reports, will not dare to say that the Ross rifle in itself was wrong. But he does say that certain rifles were delivered in which there were defects in manufacture and which rendered them undesirable weapons. I am speaking now of certain rifles, not of the rifle as a whole, not referring to the principle upon which it is made. I have not heard yet any one say that the rifle in principle was wrong or at fault. I have heard evidence that there were defects in certain rifles, defects in manufacture. I was going on to say that we need not waste time discussing this point. Those rifles have been taken over by the Ross Rifle Company, the company now have a half dozen rifles or so, and they are only waiting for a notice from the Northwest Mounted Police authorities to take them to the Northwest to be thoroughly examined and inspected to see whether the rifles which they have on hand are satisfactory. If they are found unsatisfactory they are going to issue a substitute for the thousand rifles that the Northwest Mounted Police now have, at their own expense, another thousand. That is the whole story, and there is not involved in it any condemnation of the rifle in principle. There is involved in it the fact that certain defects of manufacture existed, and that the Ross Rifle Company have offered to take them back and substitute good rifles.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I do not think that anybody is arguing that the Ross rifle per se is not a good rifle, that its mechanism is not good, that the sealed pattern was not a good pattern. But if the structural weaknesses are there and there are certain defects which make the rifle unfit for service, what difference is there whether

the pattern is wrong or the making of the rifle ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Every difference in the world, because if the rifle is all right in design it may be made right, and the defects are defects of manufacture.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I say it is not a good rifle, and if you agree to that, there is no difference between us. The rifle submitted to the mounted police in the first place was a hand made rifle manufactured at Hartford, and the rifles afterwards distributed were made at the Ross rifle factory, and according to these reports many structural weaknesses and faults in the workmanship existed. I do not see that it makes any difference whether the pattern is wrong or the workmanship, as long as the rifle is defective. If a man gets his eye almost blown out, surely there is some defect. The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It makes a lot of difference.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In regard to the structural weaknesses of the rifle, the hon. member for Sherbrooke has pointed out that one accident to a rifle condemns the whole rifle. The hon. gentleman summoned Major McRobie here to prove——

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I did not summon him.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Northrup summoned him, but when he saw he was in a hole he said that he had nothing to do with it at all, that Dr. Worthington told him to summon Major McRobie. I have here the evidence of Major McRobie. I asked him if he had any experience with rifles exploding, and he had had one rifle explode and his son had another. I asked what rifles they were, and he said that the first was the Lee-Enfield and the other, a carbine, was the Lee-Metford, the same make of rifle, the British rifle. They had both exploded, the whole breech had split open.

Mr. J. D. REID. The evidence given up there certainly has convinced me that the Mark I rifle was not right.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he was not convinced before he went there?

Mr. J. D. REID. No, I was not convinced before I went there, but I was convinced from the reports in circulation in this country that there was something wrong about the Ross rifle deal, and I think the hon. gentleman should try to help in finding it out. The minister gets wrathy when we try to ferret out anything that we think is wrong, and I can understand that ; but I think the member (Mr. Sam. Hughes), instead of helping the minister, should try to help us. He knows that rifle is not right, and he would not shoot one off himself. He went in and tried to shoot, and he could not hit a target 90 feet square.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not a member of the House has heard me directly or indirectly defend the government in regard to the contract or the financial aspect of the transaction at all. If he can show any graft, anything crooked in connection with the Ross rifle, I am at his back to unearth it. Who has taken the lead in having all defects exposed in the committee? I have been most anxious to have every one of them exposed, but I point out that Perry in his evidence to-day, endorsed the Mark II rifle to the utmost. The only objection he had in condemning the rifle he said was the accident to the sergeant-major. I asked him to name the defects of the rifle, and he said that the rifle sometimes jammed, but he admitted he never saw one that had jammed. He declared also that the Winchester frequently jammed. There were three springs in the rifles that were somewhat weak, although he never found them himself. I want to point out here, and it can be satisfactorily demonstrated, that, whether it is for love, or patriotism, or some other cause, certain interested persons have gone from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or as far as these rifles go, pointing out to the people the defects of this rifle, showing the weaknesses——

Mr. J. D. REID. That is only your assertion.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Surely my hon. friend does not think I am busy in this?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know if a rifle factory is behind you or not.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is no evidence to that effect.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is no evidence to any other effect. It can be shown that where the stock of the rifle was broken it was broken deliberately. If you read General Otter's report, you will see that some of these accidents were suspected of being caused deliberately by the men trying to smash the rifles. It is reported that one man was seen to take the back sight and twist it around with his finger and thumb and then twist it back again.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Is that a good sight ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is not the sight I have endorsed, but it is the sight which is on the rifle. Several minor defects were pointed out by this witness, but does any man say that they were sufficient to condemn a rifle ? I say that no honest man dare to stand up before the people of the country and say that trifling, petty, objec-

tions like this should condemn a rifle. I say that the man who would do so is either prejudiced, or influenced, or he does not understand what he is talking about.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I am quite willing to stand up and condemn that rifle and I am not dishonest. I think it requires a man with a twenty-four carat assurance to get up in this House and advocate that the Ross rifle is a proper rifle to serve out to the militia men of this country. My hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) says that at the committee to-day, Major Perry approved the Ross rifle in emphatic terms. Major Perry's emphatic approbation of the Ross rifle is to be found in his statement that he recognized the seriousness of condemning that rifle, but under the circumstances he could not do otherwise, because structural weakness and other defects existed, and so he asked to have it withdrawn as it was not only unserviceable but unsafe. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) thinks that, an approbation of Mark I, I do not know what he is going to do when Mark II and Mark III are issued. It is an extraordinary idea of the hon. gentleman to think that some one is travelling from Halifax to Vancouver, breaking these Ross rifles.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is drawing on his imagination.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I rely on the evidence.

Mr. SPROULE. I have listened to the evidence taken before the committee, and I have come to the conclusion that the Ross rifle is not a fit rifle to issue to the Canadian militia. It is said that a horse is no better than his weakest leg, that a ship is no better than her rottenest plank, and so a rifle is no better in active service than its smallest defect. It does not matter how trivial the defect may, be if it renders the rifle useless. I listened to the evidence in that committee, and I reached the conclusion that out of 1,000 rifles issued, accidents happened to 300 of them. In face of that record I say it is not a safe rifle to issue.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is not the evidence at all.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the evidence. The hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) says that the Northwest Mounted Police did not condemn this rifle.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said the Northwest Mounted Police condemned it because of one accident.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Exactly.

Mr. SPROULE. Well it does not happen to be a fact because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) says it. I have the report here and inspector Sanders says :

Owing to some defects being discovered in the Ross rifles it was not thought advisable to finish the annual course in musketry and target practice.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Major Perry telegraphed to this gentleman to stop the practice.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they made by day's reports :

Rifle practice with the new Ross rifle was started in July, but these rifles having been found defective it had to be discontinued.

I have quoted two reports against the rifle, and I find there are several others. I believe that these men were honest and truthful and that they gave a correct report. If 300 out of 1,000 rifles are disabled in the short space of a few weeks, what kind of a rifle is that to equip our active militia with ? Why, the minister himself has admitted that the manufacturers have acknowledged these defects and have offered to remedy them. We have no further guarantee than the word of these manufacturers for it, and after their promises with regard to the first issue, we cannot rely much on their undertaking in reference to the second issue. The military men who reported against this rifle were, I assure, honest and unprejudiced, and were trying to discharge their duty faithfully. In view of all the circumstances, how can any man say that the Ross rifle is an efficient arm?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has read from the report of some of the subordinate officers, but why did he not read Commissioner Perry's report which said :

Some serious defects were found in the Ross rifle with which the force was armed last year, when it was put to the severe test of the annual target practice. As soon as these were discovered the practice was suspended as it was thought some serious accident might happen.

Mark the words 'might happen.' When he received notice that this accident occurred to the sergeant major——

Mr. J. D. REID. What sergeant major?

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Sergeant major Bowridge, the only man ever hurt who was struck with the firing pin owing to a defect, said that when he got back, and before his board of officers were assembled and reported on the rifles, he telegraphed to the various squadrons to discontinue their rifle practice for the year, and it was accordingly stopped. Then what did the other commissioners do ? They reported that they had discontinued the rifle practice.

Mr. SPROULE. The reports of several of these individuals were that they discontinued the rifle practice of their own motion, because the Ross rifle was found to be defec-

tive, and not because Major Perry ordered them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. gentleman not know that not one of these men dare discontinue the rifle practice without Major Perry's order ?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I do not think anything is gained by discussing this matter at this time. There will be other opportunities, and as the minister wishes to get away, I think we would be wise to let this item pass.

Militia and Defence—provisions and supplies, $350,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to ask one question with regard to the aggregate expenditure for militia and defence. I see that the amount to be expended on income is $3,928,000 and the amount on capital account $1,300,000. That makes $5,228,000. I understood the hon. minister to tell us last night that the total expenditure was between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not deal with the expenditure on capital account. in 1895-6 there was $1,000,000 voted on capital account to which I did not refer ; that was for the purpose of purchasing warlike stores of various kinds, including rifles. In the present estimates the $1,300,000 on capital account is for a similar purpose. I may say that $1,300,000 was voted for the first time about four years ago, and I explained at the time that it would take an annual vote of that amount for about five years to accumulate a surplus of clothing, stores, artillery and other things required, after which that vote will disappear. We are now approaching the end of that period. I do not say that it will disappear next year, but it will considerably diminish.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume there will be an additional amount in the supplementary estimates as well ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is, but not very much.

Militia and Defence—contingencies, $45,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there any chance of the minister giving that man Mulloy a small pension ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like very much to do it. It would have to be done by a gratuity.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the hon. minister would put him on the staff of his department and give him something to do, I think everybody in Canada would be gratified.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall be glad to see if I can do that.

Royal Military College, $92,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many students are attending that college at the present time ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 90.

Dominion Arsenal, $233,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the Dominion arsenal now ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. There was a discussion some years ago with regard to having more than one. Has the minister considered that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We ought to have three more, and I hope we shall, but it will require a good deal of money. My hon. friend asked me that question on more than one occasion, and I said that I thought that a company was likely to be formed which would manufacture explosives and cartridges ; but it has not materialized. The Quebec factory has grown very much, and for the present meets our requirements. As this country grows and population increases in the west, it will be absolutely necessary to have one or two arsenals west of Ottawa.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. One of the defects pointed out in the Ross rifle is that the cartridges jam in the chambers, and are hard to extract. I have pointed out the reason of that : the manufacturer undertook to make the cartridge fit the rifle as closely as the cartridge fitted the United States rifle. I would like to ask the minister if any thing is being done to strengthen the cartridges in the factory ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is something being done.

Militia and Defence—chargeable to capital—for purchase of ordnance, arms, lands for military purposes, reserve stores of clothing, equipment, &c., and for fitting up rifle ranges, $1,225,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the minister if it is a fact that he intends to purchase a site for the new drill shed in the city of St. John ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That matter is engaging the attention of the department. My own feeling has been that the armoury should be constructed on the old Battery Point property near where the present armoury is. There has been a proposal that it should be constructed at or near the rifle range and the matter is now being looked into.

Mr. DANIEL. How long is the minister going to keep it under consideration ? He has already had it under consideration for three years and that would appear to be ample time.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, the proposal to erect the armouries at or near the rifle range is a very new one. It was

only brought to my notice six or eight weeks ago and it is that that I am investigating now. I have caused an officer to go there and look the matter over but I have not yet read his report. Colonel Drury, the officer at the head of the maritime province command, is decidedly opposed to that.

Annual drill—further amount required, $75,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How much does that make the aggregate cost ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $810,000.

Military properties—further amount required as a grant towards cost of armoury for Fifth Royal Scots, Montreal (revote $3,000), $13,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Royal Scots have built an armoury and handed it over to the government. The government have assisted to the extent of less than half, they contributing $35,000. The whole thing has cost about $85,000.

Customs dues—for payment of duties, $75,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is putting it from one hand to the other.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Is that in connection with officers getting clothing from England ? Has there been anything done in the way of granting a rebate of duty ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Worthington) was not in when we discussed that question. While no decision has been reached I stated that it seemed to me that in a case where clothing had been actually ordered before it was known that the tariff changed the whole policy which had existed for forty years in regard to these matters a fair claim could be made for compensation. I am getting all these claims together and there will be further consideration of them from that point of view.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. It seems to me that where these articles were ordered before the new tariff came into force there should be a rebate. In the case of the cadets of Lennoxville their uniforms were ordered from England some months before the tariff came into force and it seems only right that they should get the rebate to which they are looking forward.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—salaries, $99,875 ; contingencies, $19,150.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). We intend to appoint another chief clerk in the person of Captain McElhinney and to increase the number of second-class clerks from nine to eleven. I found when I came into the department that there were several temporary officers who were paid out of a vote which we took every year notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. I thought it was more regular to have these temporary clerks put on the permanent list. I am going to increase the number of third-class clerks from four to eleven.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that in addition to the temporary officers you are making permanent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. SPROULE. How many additional clerks have you ? I see by the report that there were 56 last year.

Mr. BRODEUR. There were 56 last year and there are going to be 70. There is no increase in the number of employees except that they are going to be transferred from the temporary list to the regular list. They have passed their examination and I thought it was more regular to put these men on the permanent list.

Mr. SPROULE. You are adding 14 to the number as far as the permanent clerks are concerned ?

Mr. BRODEUR. As far as the permanent clerks are concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you increase the salaries of the temporary clerks who are made permanent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, most of them are receiving a salary of $500. There may perhaps be some who are in receipt of a larger salary than $500 because I see there are two at $700, six at $650, two at $600, and one at $550 and they will be in receipt of the salaries that they are receiving to-day upon being transferred from the temporary list to the permanent list.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they being transferred from the temporary list to the permanent list without passing any examination or giving any evidence of qualification ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have all passed the qualifying examination.

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs of government steamers and ice-breakers, $500,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the same amount as last year, and is for the following vessels : The 'Quadra,' 'Lady Laurier,' 'Aberdeen,' 'Lansdowne,' 'Druid,' 'Montcalm,' 'Champlain,' 'Minto' and 'Stanley.'

Mr. SPROULE. How much did the repairs amount to in each case?

Mr. BRODEUR. In 1905-6 the repairs, in round numbers, were as follows :

'Montcalm'	$46,000
'Champlain'	25,000
'Minto'	9,000
'Lady Laurier'	29,000
'Stanley'	9,000

'Aberdeen'	$28,000
'Lansdowne'	2,000
'Quadra'	11,000
'Druid'	4,000

Mr. SPROULE. What happens these vessels that so much should be paid for repairs? The amount every year seems very large.

Mr. BRODEUR. In all steamers the bill for repairs is heavy. Painting, inspection and overhauling of machinery and other repairs are needed. They are made under the immediate control of the inspector of government steamers.

Mr. SPROUL. Are they made by days work?

Mr. BRODEUR. In case of extensive repairs they are done by contract, but in other cases by day labour. In many cases it is impossible to get the repairs done by contract, as the extent of the work cannot be known until it is actually entered upon. In many cases the repairs are made in our own shops at Sorel.

Mr. SPROULE. Some hon. members on this side desired to be present when these items were under consideration, but happened to be absent this evening. Are there items of the same character in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to have it understood that when these are under discussion any matters under the present items may be referred to.

Rewards for saving life, including life-saving stations, $21,600.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have asked for a larger vote this year, because strong representations have been made from different parts of the country in favour of an increase in this service. Hon. members will recollect that the subject has been discussed at different times, and that there was a general sentiment in favour of an increase.

Mr. SPROULE. On one occasion I called attention to a disaster that had taken place at Lion's Head, and to the strongly expressed wish of the people in that section that there should be a life saving station on that coast. It is a dangerous place, and one where many accidents have occurred; yet, in the absence of life-saving appliances, rescue is almost impossible, and there is sometimes heavy loss of life.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that the increase now asked should enable me to place life-saving stations at a number of these places. Lion's Head has been brought to the attention of the department. Of course, we cannot meet the requests from every point of the country for life-saving stations, but this larger vote will enable us to do something. Many accidents happened last year, and strong requests have been made to the department to increase the life-saving service. Lion's Head is on Lake Huron?

Mr. SPROULE. It is on the narrow point of land between Lake Huron and Georgian bay, but on the Georgian bay side. Do I understand that it is the intention to establish a life-saving station somewhere near Lion's Head?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. A number of these life-saving stations are mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, but the amount in each case seems small. Is there a man in charge of each of them?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are boats at each station, with a coxswain in charge. There is also a crew of men, and these men are called out to drill at certain intervals in order that they may be fitted for the work if an emergency happens. Each, including the coxswain, are paid $2 a drill, and the coxswain receives $75 a year besides.

Mr. DANIEL. And when they go out on duty they are paid extra?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I would desire to call attention to the need of life saving appliances in Toronto harbour. I trust it is only necessary to mention the matter for the minister to realize that better equipment is needed at that station. I might refer to the wreck which took place last fall, in which six lives were lost, partly owing to the lack of proper life saving appliances. The condition at present, owing to the lack of proper harbour channels of entrance, is extremely dangerous. A thoroughly equipped modern life saving station is an absolute necessity. The attention of the minister has been drawn to the subject since the loss of the 'Resolute,' and I think he fully understands the necessity. I trust he will give the House an assurance that a properly equipped life saving station will be installed at the harbour of Toronto. There is now a life saving appliance there, but it is wholly insufficient. It only costs something over $300 a year, and is unable to cope with anything serious in the way of a wreck. Had there been a proper life saving station at Toronto Island when the 'Resolute' was wrecked, I am safe in saying that a great deal of the loss of life on that occasion could have been avoided. Unless the government makes an adequate appropriation for deeping the entrance to that harbour a similar catastrophe is likely to occur at any time. Therefore I urge upon the hon. gentleman the necessity of an oppropriation for equipping an up to date life saving station there.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have to deal with the island opposite Toronto where we have

one station which is equipped in the same way as other stations. There is a boat and crew there who are available on occasion. With regard to the accident to the 'Resolute,' we had an investigation made, and I think it was proved that the loss of life which occurred could not be due in any way to the man in charge of the station. There were at the same time other boats exposed to be wrecked, and this man, Capt. Ward, went to their assistance and saved, I think, 14 or 15 persons the same night. The 'Resolute' had left the western entrance to go to the eastern entrance, and before any warning could be given she was wrecked. It was not supposed that the boat was in danger, there was no warning of danger, and I am sure that the loss of life was not due at all to want of a proper live saving appliance at this place. I must say on behalf of Capt. Ward that at the time this accident occurred he was engaged in saving the lives of all these persons.

Mr. MACDONELL. It is quite true that Capt. Ward and his life saving crew did excellent work on that occasion, other boats were in danger and were wrecked, but the crews were saved. At the same time had there been a proper boat properly manned, it is safe to say, at least that is the opinion of the people of Toronto, that the life loss on the Resolute could have been saved. The fact is that the 'Resolute' was for some 24 hours immediately outside Toronto harbour and made several trips from the eastern gap to the western gap and back again in order to effect an entrance.

Mr. BRODEUR. She never showed any signs of distress.

Mr. MACDONELL. Well, the boat was in distress, she was seeking her harbour, and she could not reach any shelter. The boat was simply pounded to pieces by the heavy sea. Her anchor worked all right, and she was safely anchored in a sufficient depth of water, but found it impossible to effect an entrance to the harbour. Therefore she had to lie outside the harbour at the mercy of the sea, and about four o'clock in the morning she was literally pounded to pieces and went to the bottom. When the storm was at its height the rising and falling of the water made it impossible for her to enter the harbour. There is no doubt that if a proper life saving crew had been there these lives could have been saved. However, I think the minister must realize that a volunteer crew costing only some $300 a year, with no proper boat, without the means of transporting the boat except pulling her across the sand, is not an adequate life saving appliance for what is the only harbour of refuge along the whole north shore of Lake Ontario.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to call the minister's attention to the fact that the city of St. John keeps up a life boat at her own expense. I do not know how much it pays annually to the crew to keep themselves ready to take to the boats when required. But it appears to me that a work of that kind should be taken over by the Dominion government as are other life boat stations. It has been kept up at the city's expense for a great many years. They have a boat always ready and a certain number of men ready when called upon. I think the Dominion should take that work over the same as they do other life saving stations. I would like the minister to take the matter into consideration, because I think the city has a fair claim on the government in that respect.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the first time the case has been brought to my attention. We have a station not very far from there at Grand Manan.

Mr. DANIEL. That is a good many miles away.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a good many miles away, but we have not many stations in this country. The system is quite new, in fact it is only within the last twenty years that we have established these stations. Before that the Canadian life-saving service was on the same basis as the British system which depends on voluntary subscription. We have since then followed the American system.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. During the discussion last year of the wrecks that occurred on the coast of Prince Edward Island the minister stated that it was the intention to establish life-saving stations on the island. It has been shown conclusively that had there been life-saving apparatus available at the places where these wrecks occurred, much of the deplorable loss of life might have been avoided.

Mr. BRODEUR. We already have life-saving boats on the government steamers plying between the island and the mainland. It has been decided to establish one or more stations on the island. There might be three stations, one at each of the extreme ends of the island and one in the centre, or as an alternative it has been suggested that one set of apparatus might be installed at Charlottetown, provided that it could be carried by rail to the scene of a wreck, in other parts of the island.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the minister should devote some of this vote to the assistance of the voluntary crews, which exist in different parts of Canada. For instance at Port Credit, between Toronto and Hamilton, where there is a great deal of shipping, there is an efficient voluntary life-saving crew and I think when men are willing to voluntarily devote themselves to the saving of life, they should be treated generously by the government as this is re-

cognized as a work which the government should perform.

Mr. BRODEUR. I fully realize that the amount voted is not probably large enough to meet all the requirements of the Dominion. We have a very large coast and we are spending only $21,000. Last year we asked only $9,000, but it was increased this year to $21,000. The United States with a coast no larger than ours spends several million dollars per year. I fully realize the importance of the question and I appreciate that all the members are in favour of increasing the expenditure in that respect. I think this is money well invested.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. During the storm in which these vessels were lost in Prince Edward Island two men at the imminent risk of their lives saved several men on board a Russian ship. Is any recognition to be made of their gallant services by the Dominion government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we have sent rewards to those men.

Subsidy for wrecking plant, Davis & Sons, Lévis, $24,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. In connection with this, I would like to mention the claims of Mr. Leslie. The work he has done in taking off the 'Bavarian,' proves his ability as a wrecker. He has raised many vessels on the upper lakes and in Newfoundland. I was interested with him in Ontario, but I am of course not interested in asking for this subsidy. Mr. Leslie also had a small plant in Newfoundland. I would like to see Captain Leslie subsidized to establish a wrecking plant in the neighbourhood of Seven Islands.

Mr. BRODEUR. I know that Mr. Leslie is a very capable man, and that he succeeded in floating the Bavarian when all others failed.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Leslie has on two or three occasions made application for a subsidy to establish a plant in the vicinity of Seven Islands. The plant located at Quebec is too far removed from the scene of a disaster which might happen down there. Mr. Leslie's wrecking plant is an excellent one and where life and property is in danger, as it is liable to be at any time in those waters, a small subsidy would be well expended in establishing a wrecking plant. There is a wrecking plant at Sarnia and another has been established at Port Arthur, and I think similar plants should be located at reasonable distances apart, on our navigable waters. I think Mr. Leslie should be granted a subsidy to take his plant from Newfoundland, and establish it at Seven Islands. If it only saved the life of one individual it would more than justify the expenditure.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there any wrecking plant established in the maritime provinces?

Mr. J. D. REID. We have three wrecking plants; one at Sydney, one at Quebec, and the other in British Columbia, to which we pay $10,000 a year each.

Maintenance of vessels for patrolling the waters of the northern portion of Canada, $40,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where is the 'Arctic'?

Mr. BRODEUR. She is wintering on the North East coast of Baffin land.

Mr. J. D. REID. Here we have another Bill for supplies for the 'Arctic.' Last year we ascertained that when she sailed on her voyage she was loaded up to the top of her masts, but now it appears that there was $40,000 worth more stowed away somewhere. We want to get an explanation of that, but I suppose as the minister is leaving to-morrow, we must let it go.

Mr. BRODEUR. These purchases were made between September, 1904, and October, 1905. The item is comprised of pay for the officers, and an item of $5,000 to the German consul for balance of purchase price. The only supplies purchased amounted to $1,400.

Mr. J. D. REID. We bought from Hudon and Orsali supplies to the amount of $1,481; from the Hamilton Company to the amount of $1,247.60, and from a Halifax firm to the amount of $309.97 and there are numerous other items of that kind. I do not want to appear as obstructing the hon. gentleman's estimates, but this is something on which we should certainly have some explanation.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend spoke of $132,000 as being spent. Out of that there was $55,000 for the construction of a boat and $36,000 for the chartering of the Neptune. The only items for supplies are to the extent of $1,481.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know from the hon. minister that we shall have the privilege next year in the Public Accounts Committee of going into any items in the Auditor General's Report that we are not able to go into this year.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the committee cannot go into these accounts this year, owing to the fact of my being absent, there will certainly be no objection to hon. gentlemen going into them next year.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will the Prime Minister promise that we shall have an opportunity of going into any of these accounts next year that we cannot go into this year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the hon. gentleman will close the discussion now

and cannot go on with the investigation, certainly he will be allowed to take it up next year.

To provide for the organization of a naval militia and expenses in using the cruiser 'Canada' as a training ship, $10,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I see by the Auditor General's Report that $6,500 was used in connection with the cruiser 'Canada,' but it is impossible to find out how much of the expenses of the cruiser were used in this service. I notice also that $2,500 of that appropriation was used to pay the expenses of the minister's trip to the old country. So that, unless there is something of that kind in contemplation this year. the whole of this $10,000 will not be needed, that is, if the business of the naval militia is to be carried on exactly in the same way as before.

Mr. BRODEUR. The cruiser 'Canada' was employed only during a certain part of the year. This year it is the intention to put as many sailors as possible on the cruiser. Besides we are going to establish a new cruiser on the British Columbia coast, and an item will be asked for that purpose.

River St. Lawrence ship channel, $760,000.

Mr. SPROULE. As we have got down to the foot of page 58, as it is now a quarter past twelve, and as we have to meet to-morrow at ten o'clock and we have only a little over nine hours for sleep I think we should now adjourn.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course I am not asking anything that is impossible, but if we may pass some of these items in order that I may dispose of my estimates by noon to-morrow I shall be very much obliged to my hon. friend.

Mr. J. D. REID. There are a number of these items that some hon. gentlemen would like to discuss and it is hardly fair to ask that they be allowed to go through.

Mr. BRODEUR. If we pass the items concerning the marine branch we will proceed with the fisheries to-morrow morning. There is no contention about these items.

Mr. J. D. REID. These are the items they want to discuss.

Mr. SPROULE. We want some information as to what has been done with this ship channel. We have heard every year that it is about completed. We would like to know what progress has been made.

Mr. BRODEUR. We started to work in the spring of 1906, and we intended to complete the channel to a depth of 30 feet from Montreal to Batiscan. All this work has been done from Montreal to Batiscan. There is a complete ship channel 30 feet deep between those places. The money which is asked for this year is mostly for the purpose of dredging in the St. Lawrence between Batiscan and Quebec especially at Cap à la Roche and Cap Charles. The depth of water there is 27½ feet at high tide there is more than 30 feet. The intention is to provide 30 feet at low tide.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is Batiscan?

Mr. BRODEUR. Twenty-five miles below Three Rivers.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand from what the minister says that we have a 30-foot channel for half the distance between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. BRODEUR. More than half.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood it was down to Batiscan. That is about how far from Three Rivers?

Mr. BRODEUR. About twenty-five or thirty miles.

Mr. SPROULE. Or about eighty miles from Montreal?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, one hundred and ten miles from Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, the balance of the route from there to Quebec has how many feet of water?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are 27½ feet of water to-day at low tide. At high tide there is more than that. The channel at Cap à la Roche and Cap Charles is to be deepened to 30 feet and widened to 500 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. How much dredging is required to be done there?

Mr. BRODEUR. Six or seven miles.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the width of the channel?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is 300 feet at that place.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not give an approximate estimate of the work to be done.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is 27½ feet deep and 300 feet wide and the idea is to make it 30 feet deep and 500 feet wide.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the same dredges be employed there as were employed last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. The same dredges we had for the other part of the work will be used there. The shale rock requires a special dredge which we are building at Sorel for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. You have been building dredges for the last five years for special purposes?

Mr. BRODEUR. The dredge which has been built to which my hon. friend has re-

ferred was the 'Tarte' which was built for work on Lake St. Peter. We have been saving money as a result of constructing that dredge because it has been giving more satisfaction and the work is being done cheaper than before.

Mr. J. D. REID. What about the 'Galveston'?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Galveston' has been working at Beaujeu Bank below Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw a statement in the newspapers a short time ago that the dredge 'Tarte' was practically disabled.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the dredge 'Tarte' was working during the whole of last season except during a few days when she was stopped for small repairs. She has been doing magnificent work during the whole season.

Mr. SPROULE. It was stated in one of the newspapers lately that a heavy expenditure upon her would be necessary and that she was a comparative failure.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is absolutely erroneous.

Mr. SPROULE. Part of this is shale rock work. Is this to be done with the government dredges?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many hours is a day's work for the men on these dredges?

Mr. BRODEUR. Nine hours. The work of dredging goes on night and day.

Mr. SPROULE. How long will it be before this channel is deepened to thirty feet down to Quebec?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will take two seasons to complete 30 feet deep and 500 feet wide.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you widening it from 300 feet to 500 feet?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, at Cap à la Roche.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it with regard to lights in the St. Lawrence channel? Will it soon be lighted so as to make it safe?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is well lighted now. The Shipping Federation, which is most interested in the work, have asked nothing in the way of lights lately, except small lights in some places. Between Montreal and Sorel, which is considered the first section, we have put up gas lights which are working splendidly. In fact, several large ocean-going vessels have come up during the night which was not possible previously.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended to light the channel in that manner all the way down?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BRODEUR. Wherever the channel is dredged and there is a width of only 500 feet. Below Cap à la Roche the channel is so wide that gas buoys are not necessary. We put them where it is necessary for the boat to change her course.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that the department has a dredge suitable to go on with the work when navigation opens?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you building dredges?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have those dredges for work that have been built within the last fifteen years. We are building also a dredge with special equipment for the shale rock.

Mr. SPROULE. And that dredging cannot be done until the new dredge is built?

Mr. BRODEUR. The dredging will go on in other material, but one kind of shale rock can only be removed with this special dredge.

Mr. SPROULE. Therefore, you cannot go on with that dredging until the new dredge is built?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not all the same kind of material. The other dredges can go on. But at Cap à la Roche, in this shale rock, the new dredge will be required.

Mr. SPROULE. Therefore, it cannot be done until the new dredge is built?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but outside of that there will be dredging upon which we can begin and on which we were at work last season.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Is not the new dredge to be ready for the spring?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, she will be ready during the season. We only started to build her a few months ago.

Mr. SPROULE. What is likely to be the cost of the new dredge?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will cost about $215,000.

To provide additional plant for Cap à la Roche (mostly revote), $75,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of plant is this?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the dredge in question—$115,000 voted last year, and $75,000 now.

Signal service between Montreal and Quebec, $18,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that for Marconi stations?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, for telephone stations and signals. We are establishing this

at the request of the shipping federation on both sides of the St. Lawrence. I may explain the occurrence which gave rise to the request. Two years ago, one of the boats of the Allan line was going down the river. When at Cap Charles, near Cap à la Roche, a sudden fog came in. Up above, there was no fog. But the boat went ashore, and it was at one time thought it might be a very serious accident, though fortunately, it proved less serious than was expected. The idea is to have signals where the channel is narrow, in order that, when fog exists, the vessel may be notified and stop in the proper place.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING. I desire to call up two orders for the purpose of dropping them. I propose to drop item 11 respecting the Manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada, and to bring it forward in an amended form. I move that item 11 be dropped.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. I make the same motion with respect to item 13 in relation to the bounties on iron and steel. The reason of the change is that we contemplate making special provision for the encouragement of the manufacture of iron and steel in Canada by the electrical process. We will drop the motion in its present form and will bring it forward in an amended form to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will resume supply in his department at the point where we left it this evening. After that the Prime Minister desires to deal with the estimates for the Mounted Police ; then the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 4, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 145) to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). What is the nature of this Bill ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. A great many amendments to the Criminal Code had been prepared, but, considering the advanced stage of the session and the desirability of bringing before the House only those amendments that seem essential at the present time, every thing that is not of that character has been omitted from this measure. The most important provision of the Bill is to enable any offence committed in unorganized territory, to be tried in any place, where the defendant may be found, as is most convenient. The practical need of this clause has been shown by events, very possibly involving murder committed a year ago in the Arctic ocean on board a ship which was lying up for the winter among the British islands there. On the ship reaching civilization and the facts becoming known, the situation was manifest as to the possible difficulty, under our present statute, of trying such an offence in any other place than where it was committed. This Bill will provide that offences committed in any part of Canada not in any province or in the Yukon may be inquired of, tried and proceeded with to execution, either in the place where the offence was committed or in any other portion of Canada, as may be most convenient, where the defendant may be found. That, as I have said is the principal provision of the Bill. There are four or five other minor amendments.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BERGERON. As we have not either the Bill or the statute before us, would the minister be kind enough to explain ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think that it would be more satisfactory that the matter should stand until the Bill is distributed.

Progress reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 146) to make certain amendments to the statute law in its application to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.—Mr. Aylesworth.

WINDING UP ACT—AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 147) to amend the Winding Up Act. He said : This Bill consists of one clause, providing means whereby, in the course of winding up a company, if there should be classes of shareholders, contributories or creditors too numerous to be served individually with a notification of proceedings

without undue expense, the court may appoint some person who shall represent the whole class and by whose conduct all shall be bound. That is the substance of the measure. The practical need of it has been illustrated recently in the winding up of some companies where, in one instance I am told, there were over 100,000 different contributories or persons interested, and the cost of service on each one of this tremendous number would have eaten up the whole estate. In order to enable a company that may find itself in such a position, to be wound up without enormous and undue expense, this provision is proposed to be inserted. It is analogous to the ordinary practice which obtains in Ontario, at all events in suits and litigation in which classes are represented by some person designated by the court.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

COMPENSATION TO POSTMASTERS.

Mr. LENNOX—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Has the Postmaster General yet formulated a scheme for compensating the postmasters upon a more liberal basis than heretofore ?

2. If so, will it date back to, or take effect from, about the date when the postmasters' memorial was presented ?

3. If the Postmaster General has determined upon what should be done, when will the proposals be laid before parliament, or announced ?

4. What is the cause of the delay ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The matter is now under consideration.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to increase the salaries of postmasters for the coming fiscal year, in accordance with the representations made by them from time to time since more than a year ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to increase for the coming fiscal year the salaries of letter carriers ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The matter is now under consideration.

SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES OF CITY POST OFFICES.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. J. D. Reid—asked:

Is it the intention of the government to this year increase the salaries of the outside employees of the city post offices, as promised by the Prime Minister in June last ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The matter is now under consideration.

GRANTS OF DOMINION LANDS TO DOUKHOBORS.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Has the government, or any member of it, or any person acting on its behalf, made any promise to the Doukhobors, either before or after they came to Canada, that they would be allowed free grants of Dominion lands without taking the oath of allegiance ?

2. Has the government, or any member of it, or any persons acting in its behalf made any promise to the Doukhobors, either before they came to Canada, that they would not be subject to the provisions of the Militia Act ?

3. Did the Minister of the Interior, or any one acting for him, at any time intimate and promise that the Doukhobors would receive a free grant of land without having performed the duties as to residence, cultivation and building, required by the Dominion Lands Act and the regulations thereunder?

4. Has notice been given to any of the Doukhobors living in villages that they must commence cultivation, building and residence on their homesteads ? If so, at what date was such notice given, and how much time was given for compliance with such notice ?

5. Is it the intention of the government to cancel all Doukhobor homestead entries where the duties are not being performed ? If so, what date has been fixed for such cancellation?

6. What concessions, if any, in regard to the possession or occupation of land, does the government propose to make to community Doukhobors whose entries are cancelled, and who refuse to take the oath of allegiance ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). In reply to this question I beg to say that in response to an order of the House by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Cash), a return is in preparation which will be laid on the table of the House in the course of a few days, containing all the information asked for in this question, and it will be very much fuller than any information I could give in answer to a question.

RUNNING RIGHTS OVER GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What proposals or preliminary offers, if any, have been made to the government for purchase, lease or for running rights over or joint use of :

(a) Any portion of the National Transcontinental system from Port Arthur eastward ?

(b) Over any portion of the Intercolonial from St. John eastward ?

(c) Over any portion of the Intercolonial from Montreal eastward; or

(d) From Point Lévis eastward to any point or port in the maritime provinces ?

2. What is the nature of any such applications, proposals or offers, and who are the parties making them ?

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

1. No.

(a) None.

(b) An application has been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway for running powers between St. John and Halifax.

(c) No.

(d) No.

2. The Canadian Pacific Company have asked for a joint use of the line of the Intercolonial Railway from St. John to Halifax.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolutions :

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the salaries of the judges of the courts of Appeal and of King's bench of Manitoba shall be as follows : The chief justice of the Court of Appeal, $8,000 ; and three puisne judges of the said court, each $7,000 per annum ; the chief justice of the Court of King's Bench, $7,000, and three puisne judges of the said court, each $6,000 per annum.

2. Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the salaries of eleven judges and junior judges of the county courts of British Columbia shall be $3,000 each per annum.

Motion agreed to.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide as follows :

1. The Governor in Council may from time to time advance and pay to the corporation of the harbour commissioners of Montreal, hereinafter called 'the corporation,' in addition to the moneys authorized to be advanced to the corporation by the Governor in Council by chapter 36 of the Statutes of 1903, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of three million dollars, as are required to enable the corporation to complete the terminal facilities of the port of Montreal now under construction, and to construct such further terminal facilities as are necessary to properly equip said port.

2. No such advances shall be made unless the plans, specifications and estimates for the works to be performed by the corporation, and on which the money so to be advanced is to be expended, have first been submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council.

3. The corporation shall, upon any advance being made, deposit with the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, debentures of the corporation equal in par value to the advance so made (which debentures the corporation are hereby authorized to issue), and such debentures so issued shall be of such amounts as the Minister of Finance and Receiver General determines, and shall bear date on the day when such advance is made, and shall be repayable within twenty-five years from the date of their issue, and in the meantime shall bear interest at the rate of three per cent per annum, such interest to be payable half-yearly, on the first day of July and the first day of January in each year.

4. The principal and interest of the sums advanced under the authority of this Act to the corporation shall be paid by the corporation out of its revenue mentioned in section 8 of chapter 10 of the statutes of 1896 (first session), and shall be a charge upon the said revenue in the same manner and to the same extent as if the sums so advanced had been borrowed by the corporation under the said chapter 10.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY AND MR. BEDDOE.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the House enters upon the consideration of the Orders of the Day, I rise to a question of privilege in connection with the motion of which I gave notice last Wednesday, a week ago, with regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture. Perhaps the shortest way of placing this motion before the House would be for me to read the motion of which I gave notice, and having read it, there will be very little to add. I gave notice on the 27th of March that in connection with the consideration of the fifth report of the Committee on Agriculture I would move as follows :

That this government has entered into certain agreements with a syndicate or association of persons known as the North Atlantic Trading Company, for carrying on an immigration propaganda in continental Europe, said agreements beginning in 1899 ;

That large sums of money have been from time to time paid by the government of Canada to the said North Atlantic Trading Company under the said agreements and considerable amounts are still pending between the government and the said company ;

That C. H. Beddoe, accountant of the Department of the Interior, a witness examined before the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, during the present session, as appears by the report of the said committee, was officially sent to Europe by the Department of the Interior, upon the refusal of the Audit Department to sanction the payment of some claims of the said Trading Company, in order that the said Beddoe should examine and audit the accounts of the said company and ascertain if the said company had expended in immigration propaganda the amounts it was bound to expend, under its contracts with the government ;

That the said accountant, having proceeded to Europe and made his report upon the said audit and being examined before the said committee, has refused to answer the questions put to him, concerning : 1. The names of the agents and subagents of the North Atlantic Trading Company in Europe, mentioned in his audit report as having received money, in execution of the contract ; and 2. The names of the printers to whom moneys are alleged to have been paid by the said company in execution of said contract, the whole as mentioned in report of audit ;

That the said accountant offers as a reason for his said refusal a promise made by him to the officials of the said North Atlantic Trading Company to the effect that he would keep said names secret ;

That it is and has always been the undoubted right and privilege of this House of Commons to have all the information which it may desire regarding public matters of any kind and description, coming within the jurisdiction of parliament, and the refusal of the witness to answer under the present circumstances constitutes a breach of such privilege ;

That the said C. H. Beddoe be summoned to appear at the bar of this honourable House according to the law and usage of parliament, on.. .. .. at four o'clock in the afternoon, to answer such questions as may be put to him by Mr. Speaker or other members of this House and receive such injunctions, orders and monitions as to this honourable House may seem fit.

Mr. Speaker, the procedure adopted this year in connection with the refusal of this witness to answer questions put to him, is exactly the same as the procedure adopted last year in connection with the refusal of Mr. Preston to give to the Committee on Agriculture and Immigration the names of the parties forming the syndicate with which the government contracted in 1899, and since then on two occasions, to carry on a propaganda on continental Europe in certain countries, and who received therefor several hundred thousand dollars under the terms of said contract. The procedure is the same, consequently it is not open to question. The difference this year is that the witness examined is the accountant of the Immigration Department. Apparently, claims coming from this company, although approved in the Immigration Department, were refused in the Department of the Auditor General because there was no satisfactory proof before the Auditor General that this North Atlantic Trading Company had in reality expended in Europe the $15,000 a year which it was obliged to expend under the terms of its contract for an immigration propaganda. Upon the refusal of the Audit Department to accept these claims and to permit payment, Mr. Beddoe, the accountant of the department, was sent over to Europe, in order to audit the accounts of the North Atlantic Trading Company and to make sure that in reality it had fulfilled its obligation.

Mr. Beddoe admits in his examination, which is very lengthy and which I will only quote from in so far as it is necessary to connect that examination with this motion, that he was sent to Europe without any specific directions. In a matter which had already given rise to a controversy before the committee and the House he seems to have gone to Europe without any directions which would oblige him to perform that audit in such a way as to meet all possible questions that might arise before the committee and the House. He went to Europe and returned with an audit absolutely satisfactory to this company and upon which, no doubt, payments were made to the North Atlantic Trading Company, but when he appeared before the Agriculture Committee he found himself unable to give us any satisfactory explanation of the audit and he was obliged to refuse the most elementary information that the audit called for upon the plea that he had, exactly as Mr. Preston had done, bound himself under a quasi oath of secrecy that he would not reveal to the committee or the House or anybody any of the names connected with the payments made to this company. The thing appears to be most ridiculous. Mr. Beddoe, against whom I have no word to say, and who is a most excellent civil servant, thought he could do no better than follow the example of Mr. Preston who last year absolutely set the committee at defiance when they attempted to get from him the names of the parties with whom he had expended hundreds of thousands of the people's money in connection with the immigration propaganda. Mr. Beddoe, in this instance being asked who are the agents and subagents of this company through the ministry of whom this propaganda was carried on, states to the committee that he refuses to give these names although he knows them and gives as his reason that they were revealed to him by the secretary or the officials, whoever they are, of this company under a binding promise that he would not reveal them to the House of Commons or to the committee. So it is absolutely impossible for us to know if the North Atlantic Trading Company has expended sums which it bound itself to expend in connection with the propaganda. When asked by the members of the committee in regard to an item of some $14,000 mentioned in his report as having been expended upon printing, and when asked who are the printers who have done the printing which he certified to in his report he gives a similar answer. He says that he cannot give the names of these printers because he promised the officials of the North Atlantic Trading Company in Amsterdam that he would not reveal the names. So the position now is that we have expended nearly half a million dollars in connection with this immigration propaganda and in the exercise of the undoubted privilege we have of knowing how the people's money is expended we ask an official of the government who made the contract with the company with whom he contracted and he refuses to give the names and as the members of this House will remember at the last session of the House he was confirmed and endorsed in that refusal by the majority vote of this House. This year, when the question of settling with this company comes up, when we have before

us the prospect that the company will lodge a large claim for indemnity against the government on the ground that we have put an end to this contract—because we ended it last year and the accountant certifies in his audit and report that there was no ground for ending the contract inasmuch as it has been fully, punctually and exactly carried out by the company—when we ask this accountant sent over at the expense of the government to find out how they have carried out the contract he refuses to tell us who the agents and sub-agents of the company are, and refuses to give us the names of the printers with whom $15,000 or $16,000 has been expended in carrying out the terms of the contract.

Now, I think it will be unfair at this time of the session to take up the time of the House in endeavouring to establish that we are entitled to that information. It seems to me to be an elementary point that the House of Commons is exercising an undoubted right which it has possessed since time immemorial, in investigating all accounts connected with public expenditure and in finding out, more particularly in this case and under circumstances of this kind, to whom these payments have been made and to inquire into the disposition of the large sums which this company has been receiving and prospectively will receive under the terms of the contract. I will, therefore, limit myself to pointing out to the House very briefly the answers of Mr. Beddoe which give rise to the present motion. I have taken out of a very lengthy examination the parts of it which concern his refusal, and I will limit myself to quoting those answers in which Mr. Beddoe, peremptorially and to my mind very erroneously, but audaciously, takes the position that he will not give us that information. I quote from pages 25, 26 and 27 of his first deposition:

Q. You say in your report at page 2: The company has a well established system which enables them to follow out their propaganda in a business-like manner. They have agencies at Hamburg, Rotterdam, London, Libau, Odessa, Obo, Christiania, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Gothenburg and Amsterdam. These are the principal agencies and there are many sub-agencies attached to each. What knowledge of that did you acquire in your visit to Amsterdam ?—A. In conversation with the manager and secretary of the company.

Q. Who are these gentlemen in these different cities that I have just enumerated ?—A. I do not know whether I am at liberty to disclose their names.

Q. Do you know their names ?—A. I do, sir.

Q. What makes you say that you do not know whether you are at liberty to disclose their names ?—A. Because I suppose that the committee is aware that the laws in those countries are so stringent that in conducting their emigration propaganda they are obliged to keep their names secret; it would not do to state that they were openly conducting an emigration propaganda to Canada. Some of these gentlemen are the largest steamship agents in Europe and are acting as agents for the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Q. The position then, as I understand you, is this: you got from Mr. Cohen, or from officials of the company, the names of these gentlemen just referred to at page 2 in your report, you know them and you question whether you can give us those names on account of the stringency of the laws. Is that the position you take ?—A. That is really the position of the matter.

Q. Are you aware that there is a clause in the contract which specially provides that in this propaganda they are not to violate the laws of any of the countries where they are operating ?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, why do you object to giving the committee those names since it was specially provided that they are not to violate the laws however stringent they may be ? Do you say that they violate those laws ?—A. To be conducting an emigration propaganda in some of these countries leaves them open to severe punishment. I think there is no option of a fine—there is a very heavy fine and imprisonment and therefore I have to protect them. I should not divulge their names.

Q. Are they themselves interested in this North Atlantic Trading Company as shareholders ?—A. That I could not say.

Further on, still quoting from the first deposition, at page 29:

Q. I find these words in your report: 'Special agents are doing work in Scandinavia, Germany and other countries—quite a number of clergymen are assisting in the propaganda.' Who are these special agents referred to in this report ?—A. Those names are to be kept secret as well. I know the names of some of the clergymen who are working in Germany.

Q. Does that simply apply to the clergymen? —A. There are a great many letters that have been published—I forget now whether the signature of the clergymen was attached to the letter—bearing testimony to Canada as a field for emigration.

Q. Do I understand that you promised Mr. Cohen that you would not divulge the names of these special agents and of these clergymen ?—A. Yes, I did.

Q. You made him that promise ?—A. I did, sir.

Q. Did you feel that you had authority to make such a promise as that ?—A. Yes, I had to consider the nature of the contract and that they had to conduct their propaganda in secrecy.

Q. Had you instructions to that effect from the department ?—A. No, but from my own ideas in connection with the matter I thought that was the proper way to treat it.

So much, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the testimony given by the witness Beddoe in connection with the names of the agents. There is more in the deposition, but I do not wish to take up the time of the House. The members of the committee will know that Mr. Beddoe said he promised not to reveal these names, and therefore he would not reveal them. The chairman was called upon to rule that the witness should declare these names to the committee, and the chair-

man refused to give the witness this order. The ruling of the chair on that point was called in question, but by a majority vote of the committee it was sustained. The examination of the witness was adjourned, and it being resumed on the 20th March he is asked, pages 2 and 3 of his second deposition :

Q. Are you in the position therefore, sir, to give the names to-day of these agents and sub-agents, or do you say that they were given to you under such conditions that you cannot reveal them to the committee ?—A. I cannot reveal them to the committee.

Q. I suppose therefore, you did make that promise not to reveal those names ?—A. I did, sir.

Q. And as to the Austrian business that was managed at points in Germany ?—A. I cannot give the names of those who were working for the company.

Now, in regard to the printing, there was a sum of $15,000 which the North Atlantic Trading Company, in execution of its contract alleged it had expended, and in his report to the Auditor General, Mr. Beddoe certified that that amount had been expended. When he appeared before the committee he was asked if he would give the names of those printers, which was a most natural question to put to him. I quote from page 21 of the second deposition :

Q. Did the secretary of the North Atlantic Trading Company bind you to secrecy as to those printers, as he did with respect to the agents of the company ?—A. He showed me the accounts receipted on the understanding that I would not divulge the names ; that was it.

Q. You entered into that understanding ?—A. I did, sir.

If the members of the House will read the whole deposition they will find that the extracts I have given are abundantly confirmed in other parts of Mr. Beddoe's examination. It is evident that this public official of the Department of the Interior takes the position which was taken last year by Mr. Preston, that he will not give to the representatives of the people in parliament, the names of those interested in the North Atlantic Trading Company who are demanding large sums of money from the government. It is a matter of the utmost importance that we should know at this stage of the investigation whether the North Atlantic Trading Company has carried out this contract. On general principles it seems to me that when we are investigating payments made by the country, we have a right to the fullest information concerning these payments. Only the other day, those in this House who dissented from the motion in respect to the Grand Trunk vouchers, were loud in their expressions that if any payment was made or was to be made in connection with these vouchers, the House had undoubtedly the fullest right of investigation. In the present case it is not a question of investigating accounts that have not been paid, but it is a question of finding out whether a company that has received considerable sums, and expects to receive considerable sums further from the government, is entitled to the payment of these moneys. The House will be laying down a most dangerous principle if it does not assent to this motion. As the right hon. the Prime Minister is about to confront the perils of the sea, I do not see how he can leave the country with a clear conscience unless he accepts this motion. I feel he will have greater security for his safe passage across the Atlantic if he does justice to the rights of the representatives of the people on this occasion. I beg therefore to move the motion which I have already read.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). While the motion is nominally to bring before the Bar of the House an official of the government it is in reality a motion in criticism of the policy of the government. My hon. friend, (Mr. Monk) does not suggest that Mr. Beddoe showed any discourtesy to the committee or acted in any other way than it was his duty to act as an official of the government in carrying out the policy of the government, and assisting in its administration. Whatever responsibility there is, must be assumed by the government and not by Mr. Beddoe. It is of course a matter of debate as to whether the action taken by the government was wise or unwise, but it was taken on the responsibility of the government, and it has been endorsed by parliament. A certain condition existed in Europe with regard to emigration under which it was contrary to the laws of certain countries to carry on an active emigration propaganda in these countries. It was the desire of Canada to secure immigrants from these countries, and the choice was between not making active efforts to secure them, or making active efforts by such means as might be possible. The government employed an agency which might carry on an active propaganda to secure the results that were desired, and in order that this propaganda might be carried on it was necessary that a certain consideration should be given to the people who were carrying it on. That consideration was given, and one part of the consideration was that their names should not be made public.

Now, that might have been right or it might have been wrong ; it might have been wise or unwise ; but it was done, and it was done as a deliberate act of the government, as part of the government's policy, and it has produced, as the returns show, the results which were expected of it up to a certain time and during a certain number of years. That being the case, while it would be perfectly in order for Mr. Beddoe to be brought before the bar of the House, we understand that this motion is only a

means of again bringing forward this question, which has been before the country for several years, on which the House has repeatedly expressed its opinion, and on which I fancy the House has no reason to change its opinion.

In regard to the purpose desired to be attained by Mr. Beddoe's visit to Europe, it was that the Auditor General should be satisfied that certain expenditures required by the contract were made so that he would be warranted in paying to the North Atlantic Trading Company the sum claimed by them and allowed by the Immigration Department. Mr. Beddoe, as the accountant of the Department of the Interior, as an officer who has been in the public service for many years, as a tried and trusted servant in such matters, was sent to Europe to make such an audit as would satisfy the Auditor General that $15,000 per year had been expended by the North Atlantic Trading Company in an active propoganda as provided in their contract. Mr. Beddoe made the investigation. and reported to the Auditor General in such terms that the Auditor General is satisfied that the expenditure was made and that he is therefore warranted in paying the North Atlantic Trading Company such portion of their claim as has been approved by the Department of the Interior. That was Mr. Beddoe's duty, that was what he went to Europe to do, and that is what he has done. I submit that he is not fairly subject to criticism or censure by the House for having done his duty. It is a fact that the government is responsible for every act of its officials, as it is responsible for the policy to which they give effect. Mr. Beddoe cannot be fairly held responsible, and I submit that he should not under the circumstances be called to the bar of the House to answer personally for a condition for which the government is responsible and has been responsible during all these years. In order that the House may have perhaps a clearer statement of the case than it would gather from what has been said already, I will take the liberty of reading a statement prepared by Mr. Beddoe for the information of the House in regard to this matter.

Mr. MONK. May I ask if this statement has been prepared since his deposition was given ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I do not want to prevent my hon. friend from reading that statement, but I do not know that it is quite in order, on the discussion of a motion founded on evidence taken under oath before the committee, to read a subsequent statement at a time when the House has not decided that he should be summoned before the House. I question, Mr. Speaker, whether that is in order. It would be proper for him to give these explanations when he is before the bar of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not insist on reading the statement if it is not in order, but I take it that the question is a question at large and that it is really in the interest of the public and in the interest of the House that a short, concise and clear statement should be made of the case from the standpoint of the accountant, who certainly has been more closely in touch with this matter than any other person, and against whose character, standing and statements I fancy no member of the House or no one who has had any business relations with him will at all question. He says :

Under the contract the company agreed to carry on an active educative work in the agricultural districts of certain countries in Europe, to promote emigration to Canada and to make known the advantages offered by Canada as a field for settlement. The company undertook to advertise in the public press, publish pamphlets in various languages and their representatives were to make a personal canvass. To carry out this work they agreed to expend not less than $15,000 each year, and they were to furnish the department with receipted vouchers, sworn statements or other evidence in proof of the expenditure having been made.

Last session when the annual expenditure of the $15,000 was questioned and criticised in the Public Accounts Committee, the Agriculture and Colonization Committee, and in the House, and it was hinted that the company had not spent the money which they claimed had been expended, the Auditor General refused to pass any further accounts until a certificate had been given by a responsible officer of the Department of the Interior that the $15,000 had been expended during the years 1903-1904, 1904-1905 and 1905-1906.

The statements and receipted vouchers furnished to the department for the years 1903-1904 and 1904-1905 were satisfactory, but for the year 1905-1906 the company gave sworn statements as to the correctness of the whole expenditure for that year. In some instances, however, they did not furnish the original accounts—they only gave details, and, in these cases withheld the names of the people to whom the payments had been made. It was on account of the incompleteness of the accounts mentioned that the Auditor General preferred to have a certificate from an officer in the department at Ottawa.

The reason assigned by the company for giving sworn statements instead of providing the original vouchers in certain cases for the year 1905-1906 was the danger of publicity and the serious consequences to the members of the company. It was pointed out that the inquiry held during the session of 1906 had brought out the names of persons with whom they had had business relations, and these names they had been led to believe, as a part of the agreement, were not to be made public, and they asked that the department would meet their wishes and not give out publicly or officially even the names of persons appearing in the accounts presented. The company has always been particular about this matter. When presenting the accounts for 1903-1904 they said : 'The business we are controlling ourselves and through our friends is of such a dangerous nature that even a suspicion of

our friends that they might run any risk by giving vouchers if the same would not be treated in a most careful way would induce them to prefer no more to work for us rather than endangering themselves.' Again, in the same letter they state: 'If anything of these particular matters would fall into wrong hands, not only the whole propaganda work would be ruined but a number of prominent people personally endangered. Imagine how European governments look upon this business, knowing that the free Switzerland's government has now threatened the newspaper offices through which we have advertised in Switzerland, and there is no newspaper any more in that country accepting such an advertisement. In other countries they do not threaten first, but fine people who act against the law without warning them.'

In regard to the audit of the accounts for the year mentioned, made in accordance with the wishes of the Auditor General, I would respectfully state that I examined the books and assured myself in every way that it was possible to do so that the expenditure had been made. The company has furnished copies of hundreds of newspapers published in various countries on the continent in which advertisements relating to Canada have been inserted. They have given the department samples of the literature printed in seventeen or eighteen different languages. The payments made to various persons and firms were verified by entries in the books of the company, and they produced the correspondence when required which showed the arrangements made and the acknowledgment of the payments received. A large quantity of the printing was done in London, England. I visited the printing firm who did this work and verified the payments made to them. The book in which a record is kept showing the distribution of the literature on the continent was always at my disposal when conducting the audit.

During the audit of the 1905-1906 accounts, in connection with which certain original receipted vouchers had been withheld, the secretary reiterated what he had stated in his letter transmitting the accounts to the department. I told him that it was impossible for me to make a proper audit unless the original receipted vouchers were produced. He consented to produce them, but it was upon the distinct understanding that I should on no account make the names public. One of these vouchers was for the printing of literature by one of the largest firms in Germany. Samples of the literature had been furnished. A lot of it was in stock and a large quantity had been distributed. The account included the following items: Printing 275,000 pamphlets 'Canada', in 17 different languages; 300,000 covers for pamphlets. Printing agents advertisement on back of 173,500 pamphlets; 5,000 large Dutch pamphlets, 20 pages, with map in two colours lithographed; 130,500 'Canada-Karten' printed in 13 languages; 15,000 large Swedish pamphlets, 28 pages, with map cover lithographed in 2 colours; 10,150 large Norwegian pamphlets, 32 pages; 100,000 maps lithographed in 3 kinds (75,000 in 5 colours and 25,000 in 6 colours).

Perhaps my proper course would have been to cable you respecting the refusal of the company to furnish all the original receipted accounts, in order that I might know whether you would consider the mere exhibition of these vouchers sufficient for the purpose of my audit. Having satisfied myself in regard to the matter I thought that sufficient, and, knowing the dangers connected with the revelation of the names of those who were working for the company, I did not hesitate to promise secrecy with respect to the names mentioned in these accounts. With the exception of some of the accounts included in the 1905-1906 expenditure, the names of all those to whom the company had paid money are shown in the accounts and these accounts have been before the committee and have been open for the inspection of the members. I feel, Sir, that, as far as the audit of these accounts is concerned, no end could possibly be gained by giving out publicly the names of the agents who have been working for the company in the various countries on the continent; to do so would, in my opinion, result in some of these people being fined or imprisoned. Therefore, I would respecfully ask to be relieved from the responsibility of making public the names which have been given to me in confidence. I would again call your attention to section 3 of the contract, which states that the $15,000 is to be accounted for at the end of each year by receipted vouchers, sworn statements or other evidence in proof of the expenditure having been made. To comply with the terms of the agreement sworn statements might have been considered sufficient, but, instead of accepting these statements which were made by officers of the company, a thorough audit of the accounts has been made.

Respectfully submitted,
CHAS. H. BEDDOE,
Accountant.

I do not know that there is anything to add to that statement; I read it so that the House and the country might have a clear statement of the position taken by the auditor in this matter. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman reflects upon Mr. Beddoe; I take it that his object is to discuss this as a question of the policy of the government. Under the circumstances, the government having given, by its proper officers, its word that a certain privacy should be maintained, the honour of the government and the honour of the country requires that that promise should be kept, and parliament has already pronounced in favour of that being done.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It seems to me that the Minister of the Interior has taken a most extraordinary stand in connection with this matter. He tells us that an official of his department was sent to Europe to ascertain whether certain public moneys had been properly paid to certain parties, in order that parliament might be satisfied that the expenditure was legitimate, and then the minister comes to the House and reads a statement from the official, justifying his conduct in not divulging to parliament the information necessary to enable parliament to know whether that public money has been properly expended or not. The minister declares that parliament has no right to

call that official to the bar of the House so that it may be known from him why he has refused to give this evidence. The minister says that parliament has already condoned the offence, if offence it is, and that the government having called upon its supporters in this House to vote with them, have succeeded in obtaining an endorsation of their policy in this regard, which precludes us from going further into the matter. Now, what is the duty of the representatives of the people in this parliament? One of our most important duties is to ascertain whether every dollar of the people's money has been properly expended, and whether or not the country has received full value for it. The Public Accounts Committee and in some respects the Agricultural Committee have the duty cast upon them of ascertaining whether the public expenditure has been made in accordance with the intention of parliament, whether proper vouchers have been received for the payment of the money, and whether value has been received. In pursuance of that duty the Auditor General's report and certain accounts are referred to these committees by parliament, and the committee is empowered to call witnesses and to put them under oath to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Now, Mr. Beddoe, an officer of the government, was called before the committee, and one of the first questions naturally put to him was as to the names of the members of the North Atlantic Trading Company, to whom these public moneys were paid. The witness refused to answer that question, giving as his reason, that there was a clandestine arrangement which had been entered into between some official of the government and some unknown people in Europe or elsewhere calling for privacy. The Minister of the Interior now tells us that an arrangement had been entered into beforehand that this information should not be divulged. If this system of shutting off inquiry and denying information where applicable only to the North Atlantic Trading Company, the minister would have a stronger argument, but we find that principle carried out by the government in regard to every line of inquiry which we enter upon. To-day it is in connection with the North Atlantic Trading Company, to-morrow it is in connection with the expenditure of public money for the purchase of land in the maritime provinces for the Intercolonial Railway; the next day it is in connection with the supplies of some department of the government; the next day it is in connection with the Ross rifle, or the sub-target gun. In every one of these lines, when we ask questions intended to bring out the information whether the country has received value for the money expended or not, some member of the government, or some supporter of the government, objects to the questions and the chairman declares that the witness has no right to answer. The witness is sworn to tell the whole truth; but when he has told just so much as suits his purpose, we are denied the right to get further information. If this were confined to the case of the North Atlantic Trading Company, it might conceivably be said that some reasonable excuse could be imagined for refusal to give the information. But the same thing occurs in all sorts of cases. Go to the Public Accounts Committee to-day—and I have sat there day after day during this session—and you have a chairman presiding there who, I am sorry to say, is simply a disgrace to the committee and his rulings an insult to the intelligence of the members of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) will see that the word 'disgrace' as applied to a member of the House is not parliamentary.

Mr. SPROULE. In deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I refrain from using that word. But I draw attention to the fact that time and time again, when questions have been asked in that committee with regard to public expenditure, the chairman, without waiting for objection to be raised, tells the witness that he has no right to answer the question. It is for the committee to decide whether the question should be answered or not. But the chairman does not wait for any objection from members of the committee. He even goes so far as to say, before a witness is called that if that witness is brought in he will not allow him to answer. Is that partisanship or is it not? I say that the arm of parliament is paralyzed in that committee, and the representatives of the people cannot do their duty; they cannot get the information they ought to have to lay before this House that the country may be able to judge whether there has been a proper expenditure of public money or not.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) in the written statement that he has read, has told us that 75,000 pamphlets were published by this company in seventeen different languages. How do we know that? Whose statement have we for it? The statement of one of the officials. We have the right to have samples of these pamphlets laid before the committee so that we may know whether proper literature is being distributed or not. Yet, not a single copy has been submitted for our consideration. We have simply the statement of an official who went to England to audit those accounts. But when the official who was sent by the government to collect information is brought before us, he refuses to give us the facts. Even admitting that these pamphlets were printed, we do not know whether they were distributed or not. A few years ago when Mr. Preston went to

England as Immigration Commissioner, we were told that tons of literature published in Canada had been stored away in cellars instead of being distributed. How do we know that that is not the literature that is being distributed to-day? We have the right to know what these pamphlets contain in the way of advice to intending settlers in this country, and also what means were taken to distribute them. But when we try to learn this information we have only the statement of an interested official, an official, who, on behalf of the government, I say, becomes interested to keep us in the dark if there is any impropriety in connection with the matter, because it is not to the advantage of the government that the facts should be brought out. Is this to continue? Is parliament, through one of its committees, to be treated with contempt? The committee is allowed the empty privilege of bringing witnesses before it and putting them on oath. But when it seeks to get the information which those witnesses have, that right is denied them. The work that has gone on in that committee, in my judgment, has been practically a farce for the last two years. And if members of that committee would follow my advice, we would leave the committee room and refuse to take part in the proceedings, that the people might know how their representatives are treated when they seek to make known how public money is expended. The people of this country ought to be informed that their representatives in this committee are treated with scant courtesy. That is a mild way to put it, for I say that the representatives of the people are treated with contempt and parliament itself is treated with contempt by the witnesses who come before that committee. It was so treated by Mr. Preston, by Mr. Smart, by Mr. Beddoe and other witnesses. Will parliament and the people support the government in its high-handed course of denying the public the right to know what has become of the money of which they have charge? The government is responsible, for the witnesses are sustained and defended in their refusal to answer questions put to them in these committees. If this course is to be continued, we might as well not go through the force of appointing these committees and calling witnesses before them. What is the use, when the chairman invariably—well, perhaps, 'invariably' is too strong, because he sometimes does direct a witness to answer some important question, but it certainly is not too strong to say almost invariably—sustains the witness in his refusal to answer, and denies a member of the committee the right to get information? What can be the affect of this but to paralyze the arm of parliament? What does it mean but that parliament is treated with contempt? And if we cannot bring these witnesses before the bar of this House, to learn why they have done as they have done, then parliament refuses to maintain its rights and privileges. It is no longer parliament that is expending the peoples' money but a star-chamber executive whose acts cannot be supervised by the representatives of the people.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Before making a few remarks on the question now before the House, I would like to ask the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) whether he was present at the meetings of the Agricultural Committee when Mr. Beddoe gave his evidence?

Mr. SPROULE. I was there a portion of one meeting, but I was not there all the time.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. member for East Grey has not said very much about the matter we are supposed to be discussing, but in a general way has discussed the functions and practices of committees of the House. I scarcely think it was fair for the hon. gentleman to refer to the witness, Mr. Beddoe, as an interested witness, because he is an employee of the government. I had not intended to say anything as to Mr. Beddoe's career or record, but perhaps after that remark of the member for East Grey, it may not be out of place to point out that Mr. Beddoe was appointed by the old Conservative party, and has been an employee of the government for some twenty-five years.

Mr. SPROULE. That makes no difference.

Mr. MILLER. Quite so; I do not wish to argue that Mr. Beddoe is more or less reliable or to be depended upon because he was appointed either by one party or the other. I merely wish to say that he has been a trusted employee of succeeding governments for twenty-five years, occupying a very high place in one of the departments, a man whom I think we ought to consider as worthy of confidence. While Mr. Beddoe was before the committee I was present during the whole of both sessions in which his examination took place, and I was pleased when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) spoke in complimentary terms of Mr. Beddoe and the manner in which he gave his evidence.

Now, the hon. member for East Grey spoke of Mr. Beddoe as having gone to Europe in order to obtain information that he might lay before parliament and before its committees. I do not think his mission was anything of the kind. Mr. Beddoe tells us that his mission to Europe was to satisfy himself, in order that he in turn might satisfy the Auditor General, that the North Atlantic Trading Company had expended $15,000 in general European immigration work, and an additional $5,000 a year in Scandinavian work, during the three years from 1903 to 1906. So Mr. Beddoe's mission was not to obtain infor-

mation as to the personnel of the company, but it was to satisfy himself that the money had been actually expended. I want to point out that what Mr. Beddoe has refused to reveal is not the personnel of the members of the company, because on page 20 of his type-written evidence, which is in the hands of some of the members—at any rate, of the member for Jacques Cartier—Mr. Beddoe says that he does not know who are the members of the company; and what he refuses to reveal—what he says he knows, but will not disclose—is the names of the agents of the company in various places of Europe, and the names of the printers by whom the printing in Europe was done. I submit, in the first place, that it is not the business of parliament, nor of this country, to know what particular agents the North Atlantic Trading Company employ or what printers did their printing, so long as they actually expended the money that they bound themselves to expend. But it is also said that Mr. Beddoe had directions from his minister, or from this government, not to reveal the information that came to his hand. Mr. Beddoe says distinctly that he had no such directions; that he was not directed to make any promise to keep any secret that he might hear or learn while in Europe. But, he says, I have read the debates of last session, I have read the papers of record in the department, and I knew the general nature of the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, I knew the nature of the bargain that had been made with them, and I considered that I was simply carrying out that bargain, and authorized by the bargain that was made, and all I have been able to learn, to make the promise that I did make. Further he says: I could not obtain the information I desired as auditor to obtain, I could not see the vouchers that, as auditor, I desired to see, unless I did make a promise that I would not reveal the names. So Mr. Beddoe has refused to tell us who are the agents of the North Atlantic Trading Company in the different places in Europe in which he says they had agents; but while he has refused to reveal the names of the printers in Europe who did the printing, he does give us a considerable amount of valuable general information. The hon. member for East Grey says that he has given us information concerning matters that we care nothing about, but as to the important matters, he refuses to reveal information. Now, Mr. Beddoe has said that some of the largest steamship agents in Europe are agents of the North Atlantic Trading Company. Surely that is information that is worth something. Then Mr. Monk asked Mr. Beddoe this question:

Are the agents in Europe of the North Atlantic Trading Company business men of good standing?—A. Yes, first class, the very best.

Then Mr. Beddoe has told us that some of the employees and agents of the North Atlantic Trading Company in Europe are ministers. Being asked by Mr. Blain of what denomination, Mr. Beddoe says that he does not know, but they are ministers of various churches in Europe, and it would be detrimental to the work of these ministers to make their names known. Mr. Beddoe cites an instance that came under his own observation, where people got into trouble who were carrying on immigration work in Europe. He says that large steamship lines were carrying on an active emigration propaganda in Budapest, and when the names of the agents of the Cunard line became known they were obliged to close their offices in Budapest in consequence of the work that they were carrying on. I believe that in Germany the German people are largely members or adherents of either the Lutheran Church or the Roman Catholic Church, and I believe in Germany both those churches are state aided, receiving aid from the government. That being the case, we may easily understand why ministers of either of those churches might get themselves into serious trouble by having their names revealed. Mr. Beddoe says that what he wanted further to find out was whether the North Atlantic Trading Company had expended, during the three years I have mentioned, this $15,000 a year in general European work and an additional $5,000 a year in Scandinavian work, which would make a total expenditure in three years of $60,000. He says: I did ascertain that the North Atlantic Trading Company had expended in three years, not only the $60,000 stipulated, but $84,428, $24,428 more than under their contract they were bound to expend. He says: For every detail, every item of that expenditure, an account has been furnished by the North Atlantic Trading Company; I have examined the accounts, I have examined the books, I have examined the vouchers, and you have the vouchers or copies here of every dollar and every cent expended.

Now, as to the vouchers, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who carried on the examination of Mr. Beddoe, in his address to the House to-day, laid some stress upon the fact that we have not the original vouchers but only copies. I submit that Mr. Beddoe had no right to obtain the original vouchers for this expenditure, and that the North Atlantic Trading Company, under whose control these vouchers were, had no business whatever to give up the vouchers. Mr. Beddoe was not inquiring as to whether this Canadian government had expended certain moneys, and that we needed the original vouchers to know whether the money had been properly expended; his mission was to find out whether the North Atlantic Trading Com-

pany had expended certain moneys, and he satisfied himself that they had been expended by examining the original vouchers in the possession of that company. Those vouchers were the property of the North Atlantic Trading Company, they were receipts for money payments of that company. Suppose that within one year from now, or within four or five years, any of these persons to whom the North Atlantic Trading Company had paid money came back the second time and demanded the same money, the company would necessarily have to have these vouchers in order to protect themselves. Therefore, the company ought not to be called upon to give up these original vouchers to Mr. Beddoe, or to any other person.

Now, Mr. Beddoe also found out, as his report just now read by the hon. Minister of the Interior to us shows that in three years the North Atlantic Trading Company had spread and distributed throughout different countries in Europe 1,762,150 separate pieces of literature advertising Canada as a fit country for European emigrants to come to. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked: What evidence have we that the literature was distributed. He said that not a single article of that literature was submitted to the committee and that is why I ask the hon. member whether he was present at the meetings of the committee because I remember very distinctly that at one of these meetings at least at which Mr. Beddoe gave his evidence last month samples of the literature in various languages were submitted to the committee. My hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell says: Here are five or six of these pamphlets now. The hon. member for Lennox and Addington (Mr. Wilson) and the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) will, I am sure substantiate and corroborate my statement that samples of the literature were submitted to the committee and were examined by several members of the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware of it. I think it is the proper thing that there should be not only a few of these copies but we were told that these pamphlets were printed in seventeen different languages and I think we should have had a sample of all of them before the committee. We should be put in a position to ascertain whether the amount of money that is claimed to have been paid for this literature was really paid for it and to whom it was paid.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. member says that is the proper thing to do and I am glad that he agrees that what was done was the proper thing to be done. He said that some pieces of literature—I apprehend that is what he meant—in each of the seventeen different languages ought to have been submitted to the committee. I am told that there were samples of literature in five different languages and I want to point out that no member of the committee asked Mr. Beddoe or any other person to produce samples of literature, but that Mr. Beddoe had copies there and he said that in the department there are whole boxes of literature and I have no doubt that if the hon. member for East Grey or any other member of this House who is sufficiently interested in the matter will go to the department he will find boxes stored with samples of literature in the seventeen different languages. More than that if the hon. member for East Grey will examine the files of the department he will see that there has been a great deal of correspondence between translators here and translators in Europe and England as to the proper translation of the literature, and as to whether the translation was a translation in such dialects of the respective languages as will be most readily understood by the common people among whom it was designed to be distributed, and he will find if he makes a more thorough investigation than he has made that every precaution has been taken, that the literature has been submitted to translators here and that it has been examined by the officials of the department.

Now, the printing is also criticised. It is pointed out that Mr. Beddoe has not revealed the names of the printers who did the printing. But, Mr. Beddoe has revealed the names of the printers in London. He says that a great deal of the literature they distributed in Germany and in other European countries was printed in London and without any hesitancy whatever, he told the committee that Hickson, Ward & Co., were the printers who did the printing in London, but as to the printers in Europe who did the printing, he said that to reveal their names would get them into trouble and he would not reveal their names to the committee. But, he points out in his evidence that some of the printing was done in London. Some of the printing was done in Vienna, some in Antwerp, some in Gothenberg and some in Hamburg. I would like to know what other object than Mr. Beddoe states as being his object there could be, what other object Mr. Beddoe or any other person could have in suppressing the names of the printers. Surely no one will say that with an expenditure of less than $15,000 for printing, being distributed among five or six different printers in Europe there could be any rake-off, or that there could be any iniquity or crookedness in connection with these printing contracts.

Mr. MONK. What possible objection could the witness have to giving us the names of these printers? Is it a criminal offence in Europe to do printing?

Mr. MILLER. I have nothing for it except the word of Mr. Beddoe who says that it would get these printers into trouble to reveal their names, and as printers usually place their imprint upon their work, it is significant that they did not place their im-

print upon this work because it would get them into trouble if their names were revealed.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that we have no right to inquire who got the money or whether the money was properly expended or not. Does he remember that in connection with an expenditure of $60,000 for printing, when we inquired who the company were that did the printing we were told that it was the Arundel Printing Company? Who were the members of the Arundel Printing Company? Mr. Somerville, whose father used to be in this House, and his wife and one or two others, and when we followed that up, and endeavoured to ascertain how the cheques were made out, there was the greatest suspicion that there had been a rake-off going to some person and that the government was not getting value for the money.

Mr. MILLER. I think the hon. member is out of court when he discusses the Arundel Printing Company. One of the members of the committee asked Mr. Beddoe whether any of this printing was done by the Arundel Printing Company and he said: No. There is no evidence whatever of any fraud in connection with the Arundel Printing Company, but, at any rate, that does not enter into this transaction at all. This is a transaction in which a few thousand dollars are divided among half a dozen printing offices scattered all over Europe. I want to point out that any information that Mr. Beddoe or any other person was able to give to us when examined before the Agricultural Committee this session or last year, they have not hesitated to give it to us as to the officers or business of the company in any country outside of those countries where it is said to be against the law to carry on an immigration propaganda. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, asked the witness who did the printing in London and without hesitation, he replied Hickson, Ward & Co. He asked: Who are the London agents of the North Atlantic Trading Company where there are no laws interfering with the work and without hesitation Mr. Beddoe replies that Mr. Louis Leopold is the agent of the company in London, England. Wherever it has been possible to reveal the names without doing injury or harm to the persons whose names are sought to be known the names have been instantly revealed and made public. In Holland, where the law does not oppose emigration work and where we are told the head office of this company is located, was there any disposition to hide the names. No, Sir, we are given the names of the parties. Mr. Gluck is the manager of the company and Mr. Cohen is the secretary. In places where the laws do not interfere with the operations of the company there has been no attempt to hide anything.

Mr. SPROULE. A Bill was put in for $10,000 to pay for clerks and other incidental expenses in connection with the office and when a man went there to ascertain whether this office was kept open and whether clerks were employed he found nothing but a room locked up and a hole to drop the letters through and a party came every two or three days and took away the letters.

Mr. MILLER. I am glad that my hon. friend interrupts as he does because it reminds me of things that I might otherwise have passed over. Mr. Beddoe in his evidence says that when he went to Amsterdam he had no trouble whatever in finding the office, it being located upon the principal business street of the city within five minutes walk of the Bourse, in the principal part of the city and in a public place. He said: I found the office equipped with a manager, a secretary, and an assistant each of whom spoke four or five different languages. I found a typewriter and all the equipment of an office in which a business was being energetically carried on. He says that there was not only this one office but that there was another and a larger office in the city of Amsterdam near the station for storing literature and carrying on other portions of their work. And further he says that they not only have these two offices in Amsterdam, but they have offices in a large number of places throughout Europe, which he has named to the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. He has not named any other officers, and he would not give the names of the agents.

Mr. MILLER. It is true he did not give the names of the agents, but he said: I know the names of the agents, I will not reveal them, but they have offices in these various places. The member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked him how he knew this and he replied: I know it from conversation with the officers of the company. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier will find that Mr. Preston's evidence corroborates the evidence of Mr. Beddoe, and Mr. Preston declares that he knows, not from conversation with officers of the company, but from personal visits to the offices in these cities from which the work is carried on.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. member explain how it is that when the work was being actually carried on under the contract before it was cancelled, no offices were to be found except one in a back street, and that after the government cancelled the contract these offices have been opened up? Why were they opened up after the contract was cancelled?

Mr. MILLER. I thank the hon. member for East Grey for giving us additional testimony. We have the evidence of Mr.

Beddoe as to an office on the main business street in Amsterdam; we have evidence as to another office near the station, and now we have the evidence of the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) that there is another office somewhere in a back street.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. member (Mr. Miller) state whether or not Mr. Beddoe gave notice to the company that he was coming to audit the books, and will he state also whether Mr. Beddoe had visited these other cities and seen these offices? Will he tell us how long these offices were kept open?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Beddoe said he did not visit these other cities, but Mr. Preston swore that he had visited the offices in these other cities. The hon. gentleman has asked: How long were these offices in Amsterdam kept open? I do not know but I point out that the hon. member (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was present at the committee and he did not ask Mr. Beddoe how long these offices were kept open.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I did ask and Mr. Beddoe knew nothing whatever about it. I also asked him whether he had sent notice to the company that he was coming, and he said that he had.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Beddoe distinctly stated that he did not send any notice to these gentlemen that he was coming.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Certainly, they knew he was coming.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Beddoe stated in his evidence that this general system of secrecy as to European emigration work has been carried on for many years. We have the evidence of Mr. Preston and Mr. Beddoe, that Sir Charles Tupper entered on the European emigration business under just the same secret system as was in vogue under the North Atlantic Trading Company with this difference, that while for fifteen years we paid 20 shillings a head for immigrants, we got few immigrants in return, and, that while under the old regime the government paid in addition to the 20 shillings, expenses of advertising, the literature was allowed to remain moulding in a cellar because the European agents were afraid to distribute it. Under the old regime we paid the same bonus and we paid for advertising in addition, and we got no immigrants; under the new regime we did not pay for the advertising and we got the immigrants.

Mr. SPROULE. On what evidence does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) state that the agents were formerly paid to distribute the literature?

Mr. MILLER. I think it was Mr. Preston who said that when he went to negotiate a contract with this company he found stacks of literature not distributed and moulding in the cellar.

Mr. SPROULE. And Mr. Preston said that was because of the absolute carelessness of the officers in the discharge of their duty, and he justified reorganization on that account.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) cannot get away from the fact that the former regime paid for literature which was not distributed, and that Canada got no results from the expenditure. I asked Mr. Beddoe in the committee, as to whether the same system of secrecy did not prevail under the Conservative government, and the member for Jacques Cartier—and I will do him the honour to say that he generally endeavours to be fair and upright and honest—the hon. gentleman said: Yes, the same bad system of secrecy has prevailed for many years.

Mr. MONK. In spite of the great compliment the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) has paid me, I would ask him, if, under the Conservative regime he can find a single instance of a civil servant being brought before a committee, and refusing to give such information as is asked for in this case?

Mr. MILLER. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) rose I feared he was going to ask me to take back the compliment I had paid him. I do not know what took place before the committees of the House in years gone by, because fortunately or unfortunately I was not then a member of the House. Now, Mr. Beddoe went to Europe to get information for the satisfaction of the Auditor General. He obtained that information and he presented it to the Auditor General, and the Auditor General is perfectly satisfied with it, and on the strength of that information the Auditor General, with his experience, and astuteness, has paid the money. If Mr. Beddoe's information was sufficient and satisfactory to the Auditor General, it is sufficient and satisfactory to me. If hon. gentlemen opposite would pursue the same system in regard to every item of expenditure in this Dominion as they have in regard to the expenditure of the North Atlantic Trading Company, which is not our expenditure at all, we would be sitting here for twelve months in each year, and then we would not be able to over take the work of parliament. The original vouchers for this expenditure have been presented to an officer of this government in whom we have every confidence. He has examined each voucher, he is perfectly satisfied that the expenditure has been made, and he points out that it was not our money. Mr. Beddoe says that in order to obtain information he gave his promise that the names of these people would not be revealed. He tells

us that he did that, not on the instructions of the minister, but that having read the debates of last session; having read the papers on file; and having read, I have no doubt, the letter of Lord Strathcona to Mr. Sifton, he thought he was perfectly justified in making the promise as to secrecy. I think myself he was perfectly justified, and, just on that point let me read an extract from the letter of Lord Strathcona. We all remember that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) quoted that letter in his speech of last session; but lest we should have forgotten it, I think I might read it again to the House. It was addressed by Lord Strathcona to Mr. Sifton on the 15th of November, 1899, when this North Atlantic Trading Company was being formed. In that letter Lord Strathcona says:

> I need hardly point out that the new arrangement must be regarded as very confidential, and must not be made public in any way.

Now, when a witness discloses to us the character of the men who were the agents of this company, the character of the work they have done, the amount of money they have expended, which was far in advance of what they agreed to expend, when he is furnished with details and vouchers for every dollar of that expense and when we take into account the bargain that was made, which was merely following out the policy of the Conservative government, I am sure that a majority of the members of this House will consider that the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) should not be adopted and that Mr. Beddoe should not be compelled to reveal the names of the agents of the company.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman read that portion of Lord Strathcona's letter in which he said that he had reason to believe that we would get as many immigrants if we had never employed that company at all?

Mr. MILLER. No, but I will do this: I will defy the hon. member for East Grey to produce such a letter in this House now or at any other time, because no such letter was ever written.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny) Mr. Speaker, last year, when this question was before the House, I voted that Mr. Preston should be obliged to answer certain questions which had been put to him in the Committee on Agriculture. This year it seems to me that the question before the House is pretty much the same, with this difference, that Mr. Beddoe is asked to give the names of the agents and subagents of the North Atlantic Trading Company. I must say that I see no reason why this motion should not be granted. My reason for that conviction is that last year in the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Preston gave the names of certain agents of the company. I remember especially the name of the agent at Christiania. It seems to me that if the name of that agent can be given in public, there is no reason why the name of another agent should not be given before the bar of the House. It seems to me also that if the names of the agents of the company can be given by Mr. Preston, there is no reason why Mr. Preston last year and Mr. Beddoe this year should not also give the names of the shareholders. If there is anything criminal in the immigration propaganda of the Canadian government by the shareholders of the North Atlantic Trading Company, the doings of the agents of that company are all the more criminal because they fall immediately under the law, while the shareholders would only come later, after the trial of the agents or subagents had taken place. In the contract of the North Atlantic Trading Company there is one feature that has been neglected by this House. That is the provision which excludes any propaganda of emigration in France. It is a well known fact, which has been given as a reason for the secrecy of the contract, that the criminal laws of certain European countries prohibit the propaganda of emigration to any country, In France there is a law of that kind, and the North Atlantic Trading Company in its contract was excluded from carrying on any propaganda in that country. This seems to me to be a very curious feature of that contract. If the North Atlantic Trading Company should carry on an emigration propaganda in every other country of continental Europe, I do not see why it should not do so in France.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to point out that in France there is nothing in the law against emigration work being carried on by the government, as the government is carrying on emigration work there.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. Mr. Wiallard, one of the agents of the Canadian government in France, told me when I was there in 1905 that he had to take many precautions, because the French government was opposed to emigration. Therefore if the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company was a good contract in the rest of continental Europe, why should it not be good in France? And if the contract was so good, why was it denounced by the government of this country? The reason given by the Minister of the Interior was that the government was satisfied that the company was not carrying out its obligations. But there was another reason for denouncing that contract which was not given by the government, but which is the true reason, that is, the mediæval secrecy of the contract, a secrecy which has no reason whatever except the reason given

by one of the agents of the company, that if the names of the shareholders were given some of them would be obliged to commit suicide. Yet though Mr. Preston gave the name of the agent of the company in Christiania, that gentleman was not put in jail and did not commit suicide. I have no hesitation in saying that it was the most ridiculous contract that any government of any country ever had with any company. So far as the policy of the contract is concerned, we have the opinion of the very Minister of the Interior who sits in this House to-day, when he was only a private member of this House, that the policy of paying bonuses for immigrants should cease, and that if that policy continued we would have coming to this country a class of immigrants who would make of this country a mongrel nation. These words may appear exaggerated to some members of this House, but everybody knows that if they are not the very words, they are the sense of the words uttered by the Minister of the Interior when he was only the member for Alberta.

Mr. OLIVER. When my hon. friend first used these words, I supposed that he was quoting. From what he said afterwards, it appears that he was not quoting. I think it only fair that if he is going to attribute certain assertions to me, he should quote the actual words, and not attribute sentiments to me which may or may not be borne out by the actual words.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If my hon. friend will look up 'Hansard' of 1902, 1903 and 1904, he will find that he said that the time for bonuses to immigrants should cease, as they had only one effect, to bring to this country the most undesirable class of immigrants. I am quoting from memory, but I think the Minister of the Interior will not deny that my statement is correct.

Mr. OLIVER. I would much prefer if my hon. friend would quote 'Hansard' and not trust to his memory. My memory is that he is not absolutely correct.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. On Tuesday next, I will present a motion in connection with the bonus paid on immigrants, and I will then quote from 'Hansard' the words used by the Minister of the Interior. He will then see that he went much further and was much more violent in his language than I have represented.

Mr. BERGERON. What did he say about the Galicians ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. That will come on Tuesday.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Are you done ; it is one o'clock.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am almost done. My hon. friend has been referred to by a member of this House as president of the Milkmaid's Association, and no doubt he will vote as he is told, but I represent a constituency of freemen in this House, and I will vote as I think proper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If my hon. friends do not believe that statement, let them come to the county of Montmagny at any time and I will prove it to their satisfaction. That is practically all I have to say, I did not want to give a silent vote on the motion of the member for Jacques Cartier, which I shall support.

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been intimated to me that it will meet the convenience of the House if I should resume the Chair at four o'clock instead of three o'clock. Unless there is an intimation to the contrary now, the House will meet at four o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is satisfactory.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at four o'clock.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House at any length at this time of the session, but I desire to say a few words, because I believe that the matter now before the Chair is altogether too important to be lightly passed over. After hearing the discussion this morning, I came to the conclusion that it was nearly useless to have a committee of investigation in this House. We on this side are often taunted by our opponents during the recess with not having made any straight accusations on this floor, pledging our seats for the accuracy of those statements as has been done in the past. I believe it would be very imprudent for any hon. member to take such proceedings in view of what we have seen here last session and this session. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) I believe is taking a very grave responsibility in refusing—for he speaks in the name of the government and therefore with effect—to grant the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). It is indeed a sad spectacle to be witnessed in the highest deliberative assembly of a people pretending to have constitutional and responsible government, when witnesses who are employees of the government are allowed to refuse to answer questions properly put to them as witnesses. Why, seventy years ago, when our fathers were struggling to obtain responsible government, if a man had dared to express the opinion that, under responsible government, and in this year 1907, such a thing as this would happen, he would have been called an imposter—such a thing would not have been believed. If, when the grandfather of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was preaching constitutio-

nal government to the people in our province, anybody had said that, even granted constitutional government, in this year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seven, witnesses before parliament would refuse to answer questions put to them and would be sustained by the government and by the House, the idea would have been scouted as obviously absurd. But this spectacle we have to-day, and under a liberal government too. For eighteen years, the Conservative party was in power in this country, during that time a great many investigations took place before the committees of this House. I was in the House the greater part of that time—all that time in fact—and belonged to most of these committees; and I can say as one knowing the facts that never was seen, such a spectacle as we witnessed last session, and as we witnessed this session, in this refusal of witnesses to answer questions put to them. Not referring to a past debate, but as a matter of comparison, it has been stated that during the McGreevy investigation a witness refused to answer and was not compelled to answer. The very reverse is the fact. Mr. Connolly refused to leave in the hands of the committee a book containing a record of his private business, only one leaf of that book bearing any record relating to the questions before the committee. He offered to show everything in the book that related to the subject under investigation, but refused to leave the book in the hands of the committee. He was brought to the bar of this House and Sir John Thompson who was Minister of Justice and leader of this House ordered Mr. Connolly to place his book, the whole of his book, in the hands of the committee. And it was done. To-day, Mr. Beddoe,—who may be a good employee and an honest man, and I believe he is an honest man—comes before the committee of investigation and, when questions are put to him by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and other members of the committee, pertinent and proper questions, he declares that he will not answer them; he says he has pledged his word that he will not answer. He does not say that he was ordered to refuse, but simply explains that he made up his mind that, to obtain certain information he would pledge himself not to divulge the names of the parties implicated. We called upon the committee to force Mr. Beddoe to answer. His personal position was safe, and the majority of the committee could force him to speak. But the majority refused. We ask that Mr. Beddoe be brought before this House; and the Minister of the Interior, speaking as I repeat, for the government, declares—as we can see is the intention—that Mr. Beddoe shall not be called upon to appear at the bar of this House and divulge the names of the parties implicated in the transactions we are investigating.

Now, the simple fact is that this North Atlantic Trading Company transaction is a swindle from beginning to end—there is no other word for it. The refusal of Mr. Preston last year to give the names of the people who formed the company proved that there was something wrong at the bottom of it. There is not a man in this House or in this country who is not convinced that Mr. Preston and some of his friends were themselves the North Atlantic Trading Company and that they were the people who obtained over $300,000 for sending—as they said—immigrants to this country. But let it be remembered that Lord Strathcona said that these immigrants would have come anyway.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). I would ask the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) whether he has read the sworn evidence of Mr. Smart, Mr. Preston and Mr. Beddoe that none of the gentlemen that my hon. friend has mentioned, nor any other Canadian, nor any other person in Britian, nor any other person anywhere connected with the government, had any connection with, or received any of the profits of the North Atlantic Trading Company?

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) wants my candid answer, I will tell him I do not believe a word of the whole story. And I do not believe that there is a man in this House simple enough to believe it. Certainly there is not a man outside of the House who believes it. Why, if there has been nothing wrong in the transaction there is no reason why we should not have the names of that company.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) permit another question? Does he mean to say that these gentlemen, when under oath, have sworn a falsehood?

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) can settle that with those who were under oath. I tell him simply that I do not believe a word of the whole story. And the best answer to my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) and my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) is the fact that the Minister of the Interior cancelled that contract. And, if additional proof were needed, there is the fact that the Minister of the Interior got rid of Mr. Preston. It is a colleague of the minister's—for whom, no doubt, he will say he is not responsible—who has engaged Mr. Preston and sent him to a distant part of the world. And to-day we find a vote in the estimates to pay Mr. Jury, who was suspended by Mr. Preston—which shows that the government themselves do not believe a word of Mr. Preston's story. But there is even more than that. Did we actually make a contract, legal or otherwise, with

the North Atlantic Trading Company? Did we make an actual contract with this pseudo company which never existed except on paper? Where are the men who made that contract and who, in making it, acted both for the government of Canada and for the other side? The minister who made the contract for Canada has disappeared. The deputy minister of that time has left the department and has joined the men who pretended to be members of this company. All the circumstances show that the whole thing was a myth from beginning to end—except the amount of money that the Dominion of Canada paid to these gentlemen.

Now, the refusal of Mr. Beddoe to answer questions this year is only a consequence of what we heard last year. Who benefited by these refusals to answer? Was it the government of Canada? No. Who could benefit except the men who dare not give their names—who were ashamed to admit that they had been doing something which was illegal? The idea, Mr. Speaker, of giving as a reason for this secrecy the statement that we could not solicit immigration from these European countries without infringing their laws. We all know that, I suppose there is not a country in the world that likes to see its people going away. We have spent large sums to promote immigration from Ireland, for we look upon that as good immigration. We do not regard as good immigration the Doukhobors and many others who have been brought here. We know that those who lead public opinion are opposed to immigration from that country. I repeat that the government in taking this position will declare to the world that they have made an illegal contract, a contract of which they should be ashamed. Now, the Minister of the Interior, after taking the position he has taken in the name of the government after saying that we are not entitled to make Mr. Beddoe answer the questions we put to him, says that the House of Commons assents to that position. Well, that had better been left out of his speech. A good many men who have sat in the House of Commons have already received their reward. Over sixty men who sat in this House in 1896 have left it for a reward.

Mr. BENNETT. How many to follow now?

Mr. BERGERON. The question might well be put. And to say that the House of Commons has sanctioned this course—why, Sir, I am sorry to say that under present circumstances the House of Commons would sanction anything. Who are they responsible to? Those who do not expect to go back before their electors are not responsible to anybody. What is the best guarantee of the independence of a member of parliament, of his assiduity to his duty, of his interest in what is going on in the House? It is the prospect of meeting his electors, when he will have to render to them an account of his conduct. Those who have not to do that have no responsibility; consequently they have only to do what the government asks them to do, to sanction everything the government wishes them to sanction. Why, Mr. Speaker, have we really responsible government in this country? What are we here for? We are the representatives of the people, the only men who can enter these halls, and the whole of us, on both sides of the House, appoint a committee called the government to administer the affairs of this country. But we are the judges of that committee. Do we wish it to go out to the country that we have no authority over our committee? If outsiders were to come in here, men who have any knowledge of constitutional government they would see members standing up here talking as if they had a brief to defend every act of the government. They would see gentlemen actually preventing witnesses from answering questions put to them. We have seen in this House, when a motion is made against the administration, against the government, the ministers not defending themselves, but members sitting behind them one after another rising in their places and defending the government, as if the government did not care to do it themselves. Is this responsible government? My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Miller) said that it was a small amount anyway. Why, he says, it is only a paltry sum of $15,000 which is the subject of this discussion. It is not the amount in question over which the opposition are fighting, it is the principle involved. If it is true—and I call upon the few men in this House who still have independence—if it is true that a witness may refuse to answer any question put to him by a committee of this House, and if it is true that the House will sanction that refusal, if it is true that the government will ask the House to sanction that refusal, why, any minister of the Crown might refuse to answer any question put to him about the supplies which are granted to His Majesty. Suppose we put a question to the Minister of the Interior in supply, a question relating to his department, and he rises and says, I refuse to answer—why should he not do that? If to-day the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is voted down, any minister of the Crown can refuse to answer any question put to him, and he would be supported by the House, if the House wished to be logical.

The only reason I can see, the only circumstance in which a government in a parliament like ours, under a constitution like ours, can refuse to answer a question, is when an answer might involve the country in some international difficulty, or when an answer given by the government might involve the country in difficulty with some

foreign nation. That is the only case I can think of where a government would be justified in refusing to answer. And after many years in this House I have never yet seen, and I challenge any man on either side to discover a case analogous to this one, where a witness has refused to answer a proper question put to him by a member of parliament. Where are we going, Sir? Does my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior think that the people will sanction a pretension of this kind? He says that the government are sustained in the by-elections. Well, we know how by-elections are obtained, we know what they signify. But the hon. gentleman dare not go before the country in a general election and ask the people of Canada to sanction such conduct as this, and if the people do sanction it, they are not deserving of a constitutional government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the House any longer. It seems to me that this is one of the most important questions that ever came before the House. It is a matter of principle. I am sorry to see that men calling themselves Liberals will stand up here and say that a man shall not answer a question properly put to him by a member of this House. We are here as representatives of the people. It is no pleasure to us to spend two or three hours in the committee room questioning witnesses. We have seen more than I have already mentioned. Even when a witness is willing and ready to answer questions, we have seen him ordered not to answer by the chairman of the committee, or by some members of that committee. How long are these things going to last? I say that we have no right to boast of a constitutional government as long as these things are permitted. This afternoon the Prime Minister has left Ottawa on his way across the ocean with some of his colleagues; in London he will meet with the Prime Ministers of the different colonies, and he will be proud to tell them that Canada is a self-governing colony. But if the motion now before the House is voted down this afternoon, he will have to drop some of his pride and acknowledge that we do not enjoy constitutional government. I say again, as I said in the course of a debate last year on this North Atlantic Trading Company business, that if the government take the course they propose to take now, the people of this country will not tolerate it; and if the government go before the people with a policy such as this, there will be such a stampede at the next general election as will make the men ashamed of themselves who have pursued these tactics.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). Before the question is put I desire to make a few remarks. This question is similar to the one which came up last session with regard to the interrogation of Mr. Preston before the Committee on Agriculture, and the position I took then is the position I take now.

It is a very dangerous principle to lay down in a free parliament that a witness should be allowed to refuse answers put to him by a committee charged by this House to make an inquiry into a grave question of administration. With regard to the gentleman concerned in this motion, the slight acquaintance I have with him leads me to believe that he is an upright man and a gentleman; and although this may not be strictly according to the ethics of some ministers of the government, I will state frankly that my deep conviction is that if this witness did not answer before that committee it was because he had been ordered not to do so. The whole of this transaction from beginning to end, has an odour of conspiracy, of secrecy, which is most obnoxious to me as a Liberal member and as a representative of a free people.

Now, Sir, there may be two reasons, and two reasons only—or rather one reason and one pretext—which the government could invoke to justify them in placing an impediment in the way of a free inquiry into this matter. It is either—and that will be the pretext—that the contract is an immoral one from an administrative and political point of view, or that there are men connected with this contract whom the government does not want to be known, or the reason is that the contract is an immoral one from an international point of view. There is no escape from that position: it is either that the government have made a contract in which some men are interested of whom they do not want the public to know, or that they have made, wilfully, a contract against the law of nations, and in order not to show their imprudence and their breach of that law they do not want the right of parliament and of the people to be exercised. The argument that was advanced a moment ago by the hon. member for Grey interrupting the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is one which to my mind is preposterous in a free parliament, that would be preposterous anywhere in any free country. It is that because this or that or a third gentleman has sworn that no one connected with the government is interested our inquiry should stop and we should be satisfied that there is nothing immoral in the contract If there is any immorality in the contract from a political and administrative point of view, if there are men connected with the government or officers of the government in that contract it is not sufficient that other officers of the government should come and swear that there are not. It is only by knowing the names of the agents and the shareholders of that company that we can get the truth. I do not for a moment doubt the accuracy or the good faith of either Mr. Smart, Mr. Beddoe or Mr. Preston. It may be that Mr. Smart, Mr.

Beddoe and Mr. Preston have seen only the names that appears on the papers connected with that contract; but who tells us that if the individuals whose names appear in the contract had been brought before that committee they would not have divulged to the committee and to the House the people interested in the contract? This would not have been the first nor will it be the last contract in which names will appear only to hide the true parties behind the agreement. If the shareholders of the North Atlantic Trading Company who signed that contract were in good faith, if they were the very men who really put the money into that contract, what objection had the government to let it be known, to have their innocence, the innocence of their officers, of the ex-Minister of the Interior, of every man connected with the government who had anything to do with this contract, proved satisfactorily, and not have the majority of the House decide that the truth should not be known. I claim that if the government are convinced of the innocence of their officials or any of their members with regard to this contract and still refuse investigation, then they have only one ground to fall upon and it is that they have made a contract against the law of the nations in whose territory that contract was going to be carried out. Last year I made the argument: How is it, if it is really true that this was an illegal contract and the men connected with the contract would be exposed to the application of penal laws in all the countries in which they were going to operate that there should have been an office kept open in Amsterdam for years and years, an office that was not very pretentious but one that was really existent? The member for Grey has invoked the testimony of Mr. Smart. Mr. Smart has given testimony that he went to that office. If that office was open for the carrying on of business and if it would fall under the penal laws of Holland, will it be believed that the government of Holland would not take the proper means to go and see what was going on in that office? We have evidence from that that nothing was carried on, in that office at least, which came under the penal laws of Holland. If it was against the Criminal Code of Sweden or of Norway, how is it that Mr. Smart or Mr. Preston, I am not sure which, but I think Mr. Preston, could give the name of the agent of the North Atlantic Trading Company in the capital of Norway? If all the countries in which this contract was applied had penal laws under which the shareholders and agents of that company fell, how is it that that name has been divulged to the committee by Mr. Preston and as my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) has said, neither has the agent committed suicide, nor has he fallen under the penal laws of Norway? Here are two countries in which that contract has application and in which the theory used by the Minister of the Interior and by the majority of that Committee of Inquiry, is proved by facts, evidenced by their own witness, to be false and has fallen to the ground.

Therefore I say either from the international point of view or from the political point of view, the defence of the government is not possible and would not be possible and shall not be possible in a country where there is anything like free opinion or respect for constitutional government. This is not the only principle involved in this question; it is not confined to the paltry sum of $15,000; the principle involved is whether or not this parliament should exercise its function which was described by William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, as that of a standing court of inquest, to give an opportunity to the people of Canada to know the truth upon every question in which the interests and powers of Canada are concerned; or should we accept the policy forced upon it by a so-called Liberal majority, session after session and sitting after sitting, that because there may be dangers to some people whom we do not know, whose interests we ignore, because the government may forsooth have made an immoral contract either with some of their own friends or against the law of nations, we are going to sacrifice the principle that the people of this country are entitled to know the truth, and the whole truth about the way in which the government is spending the money of the country. From the point of view of administration, the point of view of constitutional government and also the point of view of international law, I claim it is the duty of the parliament of Canada and it is the right of the people of Canada to have the whole truth and the complete truth in this matter, and every time this question comes before the House I will record my vote for any motion the object of which will be to secure more light upon these extraordinary accounts, this mysterious transaction. The more it is discussed the more obnoxious it is to the people of Canada.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I was waiting, thinking that probably some member of the government would care to affirm the position of the government in the matter under discussion. I think it is an important one, I think the principle involved is important and should not be disposed of by the vote of to-day. It is a question which will be carried to the people and will be thought of by the people, and I believe the people will respond to an appeal on this very principle. Although my advice is not sought I would caution the acting leader of the House (Mr. Fielding) that it ought to be only after a great deal of consideration and thought that he would throw his influence against the opportunity of having complete publicity with reference

to the expenditures of public money. In the name of all that is free and good in government, if the people are the fount and source of all taxation and of all expenditures made, ought not the people to be allowed to know just how that money is expended and to whom it goes? It is not sufficient to say that provided only the money is spent it is not necessary to know to whom it goes. No country in the world would get anywhere and no great body exercising any kind of supervision over its own expenditures would get anywhere if it settled down upon a principle of that kind. You have not only to know that the money has gone out from the coffers, but you are to know to whom it has gone, and then although the man to whom the check has been made is the man named in the contract you have a right to go past that man to whom this money was ostensibly paid and see whether he was acting with any other man in the matter.

We have had instances innumerable in inquiries into the public accounts, where we came at the truth of the matter by getting behind the cheque which went to an ostensible individual, and finding that there was a partnership at the back of it. Would any parliament be foolish enough to pass a law which prevents members of parliament from participating in the public expenditure, if you never could go beyond the fact that the money had been paid out of the treasury. Why, if such were the case, a member of parliament might shelter himself behind a false name or a false syndicate, and he might thus contravene the principle, that one in such a position shall have no dickerings with the government in the way of buying and selling. A vote against this motion will affirm the principle, that it is sufficient for the representatives of the people to know that the money has been paid out of the coffers of the country, and that they have no right to ascertain to whom it has been paid. The member for Labelle fairly put in two sentences, a description of this transaction with the North Atlantic Trading Company. It is an immoral transaction which the government ought to be ashamed of to the day of its death—skulking around in post offices and forbidden places ; getting into one country by the shelter of some other country, in order to break the law of that country ; it ought to be an everlasting shame to the government that it ever had anything to do with a transaction of that kind. The Minister of the Interior, pleaded this morning : We do not want to give these names because if they were known the men would be open to punishment for transgressing the laws of certain European countries. That means, in common English, that this government were parties to a contract to break the laws of friendly nations.

Mr. SPROULE. Partners in the crime.

Mr. FOSTER. Partners in the crime. But, that is not the whole measure of the degradation. The Canadian ministry that signed that contract made the face of demanding from the contractors that they should not break the laws of any of these countries in which they carried on their operations. It is a pretty kettle of fish. The government in the first place declare that they were paying this company for breaking the laws of the different countries, and then they bind the contractors not to break the laws of these countries. Why, these men could not get a cent of the money unless they broke the laws ; and yet a clause of the contract says to them : You are not to contravene the laws of any country. The Canadian government did that simply to save their face, and, if they were questioned, to be able to say : We put an article in the contract by which these men were bound not to infringe your law.

There is another principle involved in this motion, and it is one which we cannot press too frequently or too strongly. Every progressive country in the world is making it imperative, that there shall be publicity as to the administration and expenditure by government, and we must take care in this Dominion parliament, that that principle as to publicity shall not receive a set back by the action of the government which repeatedly refuses to allow questions, the answers to which would show the ultimate destination of the public moneys. I have no hesitation in saying, that in the Public Accounts Committee, the action of the government, through their supporters, last year and this year, has been a complete negation of the right of the representatives of the people to fully and thoroughly inquire into the public expenditure. The government through their chairman, and through their majority in these several committees, have repeatedly shut down upon attempts to find where the money went. A hard word was said about the acting chairman of one of these committees in the excitement of debate this morning, and it was of course taken back when the Speaker called attention to it. But let me relate a circumstance. The chairman of the Public Accounts Committee was in the chair ; the committee was investigating the Halifax Land transaction ; the investigator knew from information he had, that the man who purchased ostensibly, was but a blind to cover up another man who was in partnership with him. Mr. Pearson was the man behind the scenes ; Mr. Pearson was the man who did not want his name to be known, and those who were prosecuting that inquiry had information that such was the case. The man who was ostensibly the purchaser was on the witness stand, and here is exactly what happened.

By Mr. Ames :

Q. How was Mr. Pearson paid this amount ? —A. Well, I paid him.

Q. In a cheque ?—A. Well, I paid him by cheque, yes.

Q. Have you the cheque here ?—A. I have the cheque here.

Q. Will you show us the cheque here ?

There was a willing witness ; he had the cheque, he was willing to show it to the representatives of the people, and when he was asked to show the cheque, the chairman rushes to the rescue and says to the witness :

Remember, you are not obliged to do it unless you wish to.

Here was a willing witness, a willing committee so far as I knew, and yet the very moment that the committee came near to getting at the distribution of that money, in rushed the chairman to save his party and his suggestion—well, I will not characterize it, but it was a suggestion which was utterly at variance with all proper inquiry by the people's representatives as to the destination of the public money. Then the following occurred :

By Mr. Ames :

Q. Will you show the cheque that you paid to your partner in this ?

By Mr. Barker :

Q. We are going to find out all about who is in this deal ?—A. Well, there are only two of us in this deal.

By Mr. Ames :

Q. Will you produce the cheque ?—A. The cheque is to pay to F. B. McCurdy and Company or order, $15,146.21, and the other is pay 'cash,' $10,000.

Q. Who are F. D. McCurdy & Company ?—A. They are brokers.

And so, by that process, we even outran the committee ; for at that time the committee did not appear to have the face to stand by the chairman in his suggestion. If the chairman's wish had been translated by an objection from any one in the committee, that question would not have been allowed to be asked, or if asked, to be answered. Now, does this government put chairmen over Public Accounts Committees to help to investigate the public accounts of this country in that way ? It is the policy of the government to be behind the chairman, to uphold him, and the chairman, who is zealous in a party sense, runs with both feet with all possible swiftness to approve himself to the government and the party whose will he thinks he is anticipating. He does not wait to be forced, he is not coy or unwilling, waiting to be wooed, but he goes out as if he were a young lady in leap year and makes the proposition himself before any member of the committee raises an objection. That is a sample of what often takes place in our Public Accounts Committee. Now, we are near the end of this session, but if we live to come back another session, and that Public Accounts Committee is in operation, this House will have to decide whether or not we shall be given some freedom to get at the real facts of any case in that committee. We will spend the time in this House rather than in the committee, in debating that question ; and if the people's will does not in the end prevail, then I am very much mistaken as to the people of this country. I want to note a fact, and I ask the attention of the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance to it. What is the very principle of the audit of our accounts by the Auditor General ? When the Department of Railways and Canals makes a contract, enters into a bargain, has work done, looks into the accounts and certifies to them by its accountant or its auditor, does that end the matter ? Does the Auditor General then say : That is all I want ? Send over the accounts vouched for by your own departmental accountant, and that will satisfy me ? Is that why we appoint an Auditor General ? We would have had no Auditor General and no auditing of the country's accounts if that had been the principle on which an Auditor General worked. The Auditor General's duties tell him that when accounts come from any department, though they may be certified to ten thousand times by the accountant or auditor of that department, he should go behind that fact and see the originals and make his own audit. That is the absolute rule. Was it the rule in this case ? No, Sir. Why was it not the rule ? What is in the very first sentences of the report of Mr. Beddoe when he comes back from Europe ? Almost the first sentence is this : I had a conference with the Auditor General, and he said to me, before I pass these accounts, I want a certificate from an officer of the Interior Department that they have been paid, and that the expenditure has been incurred. That is what the Auditor General laid down as a condition, and it was on that condition that Mr. Beddoe went to Europe. An officer of the Interior Department, I do not care how good he is—and I am saying nothing against Mr. Beddoe—if I said anything it would be in his favour, but it is not necessary—that officer is translated to Europe, and he satisfies the Auditor General when he produces a certificate that these payments have been made. Every day just as good a man as Mr. Beddoe certifies from some department here in Ottawa that accounts have been properly put in and that the amounts properly paid. The Auditor General never takes that as final. Why should he have taken the certificate of an officer of the Interior Department ? Why in the one case and not in the other ? Now, I think this is a peculiar transaction. Is it a fact that this was arranged so that the government could get out of this thing ? Properly speaking, every voucher, every bill, should have come to the Auditor General here and should have been placed within his power, and he himself should have made inquisition into it. That is what he does here. Should it be different because you send a man over to the other side of the water ? The certificate is simply a certificate, whether it be on this side of the Atlantic or on the other side.

Mr. MILLER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question ?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, go on.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the hon. gentleman for the graciousness of his manner.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will not contrast my gracefulness with that of the hon. gentleman. He is known to be exquisite.

Mr. MILLER. It might be a disadvantage to the hon. gentleman to do that. I ask him whether he realizes any difference between moneys paid out by the North Atlantic Trading Company on their own account and moneys paid out by the government ?

Mr. FOSTER. I might answer that, if necessary, by citing something that occurred not long ago in the Public Accounts Committee, where it was shown that accounts were paid by the Grand Trunk Railway Company and certified to by the Grand Trunk Railway Company on account of a contract between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and every one of these original accounts and vouchers was put within the hands of the representative and auditor of the Dominion government. What difference does it make in principle whether an account goes through two hands or three ? Was half a million dollars of the money of this country paid out annually to the North Atlantic Trading Company ? If so, we want to know, not only that that money has been paid—we know that well enough—but to whom it has been paid. If $15,000 has been paid to printers, what government is going to light on a poor printer because he undertook to print for a company and received his money from the company ? But there is no finality until you get back to the original accounts and examine those and the vouchers behind them. That is our right, and a significant thing about it is this. The government were in a quandary, and proposed to get out of it by sending Mr. Beddoe over to make an audit and give a certificate. But that is not the general course of the Auditor General's Department. Over and above the certificate of the official is the right and duty of the Auditor General and his department to look at the originals themselves. Another thing in which I think Mr. Beddoe went beyond any instructions that we see—perhaps not beyond any instructions that he received—was with regard to a claim of that company which is before this government to-day.

The proposition was condemned ; the contract was annulled. It was annulled on the ground that the parties had not lived up to the contract, and now this company is putting in a plea for compensation. They say that they have fulfilled their contract, that the contract should not have been denounced and they claim damages. As far as Mr. Beddoe's instructions, on the face of them, appear, all that he was authorized to do was to go over and audit those accounts. But he absolutely transcends that duty and lays the foundation for a claim to compensation by the company for the loss incurred through the denunciation of their contract. He thus goes beyond the mere auditing and certifying of the account, and reports to his head that the company not only paid those accounts but that they did more. He certifies that they did more than fulfil their contract, that they actually laid the foundation for a largely increased immigration, so that the company have now a trusted officer of the department to advocate their claim for compensation and may bring him before the committee or cite his report before any government and demand compensation. There is your own officer who absolutely reports, not only that the company fulfilled their contract but that they went beyond it with the idea that they had ten years ahead of them in which to continue their operations. It seems incredible that Mr. Beddoe could have acted as he did without having received instructions to that effect. Does the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) pretend to say that he sent Mr. Beddoe over without instructions at all, verbal or written, or that Mr. Beddoe went beyond the instructions he received ? In the latter case, Mr. Beddoe transgressed his orders in a very delicate matter. Here is a claim which the government disputed, yet the officer of the government goes over, hunts up evidence, and puts it in a written report to show that the company not only did everything the contract required, but did more, and on this the company can maintain their claim for compensation is good and must be paid.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask the hon. member to correct the last statement he made ? I understood him to say that Mr. Beddoe declares that their claim for compensation is good.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I did not mean to say that Mr. Beddoe had said so, but I drew that as an inference. He reported what I said he did, and therefore the company has very strong evidence in favour of their claim. What strikes one about this North Atlantic Trading Company contract is the mystery in which it is shrouded. I need not summarize all the facts but the salient ones are these. In the first place, the contract was a secret one, entered into without the authority of this parliament and without a specific parliamentary appropriation for that purpose. It was entered into by an officer of the department under the seal of secrecy. He bound himself to secrecy, which no officer of the government should have had the right to do and which no government should have sanctioned. Do you mean to say that you can prevent an investigation by parliament by simply authorizing one of your officers to bind himself to secrecy, to pledge himself that he will not divulge the names of the men he is con-

tracting with ? And you mean to say that any such pledge as that can prevent this parliament from inquiring into the transaction ? Yet that is what occurred. Afterwards when the contract was brought to the minister, he confirmed it ; and it was years after, certainly months, before that contract went to council and before it was definitely authorized by the council. The next peculiar feature is this, that there is nothing you can lay your hands on to show who were the contracting parties. And it transpired afterwards that though the contract purports to have been made by a company, no such company was in existence at the time and for years afterwards none existed, so that the money of the people was paid for years to certain unknown individuals and not to a company at all, although the government told this House, and it is so stated in the contract, that there was a responsible company and that it was with a responsible company the contract was made. But when at last public suspicion was excited and some people began to feel insecure, then a number of persons were put up to get a charter in the Isle of Jersey, and this was only done after nearly all the payments had been made. Although there was no company, no responsible party, $300,000 or $400,000 of the people's money was paid out. To whom was it paid ? There was no company and consequently no capital. Do you mean to say that this parliament has not the right to find out to whom that money was paid ? Do you mean to say that it is not legitimate for this parliament to ask who were the sharers in that money ? Where there is mystery, there is a strong presumption of peculation ; and the government which shrouds its transactions in mystery must not find fault with the people for suspecting it of wrong doing.

What have we got up to this moment ? The matter was brought into parliament. It was long before we could force the government to say anything, but finally, when they could no longer dodge the issue, they made this proposition. They said : We do not want to make the facts public but we will show to one or two members of the opposition to whom this money was paid, but they must promise to keep the information to themselves. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) refused any such offer and refused rightly. What happened next ? We had the government officials declaring that they knew who the men were but they refused to give the names. The committee demanded the names but were met by a straight refusal. Then we came to the House and the House refused to order the witnesses to divulge the names, and up to this day we have not the names of one responsible man who was the recipient of this $300,000 or $400,000 of the peoples' money. What wonder then that we asked and persist in asking to whom this money was paid ? Then the sympathy game was worked upon us and we were told that there would be numerous suicides if the names were given out. I would certainly regret such a conclusion very much, but I should like to know who are the persons who are going to commit suicide before I measure my regret. The government however will not give us that small modicum of concession, but I shall go so far as to say that it would be better the whole box and dice committed suicide than that we should affirm the principle that the government can pay out hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money and then refuse to give the names of the recipients.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). When the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) moved this resolution, I supposed we were going to discuss the refusal of the Committee on Agriculture to compel Mr. Beddoe to divulge the names of the gentlemen representing the North Atlantic Trading Company in the different cities of Europe and also the names of the printers in Hamburg who did certain printing for this company. But the discussion has taken a wider range, and we have listened to the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and other hon. members discussing the old North Atlantic Trading Company question which we all thought was settled a year ago. I can assure these hon. gentlemen that, so far as the people of the country are concerned, that question was dead and buried eight months ago, and they will have a tremendous job if they hope to resurrect it and make it of benefit to themselves in the country. I shall not take up the time of the House discussing the North Atlantic Trading Company. The contract with that company was made seven or eight years ago ; and while I was not a member of this House until 1905, I have attempted to learn something of the transaction. I do not find that there was any criticism of this contract until 1905. During that session, some questions were asked in the Public Accounts Committee, not as to the personnel, but finding fault with the amount of money certain persons were receiving for the business. But nothing much was said about it until the session of 1906. As hon. members will recollect, days and weeks of the time of parliament, both in the committee and in this House, were taken up with the discussion of the personnel of the company. The attack was largely centred upon the gentlemen who happened to be agents of the Canadian government in Great Britain as well as the agents of the North Atlantic Trading Company. We all remember that days and days were taken up with the attack upon Mr. Preston. The matter has been heard of again here this afternoon. Mr. Preston has been transferred from the scene of action ; but, as the attack upon him has been renewed, I wish to read an extract

from the Montreal 'Herald' of October 15th last, which to my mind, is a complete answer to the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite as to Mr. Preston and entirely exculpates that gentleman from any blame in his management of the Immigration Office in London. This is an interview credited to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), a gentleman, who, I think, is acknowledged by every hon. gentleman of this House to be absolutely fair in his discussion of public matters, and who would not make a statement about any official unless he believed it to be true. I think I am justified in taking the statement of the hon. member for Halton as a true statement of what he believed to be the facts when he made it:

During the course of an interview in London, Mr. David Henderson, M.P. for Halton, Ontario, is reported in the 'Canada' as saying he had visited the Canadian emigration offices and was agreeably surprised with the amount of work to be done. 'Yet everything seemed to be carried out in a systematic manner. The staff, I noticed, were specially courteous, and what is more, well-informed. The numbers I saw seeking information quite justified the upkeep of the staff.'

'It is difficult,' answered Mr. Henderson, 'to work on anything except first-hand knowledge, though, of course, I have made nothing in the way of investigation. But as a visitor, everything struck me as being very satisfactory. It is still my opinion that in years gone by everything in connection with immigration has not been what it might have. I think, however, that since Mr. Preston's appointment here, a great deal of the cause of complaint has, by his energetic methods, really been removed. Mr. Preston evidently had a very difficult problem before him when he first took over the post, and he seems to have organized the business very well.'

I think a tribute such as that, coming from the hon. member for Halton, entirely disposes of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The next person against whom attack was directed was Mr. Lazarus, who was working with Mr. Preston, and working, I presume, for the money he would make out of it. I do not know that there is any objection to Mr. Lazarus, because he happened to be a Jew, trying to make an honest dollar. If I am correctly informed, Mr. Lazarus is now employed by the Canadian Manufacturer's Association, an organization with which hon. gentlemen opposite will hardly have any fault to find. When Mr. Lazarus was working last year in connection with Mr. Preston he was painted as about the blackest man in London. This year he is found a fit representative of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. Next year he may be a Conservative member of parliament, if he can find a constituency to elect him; this I give as merely showing the process of evolution in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite as to the question of immigration. It has been strongly argued that there was no reason for secrecy in carrying on this propaganda for immigrants to Canada. Because there were offices in London and the work was done openly there, it is argued that there was no danger to any person in carrying on similar work in continental Europe. I do not have to go as far back as the arrest in Germany of the private secretary of the High Commissioner, or to show that Lord Strathcona was practically threatened with arrest. I have here the evidence of Mr. Preston—page 344 of the report of last year—referring to the effect of the law in Scandinavia. I give this in answer to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). He stated that, although there was a law against this immigration propaganda in Scandinavia, yet agents were openly conducting the business and no fault found with them. Until facts are produced to show that Mr. Preston's evidence is not true, after the certificate given by the hon. member for Halton, which I have just read, I think we must accept this statement of Mr. Preston as correct:

The fact of engaging to carry on a propaganda was recently illustrated by the experience of the British consul at one of the Scandinavian ports gone into with the authorities. A leading lumbering firm in Nova Scotia wanted labour and sent to some booking agent in Sweden with a view to getting a supply. The booking agent asked the assistance of the British consul who made some inquiries and reported the firm as being responsible. He, therefore, incidentally vouched for the labour being available for the prospective emigrants on their arrival. The booking agent, of course, was interested in it. He got his commission on the sale of the tickets, but the consul, simply for the moral assistance which he rendered in the matter came under police surveillance, and was heavily fined for the interest he had thus taken in the matter, the reason alleged being the unsatisfactory nature of the employment.

Now, I ask reasonable gentlemen on the other side—and there are gentlemen on the other side who are reasonable—how they can say that there was no danger in carrying on this propaganda and no need for secrecy? It is true that they say that, in that case, the government had no right to enter into the contract. The government, so far as they were concerned, provided in the contract that nothing should be done to infringe the laws of any country. But, if these people were to do business, if they were to give us the immigrants, they had to carry on this propaganda and, in so doing, at least technically violate, not so much, the laws of the country as the police regulations by which people might be exposed, fined, and even imprisoned for very trifling actions.

After the attack on the gentlemen I have named had subsided to some extent, the next object was to get the names of the incorporators of the North Atlantic Trading

Company. In the argument of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) there was one point against him which he himself thought it necessary to refer to, because he knew that it would be seen as a weak point in his armour by hon. members on this side. The outcry in this North Atlantic Trading Company case, was not that we were not getting the results. It was not contended that we were carrying on a different plan of immigration from the Conservative government or that we adopted different processes in carrying it on. It was admitted that we paid £1 per head, as they had paid £1 per head. But hon. gentlemen opposite are compelled to admit that where they got hundreds of immigrants we got thousands and even tens of thousands. If these immigrants were any good, then all we have done is to pay £1 per head as was done in the olden days; and instead of having a few hundreds or a few thousands of people, we have hundreds of thousands within the last six or seven years since this contract was entered into.

Mr. SPROULE. Lord Strathcona said that he thought we would get as many if we didn't pay anything.

Mr. CARVELL. I am aware that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) does not know anything more about what Lord Strathcona said than a man who lives in the Yukon, because when the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) challenged him this morning to state what was in Lord Strathcona's letter, the member for East Grey could not say.

Mr. SPROULE. I have it here; I got it for the purpose of reading it; it is written to Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) has the floor, and it is only by his permission that the member for East Grey can ask a question.

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. gentleman wishes to ask me a question, I am willing to grant him the privilege, and would have been willing, but he has not asked the privilege.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said that when I was invited to read what Lord Strathcona said I was not able to do so. I have the letter here before me, and will read it if allowed to do so.

Mr. CARVELL. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. In a letter addressed to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in the month of May, 1906, Lord Strathcona says:

> Briefly, therefore, I will conclude by saying that I am and always have been in favour of a vigorous emigration policy on the continent, in the United States and in the United Kingdom.

Passing over a few sentences——

Mr. CARVELL. Read it all.

Mr. SPROULE (reading):

> I am inclined to the opinion that the immigration which has taken place would have been at least as large in ordinary circumstances under the arrangement heretofore in force.

Mr. CARVELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman has had a chance to read his letter, if it is any gratification to him, because it is no harm to me.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman take back his statement?

Mr. CARVELL. No, I will not.

Mr. SPROULE. He is not manly enough to do it.

Mr. CARVELL. I am not called upon to do it; I don't have to do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was going to call attention to the fact that the gravamen of the charge against the government last year was that they had refused to divulge the names of the gentlemen composing this company, because some of them must be either members of the government, officials of the government, or some person connected with the government of Canada. I do not know that this statement was made openly in the House, but I do know it was made in the committees, it was made in the newspapers, and was heralded from one end of Canada to the other, that gentlemen who had been officers of the government were asked in the committee if they had any interest in, or if they knew any other officer of the government who had any interest in this contract; and the inference was drawn, if the positive statement was not made, that the reason this government did not dare to divulge these names was because somebody interested in the government, somebody whose name the government did not wish to be disclosed, was interested in these contracts, and therefore they were compelled to keep the name secret. My answer to that, an answer that satisfied the people, an answer which has never been referred to by hon. gentlemen of the opposition until this afternoon, an answer that effectually silenced criticism, was the statement of the First Minister in this House, when he held in his hand a piece of paper which he assured the leader of the opposition contained the names of the incorporators of this company, stating that in confidence he would give it to the leader of the opposition in order to prove that not a Canadian, not a member of parliament, not an official of this government, not a person connected with this government, was interested in any way, shape or form with this North Atlantic Trading Company. I would like to know what more hon. gentle-

men wanted after that. If there was nobody in this country interested, if the government was not at all concerned with the management, what more could hon. gentlemen want—unless nothing could satisfy them, and that seems to be the case. Because, after the matter has died out in the country, they now try to bring it up by a side issue, they try to bring it up by asking Mr. Beddoe to give, not the members of the company themselves, but the names of the agents with whom the company did business. The Committee on Agriculture, by an almost unanimous vote, with the exception of only four members, I think, voted against the question asking Mr. Beddoe to give these names, because Mr. Beddoe claimed the privilege for himself, and the committee, I think very properly, refrained from compelling him.

An hon. MEMBER. A party vote.

Mr. CARVELL. Well, the number that voted in favour of the proposition was very small, and I am glad it was small; I am glad to know there were only four men in that committee who would ask an official of the government to reveal something with which that committee had nothing to do, and which was of no interest to the people of Canada. I admit that had the government themselves been paying this North Atlantic Trading Company, we will say in Sweden, Norway or Austria-Hungary, then it would have been pertinent to the issue, and the hon. gentlemen would have had the right to ask Mr. Beddoe the names of these agents. But we were not paying any money to these people, we never agreed to pay them a dollar, we never have agreed to pay them a dollar, we never will pay a dollar to these people. They were simply the servants of the North Atlantic Trading Company. And if, by getting these names, we were not going to get anything for the trouble, it seems to me that it is only common sense and common humanity that committees of this House should refrain from compelling a witness to divulge those names when it was none of our business, could serve no public interest, and when it did not relate in any way to the expenditure of public money.

Now, the next question that came up was a request by the member for Jacques Cartier for a list of the printers who did the printing for the company; that brings me to the question at issue. It is a fact—and the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) at first I thought favoured the proposition, and then condemned it—that when payment was claimed from the Auditor General, he refused to pay it, because in one or two instances he had not the original documents proving that the $15,000 had been expended in printing, as called for by clause 3 of the contract. I will read the exact words of the Auditor General, as stated by Mr. Beddoe:

> The Auditor General refused to pay any further account of the North Atlantic Trading Company until a responsible officer of the Department of the Interior would give him a certificate to the effect that the books, vouchers and accounts of the company had been examined, and that the sums specified in section 3 of the contract had been expended during the years 1903-4, 1904-5 and 1905-6.

And in pursuance of that decision of the Auditor General, Mr. Beddoe was sent to Europe to make an investigation. Now, Sir, I submit, and it must be admitted by everybody, that Mr. Beddoe went to Europe for the purpose, not to satisfy the government by any means, but to satisfy the Auditor General that these moneys had actually been expended. He went there as the agent of the Auditor General, he went there for the purpose of satisfying the Auditor General that the moneys had been expended. And when he went there, he said that he had no difficulty whatever in finding the offices, they were there on the principal street of Amsterdam, just as you would expect to find any other business office. Their books were thrown open to him, everything was plain and above board. But finally he came to one account or more—and I gathered this morning from the statements of the Minister of the Interior that there was more than one account—of which the originals were not furnished to the department. But if you will read the evidence of Mr. Beddoe—and I was there during the whole of it—there was only one account, an account for some $2,200 of a firm in Hamburg, which was not produced, and which is not now on file in the Department of the Interior. I will then only discuss that one account. When it came to this one account, the secretary of the company objected to showing him the original unless he would first promise that he would not divulge the names. Mr. Beddoe finally consented, and here I want to read every word said by Mr. Beddoe in that connection. At page 81 of Mr. Beddoe's evidence we find:

> I wish to be as respectful as I can to the members of the committee and place myself right with them. I have now been accustomed to figures for forty years and I think I went into the matter pretty thoroughly when I was in Europe. I anticipated that questions would be asked, probably in the Public Accounts Committee or in this committee, and therefore I studied all sides of this question, although it is only a small matter, the expenditure of $15,000 a year. But when the secretary of the North Atlantic Trading Company asked me as a favour not to press for the production of this voucher I said: 'I cannot audit the books thoroughly until I have seen that there is a receipted account from this paper that the money has been paid.' He produced it but would not give it to me; he only furnished a duplicate with a declaration that it was correct. After going over the figures for that year I found that instead of the $15,000 which they were asked to expend, there

was a sum of $18,283.79 expended in 1905-6, or a surplus of $3,283.79 over and above what was called for by the contract. The amount of the account in question, which they would not allow me to bring back with me, amounted to about $2,200, so that eliminating that altogether there was still between one or two thousand dollars expended over and above the $15,000 called for by section 3 of the contract. We spoke of this and I said : 'Very well then, I won't press the matter and I will promise you that I won't reveal the name of this printer.'

I find that by reading the evidence of Mr. Beddoe and eliminating entirely the account of the printer which they objected to making public, still more than $15,000 had been expended. Mr. Beddoe tells us he went through the books, the invoices were all produced and he explained the whole transaction. The question was raised this morning: How do we know that this literature was sent out in these countries? Why, we have Mr. Beddoe's evidence. Mr. Beddoe says at page 83: That he satisfied himself that this printing actually was distributed over the country. I read from the evidence :

Q. Did you satisfy yourself that the printing was done ?—A. Yes, sir, I have copies of the printed material here with me now. I examined the distribution in the books in which they entered the date, the name of the consignee, and the quantity and description of the literature that was distributed, so that I was pretty well satisfied.

I would like to know now in the face of this evidence how hon. gentlemen can come here and claim that this money was not expended according to the terms of the contract. The only answer that they can give is that they believe that Mr. Beddoe went there as an agent of the Auditor General, came back here, and made a report and then went before a committee of this House and deliberately perjured himself in order to pull the government out of some trouble they may be in.

Mr. HAGGART. Was Beddoe an agent of the Auditor General?

Mr. CARVELL. He was sent there by the Auditor General.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Why was the contract annulled by the government?

Mr. CARVELL. I am not a member of the government and not in their secrets and so I am not able to answer the question. I may say, however, that as far as results are concerned the contract was producing everything the people of Canada could possibly ask. I presume there must have been some reasons or the government would not have cancelled the contract.

I have discussed this at greater length than I expected to, but it seems to me that when Mr. Beddoe was sent there for a specific purpose, to satisfy the Auditor General that this money was expended; when he went there and looked at those books and invoices; when he had the benefit of the assistance of two or three gentlemen who spoke all the different languages of Europe, when he had all those books and papers in hand, and he says he brought all the accounts but one, and that one account he saw, saw the original with his own eyes, examined it, obtained a copy of it which is now in the Interior Department, and was before the Agriculture Committee; when he swore that the copy which was before the committee was an exact copy of the original, when he has all this evidence then Sir, the only way you can challenge this evidence is to say that Mr. Beddoe has perjured himself and therefore we ought not to believe any of his evidence. I contend that none of my hon. friends opposite will go that far in order to gain what may seem to them to be a little party advantage. It seems to me that Mr. Beddoe conducted himself in a very careful and prudent manner, he did everything a reasonable man could be expected to do. He went there and by the most critical examination possible satisfied himself that this company had expended the money and they have to-day on the files of the Interior Department which were produced before the committee and examined by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) the original invoices and bills of more than $15,000 worth of printing done in 1905-6—and all this trouble is simply because printing over and above the $15,000 was done by a firm who did not want their name divulged for very good reasons given and therefore Mr. Beddoe refused to divulge the names. I think this House would be not only doing an injustice to Mr. Beddoe, but would be stultifying itself if it asked Mr. Beddoe to come here now and divulge the names which he says they asked him not to divulge. I therefore think this resolution should be voted down.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I had not intended taking any part in this discussion, in fact not being a member of the Public Accounts Committee and not having attended the meetings of the Agriculture Committee during the last part of the session, I am not as familiar with the proceedings of those committees as hon. members who took an active part in them, and I preferred that this discussion should be continued by hon. members who could speak from actual knowledge gained in the committees. I may say, however, that it has always appeared to me to be a most high handed measure on the part of the chairman of these committees to interfere with a witness sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and direct the witness that he should not answer a question that practically he was sworn to answer. Whether that is actually perjury on

the part of a witness who refuses to answer a question that he has sworn to answer is something I am not going to say, but to my mind the gentleman who directs a witness to refuse to answer a question that he has sworn he will answer is equally guilty with the man who refuses to answer the question. So far as I can judge that seems a most high handed action. When the country comes to judge of the action of these men it will condemn the chairmen of these committees more than the witnesses themselves. The country cannot understand why evidence should be suppressed, why evidence that could be forthcoming is not given simply because some man, the chairman of a committee, or a minister tells the witness that he should not answer a question. I would like to know by what authority the minister has given instructions to these men not to answer the questions which they are sworn to answer.

I rose particularly to refer to the reference made to me by the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). He has chosen to read from an interview that took place in London, and I am not going to dispute that the interview was exactly correct. I remember that a gentleman called upon me in my hotel in Bedford Place, in London, last September, and I remember having a discussion with him and I understood later on that he represented 'Canada.' I do not know that there is anything in that interview that I desire to-day to change. I do not know that the hon. gentleman has proved anything by reading the statements I then made. I do not know that he has proved from that statement that Beddoe was justified in not answering these questions; I do not know he has proved that Mr. Preston did not hug the machine. I met Mr. Preston in London and I was treated by him with the greatest courtesy. I have been personally asquainted with Mr. Preston for many years; I was politically opposed to him always, but otherwise we were on friendly terms, and I remember Mr. Preston saying to me in London that his political friends were greater enemies of his than his political opponents. I repeat here, that if Mr. Preston was responsible for the transfer of the emigration office from dark and dingy Victoria street to the centre of the city in Charing Cross he is deserving of credit, and in that connection I approve of Mr. Preston's conduct. As regards the staff of the London office, let me say that Mr. Preston's office is up a narrow stairway, and unless I had a guide I would not be able to find it out. Mr. Preston does not meet those who call to make inquiries; they are met by the staff and that is the staff to which I had reference when I said they were a courteous set of officials who seemed to discharge their duties well. I do not think I was saying anything wrong when I spoke of these gentlemen as I found them.

Mr. CARVELL. Neither do I.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know what the meaning of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) was in referring to this matter, unless it was to prove that Beddoe should not be allowed to tell the truth. I was treated by the immigration staff in London with courtesy and with more than courtesy.

Mr. BERGERON. Don't tell what it was.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not ashamed to tell it. I felt very grateful to the staff of the emigration office, the more so that when I called at the Colonial office on Victoria street I received one of the coldest receptions that a man could possibly receive. I was told by the secretary there that if I would only call to-morrow he might do something for me, but I told him I was going to leave London and that hence he would not be troubled with me. I had the misfortune not to meet Lord Strathcona who was absent in Aberdeen, but I must say that if the reception I received at the Colonial office is the same that is accorded to members of parliament and other visitors from Canada, it is not very creditable to the officer in charge. When I went to the immigration office in Charing Cross I was rendered every assistance. An officer accompanied me as far as Windsor so that I might see Windsor castle and all about it. I presume that officer was paid by the Dominion, but he certainly did his duty, and I am grateful for any expense that may have been incurred. I received that courteous treatment from him which I think a member of parliament should receive. He took me even to the King's stable and all around.

Mr. BENNETT. Did you see the stud ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am sorry to say that the chief part of the stable had been moved to Aberdeen, but nevertheless I saw all it was possible to see. So far as I am concerned, I am thankful for the courtesy extended to me by the staff of the emigration office. These gentlemen were familiar with Canadian affairs, they were competent to talk about the country, and when I speak of the staff I am not referring specially to Mr. Preston because his duties do not bring him in contact with those who call at that office for information. At the same time, Mr. Preston accorded me every courtesy and I do not suppose, if I had been one of the strongest Liberals, he could have done any more than he did. I met the celebrated Lazarus and had a conversation with him. I was invited to go to his office, but I respectfully declined, and consequently I did not see the interior of his sanctum or learn what kind of business he was carrying on. I understand that what purported to be interviews with me were cabled to Canada, but I frankly admit I am not aware I was interviewed otherwise

than by 'Canada.' Of course, if you drop a remark in London, a newspaper man may be around and you are reported and you do not know it. But no doubt what was reported in 'Canada' was practically what I said, and I do not think there is anything in it that I need be ashamed of. Now, if the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) is satisfied, I may proceed to say that I shall support the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) which is an eminently proper resolution. I believe that the government has no right to suppress the evidence which is demanded by the Public Accounts Committee. The action of the government creates a suspicion that there is something radially wrong behind the scenes. In conclusion, I wish to say that I do not believe that if everything was fair, and square, and above board, and honest, in this contract, the Minister of the Interior would hesitate for a moment to expose it to broad daylight.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, in the few moments during which I shall ask the indulgence of the House I shall try to confine myself to the principle which I understand underlies the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). In one sense it may be a comparatively small matter whether Mr. Beddoe answers certain questions or not; but I quite agree with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) that no more important question has come before the House this session, or is to come before it, than the principle which underlies this motion. That I understand to be the power of parliament to require answers from witnesses. When I listened to the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), I saw why there was perhaps a difference of opinion between hon. members on the two sides of the House, and I sincerely hope that hon. members who hold as he does, hold for reasons similar to his. He is quite clear that Mr. Beddoe is an agent of the Auditor General. I am myself inclined to agree with the hon. member for Carleton in his premises, and certainly his logic is irrefutable. If Mr. Beddoe was an agent of the Auditor General, I am not sure that we have a right to pry into the private affairs of these two gentlemen. But applying the reasoning of the hon. gentleman, if Mr. Beddoe happens to be an employee of the people of Canada, then the people of Canada surely have as high rights as the Auditor General. If I understand the case, the people of Canada sent Mr. Beddoe to the old country to do their business; they footed the Bills; and the question is whether or not the people of Canada, having sent their agent to do certain work for them, and having footed the Bills, are entitled to a report, or whether certain private individuals are to receive the report instead of the people of Canada. Now, time brings many extraordinary changes; but I venture to think that if the shades of some of the leaders of the Reform party who graced the politics of Canada in days gone by and have now gone to their rest, could return to this mundane sphere, nothing would surprise them more than the position held to-day by those who mask in their clothes and falsely pretend to be their followers. If there was one line of demarcation which in former days was more distinct than another between the two parties, it was the fidelity with which the Reform party claimed to represent the people and sought to wrest from the Crown the control of the people's money because the people contributed it. Where is the Reform party to-day? The people still contribute the money, but the Reform party to-day is the party which declines to allow the representatives of the people to investigate and ascertain how that money has been spent and who has received it. Hon. gentlemen opposite must not forget that none of us sit in this House merely to represent the constituency which elects us. The principle of our constitution is very different from that. The theory, as one speaker said, is that all the people of Canada meet in parliament to legislate on matters which touch all the people of Canada; but as it is practically impossible for all of them to meet here, the country is divided into districts each one of which is asked to send a representative, not of that district, but of the people of Canada; and therefore every member sitting in this House represents all the people of Canada. If that be the case, then each member of the House, whether on the government side or on the opposition side, has a right to ask on behalf of his constituents, the whole people of Canada, what is being done with their money. If this were the only case in which difficulties have arisen, it would perhaps be less serious; but it is well known that for years the principle has been applied, and is daily being applied more frequently, that the government majority can control what investigations shall be held, what evidence shall be taken, what questions shall be asked and what answers given, even by witnesses brought here by the opposition. I submit that when we go into a committee, be it the Committee on Agriculture or the Committee on Public Accounts, the duty of every member of that committee, no matter on which side of the House he sits, is to do his best to audit the accounts brought before him. May lays down in a few words what the effect of auditing a public account should be when he says:

> The researches made by the committee and the publication of their reports ensure on behalf of the House of Commons an effectual examination of the public accounts.

That is the object of the committee—to ensure on behalf of the House of Com-

mons an effectual examination of the public accounts; and the committee has certain powers given it by this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that the powers of the committee are limited. It is most extraordinary that these hon. gentlemen consider that members of this House sitting in committee have such limited powers to examine witnesses—that they are so afraid that some chance word will hurt somebody when we are trying to find out what is done with the money of the people of Canada whose representatives we are; and yet the ministers themselves may appoint a body called an insurance commission, with such powers that it can investigate the most secret recesses of a man's private business, even insisting on the production of his bank account, and not one word of protest is heard from hon. gentlemen opposite. But let a member of parliament endeavour to ascertain what has been done with the people's money, and the very gentlemen who should assist us in doing so, take no interest or part in it, except to block any investigation that may be attempted by gentlemen on this side of the House. I would like hon. gentlemen to consider what the inevitable result of this must be. In one sense it may be a small matter whether or not certain questions are allowed to be asked in a committee, with regard to what has been done with public money; but, on the other hand, it is of the utmost importance that every one who handles public money should realize that he is liable to be called to account for the manner in which he handles it. Only last session—I might refer to cases this session if the rules of the House did not preclude me from doing so—we had a case before the Public Accounts Committee which exactly illustrates the objection raised by the hon. member for Carleton here to-day. A man named Merwin was brought before the Public Accounts Committee. It was shown that he sold goods to the value of a quarter of a million dollars a year to the people of Canada, some in his own name and some in the name of Brooks & Company; and when we examined his books we found that Brooks & Company was simply himself under another name. We had evidence as to the value of the goods, and we found that they had been sold to the government at a profit of from fifty to one hundred per cent; and when we brought Merwin before the committee, after more trouble to get him than we experienced in the case of any other man, and endeavoured to ascertain what he had paid for those goods to see whether the people of Canada had been fleeced or not, he declined to answer; the chairman held that he was justified in declining to answer, and a majority of the committee supported the chairman. Surely it was a proper question, because Merwin had no goods to sell, but was a manufacturers' agent occupying a little room in Montreal, and was consulted whenever anything was wanted by the department, from a needle to an anchor. When we brought those who had sold the goods to him, they declined to answer what they had sold them for, saying that that would be prying into their private business.

And it was not until we took the course of asking these manufacturers at what prices they were selling these goods at that time in the ordinary market, that Mr. Merwin found it was idle to any longer refuse to reply and that the committee came to the conclusion that he should be instructed to reply. Then Mr. Merwin got permission to leave the committee in order that he might call up his partner by telephone and get information from him. He was absent an hour, but we have reason to believe that he did not spend that hour in the telephone box but spent it in the minister's office and did not go to the telephone at all. And then when he came back, he gave evidence as to the prices paid. Now that this experience with Mr. Merwin has become a matter of history, I would ask whether those who voted in the committee that he should not be obliged to tell how much he had paid for the goods in order that the people might ascertain how much they had lost by this dishonest or bungling way of doing business or those members of the committee who insisted that he should give this information were doing their duty to the public? Who were acting in the public interests—those who sought to obtain the evidence or those who were doing their best to block it? We had another experience of the kind last year in the matter of the furnishing of supplies to the steamer 'Arctic.' That matter was referred to a special committee for investigation. At every step and on every hand those members of the committee who sought to ascertain the facts were hampered by the government supporters. Motion after motion was made to ascertain the facts and voted down continuously and consistently by the majority of the committee. We asked that an accountant be instructed to go through the invoices and the requisitions for supplies and the goods on hand. But our request was voted down. We asked to have samples of the various goods purchased produced before the committee, but that proposition met with a similar fate. When I went to Toronto and Montreal in order to get information from men in the trade so as to ascertain whether or not the prices charged were proper prices, I was told that unless they were shown the samples it would be impossible for them to give evidence. There was hardly an article purchased, in which there were not various qualities. They said: Let us see the samples, and we will tell you the prices but otherwise we cannot. Take for example a fur coat. You can buy a fur coat for $15 or $20 or for $400 or $500, how could any man put a valuation on a

fur coat purchased for the Arctic expedition without seeing it? And if he did not see it, how could he possibly imagine that what was charged as a fur coat was merely canvass on the outside and sheep skin within? That illustrates the disadvantage under which the members of the committee, who were endeavouring to do their duty, were under by reason of their attempts to elicit evidence being balked by hon. gentlemen opposite. And not only were these efforts balked in the committee, but this House seems to have suffered under a like misconception of its duties, because when the report of the committee, based on insufficient evidence, was brought before this House, this House solemnly voted that it was absolutely correct. A report which stated that all the evidence offered had been taken, when every man in the House knew that the committee had steadily refused to admit the evidence, was accepted by this House as a complete and impartial report. It is because this policy of refusing to admit evidence has been followed in so many cases that I appeal to members of this House who, as representatives of the people, are bound to see that the people's money has been honestly expended, to put an end to it. Is it any wonder, when such a policy is followed, that our expenditures should have increased from $40,000,000 a year to over $100,000,000? Is it any wonder that we should find ministers recreant to their duty and allowing contractors, middlemen and others to mulct this country in most extravagant sums and deputy heads vouching for these expenditures, when we find committee after committee of investigation persistently refusing to have any light thrown upon the transactions, and this House endorsing them in their efforts to block legitimate inquiry?

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, in the course of his remarks the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) referred to this as a dead issue. I think that on the part of that hon. gentleman, and even more on the part of the members of the cabinet, there is a strong desire that this should be considered a dead issue. The silence of hon. members opposite, especially those from Ontario, is a pretty fair indication that these hon. gentlemen feel most uncomfortable to be called upon to vote on this question, and that they will vote in silence rather than attempt the impossible task of justifying their vote. If there is a department of the government whose increase of expenditure has been more noticeably abnormal than another, it is this department of Immigration and Quarantine. The expenditure in 1904-5 shows an increase over that of 1896-7 of $676,675. As one goes about the country he hears the repeated inquiry, made by men irrespective of politics, why is there such an enormous increase in the public expense of Canada? Considering that the population is little more than it was ten years ago, and that the area of country administered is practically the same, it is hard to pretend that there can be a reason able ground for that increase. Here is one of the items that go to make up the tremendous aggregate increase. Now, those who have studied the immigration policy of Canada know that it has been worked as a political factor for ten years past. The former Minister of the Interior, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) matured a plan of settling these foreigners in large blocks, so that they might outweigh the English speaking vote in the several constituencies of the Northwest and Manitoba. These people were brought in not so much because they were desirable settlers, but as part of a scientific election system. In view of the fact, it is not to be wondered at that the hon. member for Brandon called to his assistance Mr. Smart and Mr. W. T. R. Preston, for both of these gentlemen were thoroughly versed in machine politics in Ontario and Manitoba. So, we have been filling up the Northwest at enormous expense to the country, sacrificing quality for quantity, a sacrificing of the interests of the country as a whole, to the advantage of a political party. Well, may hon. gentlemen opposite cherish the hope—a hope which is surely a vain one—that this whole question may be relegated to oblivion. My hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) tries to make light of this question on the ground that, though this matter has been in course of procedure for a long time, the facts have only lately been called attention to. But when you consider, Mr. Speaker, that in the Auditor General's Report you find the details of $90,000,000 of expenditure you see how impossible it is that gentlemen on this side of the House should scrutinize every item. Now, the payments to this company were returned in 1905, and are to be found in the Auditor General's Report of that year at page L—36. The amount charged in that year $38,966.66 was so large as to attract the attention of hon. gentlemen on this side. It can easily be understood how this matter slipped along year after year when the expenditures recorded must have been so small as to be not noticeable. But this was due to the fact that the items were kept back—whether studiously and purposely I say not, though, in all probability that was the reason why attention was not sooner directed to this matter. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B., also relied upon the arguments that the opposition in this House was a laughing stock in asking for the names of the members of this company, because the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had offered to communicate

those names to the leader of the opposition. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in what position would the leader of the opposition have been had he accepted the offer to learn those names under the pledge of secrecy which was the condition that the Prime Minister laid down. Why, had it turned out even that Mr. W. T. R. Preston was one of these parties, the leader of the opposition would have been estopped from mentioning his name in public. And the Prime Minister knew very well that his proposition could not and would not be accepted.

Now, the people of this country have the right to know where their money is going and why. That is the reason they ask today for every detail of this swollen expenditure which has increased by the enormous sum of nearly $700,000 as compared with ten years ago. The attempt is made to justify this increased expenditure by citing the influx of population into the Northwest. What sane man will attribute to the government that influx of population? Why the government could not have prevented the people from going to the Northwest, even if they desired to do so. What has the government had to do with bringing in hundreds of thousands of settlers from the United States? Railway communication has been mainly responsible for that.

I shall not go into the details of this North Atlantic Trading question at great length. But one point is quite clear, and that is, that from the outset this concern has been regarded with the gravest suspicion. From the first investigation of the matter, the idea has prevailed, and still prevails that everything was not square and above board in these transactions. First, consider the case of Mr. Smart. That gentleman occupied the position of deputy minister of the Crown, with a very considerable salary. He had before him the fact that after a certain number of years of service he would be entitled to superannuation. It has not been the rule with deputy ministers to resign lucrative positions and their prospects of superannuation with liberal allowances? But Mr. Smart left his position. And immediately after his resignation, where do we find him? Why, we find him in the employ of this very North Atlantic Trading Company. And more: Certain things were done by Mr. Smart before he left the government's employ. I will be bound that, in the annals of parliamentary history in this or any other country no such act has been performed as that performed by Mr. Smart in this connection. Here is a high-priced official leaving his office to be employed by a company which has had dealings, under suspicious circumstances, with the very department of which he was the deputy head. And this gentleman, Mr. Smart has been forced to admit that, before he left his office, every scrap of paper, every detail in connection with this matter, both the confidential and public records, has been by him or by those under him destroyed. I challenge any hon. gentleman on the other side to contradict that. Consider: The man who is supposed to be safeguarding the interests of this Dominion upon leaving the official duties for which he had been paid and handsomely paid, burns the books, not merely his own personal property, but those belonging to the people of this Dominion. Little wonder is it that public suspicion has attached to every detail of this affair between the Department of the Interior and Mr. Smart.

Mr. MILLER. If the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) will allow a question: I think Mr. Smart, in his evidence, did not say that he had burned any books, and I think that he said that the correspondence that he had destroyed was not correspondence belonging to the department but to himself.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) will take the trouble to read the evidence he will find that Mr. Smart particularly referred to letter-books.

Mr. MILLER. Not letter-books belonging to the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) is one of those who will apologize for this government, no matter what it does.

Mr. MILLER. I am only asking the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) to state the facts.

Mr. BENNETT. I notice that that hon. gentleman, no matter what the case may be, always comes to the rescue of the government. That is his right, I do not complain of that, but it is a matter that he will have to settle with his electors. Now, the hon. gentleman who preceded me in this debate called in evidence the fact that Mr. Preston was connected with this concern, and for that reason the enterprise must be regarded without distrust and without suspicion. Why, I say here, as a challenge to that hon. gentleman, and to any other hon. gentleman from Ontario, that there is no man in this House who sits on the Liberal side from Ontario who will dare to go into his riding and say one word in support of the character or reputation of W. T. R. Preston. His name stinks in the nostrils of the people of Ontario, a man who has been reported in the courts, a man who has been driven out of the province of Ontario by the Ross government. And here I want to pay one tribute to the Ross government; the Ross government was as white as snow compared with the record of this government, and the Lord knows that it was bad enough. This government is following in the same wake with the Ross government, so far as Ontario is concerned. They are simply defying public opinion, and when an hon. gentleman stands up in this House and invokes the name of W. T. R. Preston as a warrant or

authority for anything done by this government, then I say that his argument will carry very little weight in the province of Ontario.

But we are given one reason, and that is the main reason, why no mention should be made of these names. We are told, with the greatest possible gravity, that there are men connected with this concern who, if their names were disclosed, would commit suicide. Sir, could anything more absurd be adduced in an argument on a public platform, at least in a deliberative body like the Canadian House of Commons? It is utterly impossible.

Now, so far as this Mr. Beddoe is concerned, it must be remembered, as was pointed out by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), that he does not occupy the position of immunity that other civil servants occupy who may be in the employ of the Auditor General's Department. The public have got to understand that the Auditor General is practically above governments, that the Auditor General can do what he pleases in this country; and I think it follows, therefore, that the men in his employ can do what they please also. But to say that because this man went into the employ of the government under a Conservative administration, for that reason he is perfectly correct in his dealings, is absurd. I do not know Mr. Beddoe personally, I have no doubt he is a very estimable gentleman. But I do know this, that Mr. Beddoe, like some other gentlemen, I have no doubt, feels hanging over his head that threat which was made here the other day by the hon. member for Westmoreland with reference to other officials. Why, every one knows to-day that officials in the different departments simply carry their lives in their hands, or feel that they do; and was it to be expected that Mr. Beddoe was going to disobey his instructions one iota? Mr. Beddoe, no doubt, received certain instructions, and he has followed them out to the letter. But Mr. Beddoe is not so much an official of this government as he is of the people of Canada, and he has been dealing on this occasion with the affairs of the people of Canada. When the people of Canada observe these enormous amounts that have been disbursed for immigration purposes, they have a perfect right to know to whom they are paying their money, and for that reason I shall have great pleasure in supporting this resolution of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier.

Now, I am going to refer to another phase of the question that has been mentioned this afternoon, and that is in regard to the now notorious—for I think it may be called notorious—Public Accounts Committee of this House. I have been a member of this House for a number of years, and I can remember that fifteen or sixteen years ago such a thing as a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee was a very rare occurrence. But now almost every day that committee is crowded and congested with work. And look at the spirit with which that work is approached. When one goes into that committee he is surprised at the way it is conducted. That was manifest the other day by a witness who was under oath to give his evidence as an honest man, and when he was trying to do so truthfully and honestly, the laughter that greeted the remarks he made, which were damaging to the government, was so loud and so continuous that the witness himself protested against the levity of the committee. I refer to the evidence of Mr. Hugh Calderwood, in the Collingwood Dry Dock case. It is looked upon as a perfect bear garden, where hon. gentlemen on the ministerial side are supposed to do—what? To give the people an opportunity of seeing where their money goes? Not at all; it has all the appearance of a regular court, where certain gentlemen are appointed for the defence of certain cases; and it is a strange thing to remark that the legal gentlemen from Ontario steer very clear of that committee. They do not seem to care to have a hand in the doings there at all. Day after day it seems to be the case that one hon. gentleman will try to silence and choke off an investigation into affairs in his own riding, and on a subsequent day he will render assistance to some other hon. gentleman to choke off an investigation in his riding, giving one good turn for another. That committee has been ringing this session with charges of graft that stand unparalled in the history of this country.

Now, I think it should be said in fairness to that committee that a great deal of the trouble is due to the fact that different decisions are given by different chairmen. In the first place, the hon. the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) is, I believe, the chairman of that committee. Unfortunately, through illness, he has been usually and unavoidably absent from the committee, and what is the result? The result is that the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) has on most occasions presided, and so it happens that when the senior member for Ottawa has given a ruling one day in favour of allowing certain evidence, a few days later, in another case on all fours with it, the hon. member for Verchères rules similar evidence out. There has been no uniformity in the rulings of the chair. More than that, the hon. member for Verchères, for reasons best known to himself, has often been absent, and other hon. gentlemen are selected as chairmen, and in consequence there has been no permanency in the decisions of the chair. So great has been the political stress, the political exigencies in that committee, that the decisions of the chair are tinged with the opinions of the gentleman who, from time to time, occupies the chair.

I have every respect for my hon. friend from Verchères for his courteous bearing in the chair; but I must join with other hon. gentlemen in saying that I think he is rather tinged with partisanship. It is often unnecessary for any appeal to be made by a member for the protection of interests, because the hon. member for Verchères intervenes himself. Let me give a case in point. A certain official of this government had to give a valuation in the Public Accounts Committee on a government work. That gentleman had, I know as a matter of fact, made a demand on this company, the Collingwood Dry Docks, that they should pay him a very large sum for giving his report, because on his report depended whether the company should gain a subsidy of $300,000—no inconsiderable amount. This gentleman, the engineer of the Public Works Department, Mr. Coste, acting as arbitrator, made a demand on this company for a very considerable amount, and what was the result? We succeeded in placing in the box the manager of that company, a gentleman who had the letter, and what did that gentleman say when he was asked this question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct your attention to the fact that the matter the hon. gentleman is discussing now is still under consideration of the Public Accounts Committee and I doubt very much whether the hon. gentleman has any right to say that the inquiry is closed, that the matter has been reported to the House, and to discuss it. When the time comes he will find the members on this side of the House perfectly willing to discuss it.

Mr. BENNETT. The motion passed by the committee was that the evidence should be reported from day to day, and be printed and I have consequently got a copy of the evidence under that rule. It is in the hands of hon. gentlemen. Knowing as I do as a fact that this Mr. Calderwood, who is the manager of this company, had addressed to him by Mr. Coste a letter demanding a large amount before his valuation which be made for services he alleged he had performed for this company, Mr. Calderwood was questioned while on the stand and I shall not use my own words but shall put in the very evidence that was given. In answer to the hon. member for South Simcoe he gave this testimony:

Q. I want to ask two or three questions. Have you received, have you got in your possession, a letter from Mr. Coste making a demand of three per cent on $500,000?—A. I have not.

Q. Have you a letter making a demand at all?—A. I have not.

Q. Have you ever had a letter of that kind?—A. I don't think it is necessary to answer that question.

Q. Well, I think it is?—A. Well, I appeal to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not obliged to say.

Mr. LENNOX. Why not?

The CHAIRMAN. Because it is a personal affair between them.

Now, sir, who could conceive a more extraordinary or outrageous case? Here is a Mr. Coste, employed by the people of this country, paid a very handsome salary—and I want to be fair to Mr. Coste, Mr. Coste says: I was allowed by the then minister, Mr. Tarte, to do certain work.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Why do you want to discuss that now?

Mr. BENNETT. Because it displeases my hon. friend.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I rise to a point of order and repeat the point taken by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston). I heard the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) say a motion had been passed that the evidence should be reported from day to day. My understanding is that no such motion was passed, and if that is correct he has no right to discuss the matter at this stage.

Mr. BENNETT. The fact is that the evidence is here and the minutes of the Public Accounts Committee are up there, and the hon. gentleman can get them and then if I am out of order I of course will bow to the facts.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The hon. member is certainly out of order.

Mr. FIELDING. We had better have an understanding. If the evidence has been reported and has come into possession of the House the hon. gentleman is right. There is a possibility that it is not germane to the original question but we will not press that but we should have an understanding as to whether this evidence is in possession of the House.

Mr, J. D. REID. I think the last report of the committee includes that evidence.

Mr. BENNETT. It is in the boxes to-day.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It is simply distributed.

Mr. BENNETT. What could be more extraordinary——

Mr. JOHNSTON. There is one way by which this——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is a well known rule of the House that unless the matter has been reported it cannot be referred to. If it has been reported the hon. gentleman is in order in referring to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Speaking to the point of order there was a distinct understanding in the committee that this matter was not to be reported for the use of members of the House, that is not for consideration

in the House. I do not know whether I read the report correctly but it was certainly my understanding of the report which reads as follows :——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the date ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The 27th of February.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was it brought to the House ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not know exactly when. The report bore date the 27th of February and I presume that is the date. It is as follows :

Your committee recommend that the evidence being taken in connection with the payment of $30,000 to the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company be printed from day to day for the use of members of the committee and that rule 72 be suspended in relation thereto.

That is the report of the committee. The understanding in the committee beyond question was that this matter was not to be considered by the House until the inquiry was closed, there could be no question about that.

Mr. FIELDING. The motion that the evidence be printed from day to day is simply to provide a substitute for the typewriting, for the conveniences of the members. That does not, I think, constitute a reporting to the House.

Mr. J. D. REID. The fact of the Public Accounts Committee reporting the proceedings up to a certain day including this evidence——

Mr. FIELDING. No, that is not the report.

Mr. BENNETT. It has all gone out in the public press and I am quite sure that the people who have read the evidence will take the same view of it that I take, that this is a most extraordinary proceeding under any government and had we been able to get at the full facts in connection with that letter there would have been disclosed a most inexplicable state of affairs. While I may not be able to refer to it, on this occasion I shall at a later date, and more than that I shall refer to it outside, and challenge any hon. gentleman to discuss on the platform the relations of a government official with a company earning $300,000 of a subsidy. That is the position of the committee under the guidance of the member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion). I think the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) wants to be fair and to do what is right, but it is simply in the air that there must be a certain amount of partisanship in that committee and in their attempt to vie with each other to check off all inquiry and investigation the member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) seems to have lapsed in with the rest and is perhaps on some occasions over zealous. That I infer has been the case in connection with this North Atlantic Trading Company. The public are interested in knowing where their money goes and to whom it goes and that is the strongest possible reason why I have great pleasure in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), a resolution that should commend itself to every fair-minded member of this House who wants to see the expenditure of public money laid before the people of this country, who are really, after all, the owners of the moneys we are spending, in the broadest and fullest possible way.

Mr. V. GEOFFRION (Verchères). I do not rise to speak on the merits of the motion presented by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). It has been discussed fully and anything I would say in favour of or against it, might not change the ideas and the opinions of the members of this House. However, I have been told that this morning whilst I was performing my duties as chairman of the Public Accounts Committee the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) accused me of gross partisanship in the fulfilment of my duty as chairman of that committee. Sir, I believe that he said more, and if I do not quote him correctly, as I was not here, he can correct me. I believe that he said that the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee was a disgrace to this parliament or something to that effect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. hear, hear.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Sir, if those words had been uttered by any other member of this House I would ask that they be expunged from the 'Hansard' of this House. Under the rules of the House, I think, I would have this right, but as the words come from the member for East Grey, I shall let them stand, and just simply say that I despise such an accusation. If anybody perchance should read the speeches of the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) and should come across these words, I have no doubt they will feel just as I do about it. Since I have been a member of the committee, I have endeavoured to discharge my duties to the best of my ability, and to be fair to everybody. I submit that the rules of procedure which should be followed in that committee, should be as nearly as possible similar to those which prevail in a court of law.

Mr. SPROULE. That is an evidence that the hon. gentleman has very little knowledge of the procedure in parliamentary committees.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I say it and I mean it.

Mr. GEOFFRION. We have every day in that committee a number of witnesses, some of whom are almost strangers to the

subject under consideration. There are some members of that committee, no doubt in the discharge of their duty, who display as much zeal as they can in what they believe to be their cause, and very often they ask questions which are altogether irrelevant. What would be the duty of a judge under such circumstances. A judge would follow the proceedings before him, and it is his duty to interfere to prevent questions being put which are not relevant to the issue. Now, the hon. gentleman from East Grey does not come very often to that committee, but when he does come I have heard him make the most remarkable arguments, perhaps I should say the most stupid arguments, in support of his contention, that any questions at all may be asked a witness and that the chairman of the committee was there simply to listen and not to interfere. I submit there must be some rule applied to the proceedings of the committee. Let me say to the members of this House, and especially to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that since I have been chairman of that committee I have endeavoured to be fair, and no threats or accusations will frighten me or bulldoze me not to do my duty in the future as I have done it in the past. I know just as well as these hon. gentlemen know, what the value of evidence is from a legal point of view, and I appeal to any hon. gentleman who is a member of that committee if I have not endeavoured to discharge my duty impartially. If I have not been fair it is certainly not because I did not try to be. I shall not discuss the merits of the motion, and I am not going to deal with that question any further——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat, I want to ask him, if I understood him to say, that in the committee, he administers the rules of evidence as they are understood in courts of law ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I did not say that. I said that the procedure in the committee must be as much as possible similar to the rules in a court of law. I do not think they should be altogether similar, for I admit that we must give as much latitude as possible. I do say, however, that there must be some rules followed, and that the contention of the member for East Grey cannot prevail, which is that he can force a witness to answer any questions he pleases such as if the witness has any debts, and if his property is in the name of his wife, and so forth. There is not a member of the legal profession in the House who will not endorse my opinion that such procedure would be absolutely irregular.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). This afternoon the hon. member for East Grey used an expression which was objected to but which he immediately withdrew in deference to the chair, and continued to argue that the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee were not conducted in a proper manner. I did not intend to say one word about the conduct of the proceedings before that committee by the chairman, but now that he has been reflecting upon the member for East Grey, I think it my duty to say a word or two upon the subject. I do not think that any hon. member of that committee will undertake to say dispassionately, that the proceedings have been conducted with a view to get at the facts. That is the question. The conduct of that committee during this session, from beginning to end, has not been with a view of getting at the facts. Let me say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Geoffrion) that the reports of the proceedings of the committee show, that he has gone away beyond what he now professes to have been doing. The extract read by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) this afternoon shows that the acting chairman had interjected an interruption in the examination of a witness, that was most unwarranted. A perfectly proper question had been put, and one that would never have been objected to in a court of law much less in a parliamentary committee. But the acting chairman did not wait for any objection to be made. It was of the utmost importance to the inquiry that we should ascertain what had become of the money paid for the lands for the Halifax cotton siding. It was of vital consequence that we should know who got the money. Mr. Henderson was the witness in the box. I am bound to say that I believe Mr. Henderson gave his evidence with absolute fairness and truthfulness; from first to last I never saw any idication that he desired to hide anything from friend or opponent; there is not a question about that in my mind. Mr. Henderson was asked to whom did the proceeds of the sale go, and he said the money was paid by cheque, and he was asked if he had that cheque and he said yes. There was no pretense of objection. The question was then asked. 'Will you produce the cheque'? Not a gentleman in the committee, anxious as they always were to stop anything that was inconvenient, said a word. The chairman turning to the witness, said: 'Remember, you are not obliged to give it unless you want to.' I ask, was that consistent with the position the hon. acting chairman has just represented to be his position in the committee? I say no. I will give another instance. I was myself examining a witness before the Public Accounts Committee, one who was trying to avoid answering any question whatever, and it was of the utmost consequence that he should be thoroughly tested in the examination. I had asked him question after question, and his answer always was: 'I do not know,' or something to that effect. I asked him repeatedly whether he had not told a different story to other people, as I knew beyond a doubt that he had. I have no

more doubt than I have of my own existence that that witness had told to other people the very opposite of what he was swearing. I asked him:

Q. Are you aware whether any of those vouchers that you brought back on this occasion were allowed then or subsequently ?—A. I am not.

Q. You never heard any of them were allowed ?—A. I never heard.

Q. Or any part of them ?—A. I never heard.

Q. Are you aware that at any time a disallowed item, or any part of it, was paid ?—A. I am not.

Q. When you say that you are not aware, do you mean that you have no personal knowledge of the matter or that you have never heard of it ?—A. I have neither personal knowledge, nor have I heard.

Q. Have you ever told any person that you did know that items that had been disallowed had been got through and had been got through by you ?—A. No.

Q. You never said that ?—A. No, I never did.

Q. You say that ? You thoroughly know what you are saying ?—A. I am under oath.

Q. You thoroughly understand what you are answering ?—A. Never.

Q. That you were able to get items passed that had been disallowed ?—A. I never did.

The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) objected to this mode of examining an unwilling witness on a very important subject. I wonder if he would make such an objection before a judge in a court of law.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Barker has not laid a foundation for contradicting this witness, and if it comes before me when I am in the chair, I will rule that he cannot call a witness for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the time for the objection of the hon. member for Lunenburg to my contradicting the witness was when I should call somebody to contradict him. The hon. member might then very properly have questioned my right to call a witness to contradict unless I had given that witness's name to the person whom I wanted to contradict. But at that moment I had not called the witness; but the hon. gentleman made that objection, and the chairman intimated in the presence of the witness that he would not allow me to contradict him. There was an unwilling witness from whom I was endeavouring to get the truth, a witness who I knew had told to other people the contrary of what he was then saying. I was trying to get the facts from him, and he was informed by the acting chairman that I would not be allowed to call a witness to contradict him. A pretty way to get the facts out of such a witness. I would not have said this but that I object under these circumstances to the acting chairman criticising members on this side of the House for their conduct in the committee.

While on my feet, I wish to say a word as to the general conduct of the proceedings of that committee. We frequently see it stated in the press that there are too many lawyers in this House.

Mr. OLIVER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. An hon. minister says, hear, hear. If he would visit the Public Accounts Committee, he would be much stronger in that opinion. I am a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, and I am not here to unduly find fault with lawyers; but I can only say that if members of the press and the farmers of this country could visit that committee, they would be inclined to move that every lawyer in it should be hanged. They would see that the proceedings of the lawyers in that committee made it absolutely impossible for it to investigate the accounts laid before it. I need not particularize. I do not think the opposition members want any obstruction in the committee; they are at work, from the very start of any inquiry to the end but from the other side there is a fire of objections from the legal gentlemen. These gentlemen seem to forget that the lawyers are not everybody in that committee. There are non-professional gentlemen there—farmers, merchants, manufacturers, and there are medical men who are professional in one sense. These gentlemen are not supposed to be au fait with all the technicalities of the law. If the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asks a question and does not put it in proper legal form and with the precision laid down in the law books, some young gentleman of the legal profession jumps up and tells him that he is out of order, that he has not done what he ought to have done before asking the question, and the chairman agrees with him, because as he tells us he has to carry on the proceedings as nearly as possible like those of a court of law. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if that is what the people of this country expect from a committee of business men inquiring, not into the law, but into the expenditures of the government. I heard the hon. member for St. James, Montreal (Mr. Gervais) stopping a member who was a non-professional man and telling him that he could not ask his question in this way, and he cited, I think, 'Greenleaf,' who laid down the rule on which he should proceed. All this was gravely discussed. The hon. gentleman cited his law books to confound the non-professional man, who was trying his prentice hand at questioning a witness. Now, I think it is not common sense to have that sort of proceeding in a committee of that kind. It might be possible, even in a well regulated House, not to have one lawyer on a committee and if these technical legal rules must be observed, how are we to get on ? Are gentlemen who do not belong to the legal profession to take a back seat, and let the lawyers do all the work ? I think not; and yet one would think that was the whole object of that Public Accounts Committee.

I would not say that the acting chairman deliberately tries to choke off discussion. But I would rather he did, for there is more mischief done by one acting as he does with all the good intentions in the world than would be done by a chairman who deliberately went to work to prevent investigation—for we could all the more quickly bring him to book. But I say that if we are ever to do work in that committee, if we are to accomplish what the Public Accounts Committee is intended to accomplish, the present method must cease. I venture to say that a committee consisting wholly of business men — merchants, manufacturers, farmers, men of ordinary business sense—and honestly endeavouring, both government and opposition, to investigate the accounts to ascertain whether it might be possible that some of the departments were not doing their duty to the country, would do more in one week than is done in a whole session in that committee under its present methods. The whole work of the committee seems to be this: One side, the opposition, wants to investigate, and the other side wants to obstruct. I defy any hon. member on the other side who is a member of that committee to rise here and state on his honour as a gentleman that, from the time he entered that committee until this hour, he ever made a serious effort to get at the facts of any case. There is not one. Their work is nothing but obstruction. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a shame and a disgrace. I take leave to use the word in that sense if the hon. gentleman, the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was not able to use it in another sense.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). I desire to say one word in answer to the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that there was not one man on this side of the House who was a member of the Public Accounts Committee who desired to arrive at the facts. I am one who desires to arrive at the facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh !

Mr. GERMAN. And what is more, I am prepared to arrive at the facts in a legal way. There is no man sitting in this House who knows better what proper evidence is, and the proper way of getting at evidence, than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) who has just taken his seat. He is an able lawyer, a careful business man and a very acute politician—particularly the last. Mr. Speaker, the whole proposition here is, to whom did this money go? The money went to the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. FOSTER. And what is that?

Mr. GERMAN. That I would like to know.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GERMAN. I knew I would please hon. gentlemen opposite before I got through The North Atlantic Trading Company is an incorporated company. The money of Canada has been paid to that company in the same manner as to any other company. The government of Canada paid millions of dollars to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and nobody knows who its stockholders are.

Mr. NORTHRUP. There is no difficulty in finding out.

Mr. GERMAN. The government of Canada has paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company exactly the same amount of money per capita for bringing immigrants as they would have paid to any other individual or corporation. No man can say that one dollar of the country's money in excess of what the statute and regulations provided for has been paid for immigrants coming into Canada. And there is the whole proposition. What difference does it make to the people of Canada, the taxpayers of Canada, who gets the money so long as they get value ? We have paid the money, we have got the value—and what difference does it make to us where the money has gone? Insinuations have been made that Mr. Smart, the late Deputy Minister of the Interior, had something to do with this company. It has been insinuated that the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) had something to do with this company. I venture to say that the bulk of the people of Canada do not care who got the money so long as we got our money's worth ; and we got it. We paid our money for immigrants, we have obtained the immigrants; and the people of Canada, so far as I can understand, are satisfied with the proposition. I may tell hon. gentlemen opposite that there is very little—if I may use the word—hurrah, throughout Ontario at any rate, in regard to this North Atlantic Trading Company affair. It is true, I would like to know who are in the company. I know one who is not in it—and that is myself. But the main point I wish to make is this, that the Public Accounts Committee, certainly so far as I am concerned, and, I believe, so far as every member is concerned, is prepared to investigate fully every matter which comes before the committee. But they propose to investigate these matters in the same way as hon. gentlemen opposite investigated similar questions when they were in power, and when the hon. ex-Finance Minister of Canada (Mr. Foster) was in control of affairs—they propose to investigate in a legal way. I happen to have sat in the Public Accounts Committee in those days and have some very distinct recollection of the rulings and contentions that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) made. And I can tell my hon. friend, with all sincerity that we are following his lines in these matters, even though we may not follow him in tariff questions.

The only other word I wish to say—and it is one I wish to emphasize in regard to this

matter—is that the government of Canada agreed to pay the £1 for every immigrant brought into this country. That pound they have paid, many of these pounds they paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company. We got the immigrants for the money we paid, and so far as the people of Canada are concerned, that is all the interest they had in the matter, and they are but little as to who got that money.

Mr. L. ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). Before beginning my speech I wish to thank the present Speaker for his courtesy, a courtesy which was not extended by the gentleman who has just vacated the chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order; the hon. gentleman should not reflect on the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. All right; I can take my medicine as well as any other man in this House. Mr. Speaker, I look upon this subject as one of vital importance, and I should fail in my duty if I did not express my opinion upon it, particularly since the principle involved in this discussion was embodied in my platform during the memorable campaign I went through in the county of Quebec. I recognize that in this House there are some people whose logic is very weak, and instead of discussing issues in a straightforward manner, they endeavour to avoid them by beating around the bush. Instead of meeting the issue openly and manfully, relying on their great majority, they refuse to grant the minority the right to produce proof in support of their position. If I understand the question, it is one which should be treated on the lines laid down in the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. Now, Sir, have the transactions of the North Atlantic Trading Company been honest transactions? If they have, why should this government be afraid to give all possible information in regard to them? If, on the contrary, they have not been honest, do you not think that, by refusing the information that was asked for, the government will create a suspicion of wrong-doing? It seems to me that conclusion cannot be avoided; the public will inevitably suspect wrong-doing unless the demands of the opposition are satisfied. Let me ask this question: Has the government any right to refuse information regarding the existence or non-existence of hypothetical directors? I should say, No. Why, Sir, the demand of the opposition is based upon the solid foundations of responsible government. Are we not here, Mr. Speaker, as directors of a vast company, whose shareholders are the people of Canada? Now, the amounts expended by this company have not been stated before this House in a straightforward manner. I have myself sought information from the Department of Immigration, and, though my request was as direct as possible, I could not find one man who would give me the exact figures of the number of immigrants brought into Canada, with the amounts expended by the North Atlantic Trading Company in bringing them in. And let me say here that I propose to discuss on a future occasion the general immigration policy of this government. The people of Canada are paying $60 per head for every immigrant that comes into this country. Now, is it not right that the taxpayer, who is obliged to pay that money, should know how it is expended, and to whom it is paid? Has he not a right to demand the names of the individuals who compose this North Atlantic Trading Company? Why, Sir, we have a law that obliges every incorporated company to file in court the names of its active and responsible directors, so that anybody who desires to prosecute an incorporated company may know who are its responsible directors. Sir, I think I am right in stating that if this company, during the three or four years it has been in operation, has not filed the names of its originators, there must be some reason for it which is not creditable to the company. It would seem that whenever anybody wants to do business with the government, instead of dealing with the government directly, they form some dummy company, under the guise of which they deal with the government. It has been stated in the Public Accounts Committee that one party had forgotten this elementary principle, that being a member of the government he had no right to accept shares in a company, and he very candidly stated, in a childish way, that if he had known the facts he certainly would have had these shares put in the name of some other person.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, it is very laughable to hon. members of this House that a young man of my age, who has no beard yet, a fact with which I was reproached during my election campaign, should dare to express opinions contrary to some hon. gentlemen who claim that they possess the highest mentality, and yet who have so little respect for the good sense of this House as to advance the argument of suicide if the names of this company were disclosed. Certainly, that is a very pitiable argument. But let us get down to hard facts. Here is a sum of $350,000 which has been expended during the period of five years. Now, that means $70,000 or $75,000 per year. If it is true, as has been stated, that this money passed through the channel of the North Atlantic Trading Company, and they have received no commission, but have handed the full amount directly to the navigation companies, that would mean that they had paid it over to at least ten navigation com-

panies which would give to each one the sum of $7,500; that is the least amount you could expect any one company to be paid. And for what purpose? To carry on a work in contravention of the laws of the country where these companies were operating. Do you think the people of Canada are satisfied to pay their money to certain people to break the laws of the country where they are operating?

The second argument, which I think should be a valuable one, is this: Do you not think that the sum of $7,500 is quite sufficient to pay these navigation companies for whatever responsibility they incur? The risk they ran amounts to this that if it should be found out that they were acting in direct contravention of the laws of the country they would be liable to be prosecuted or even prohibited from carrying on their business as navigation agents in that country. Really if you look at the matter from a businesslike standpoint this argument would not stand. Some members around me this afternoon have stated that you ought to be satisfied by the sworn evidence adduced by the committee. Sworn evidence to-day does not stand very high in the public estimation when it is given by persons who are working directly with the government or in an underhand way. I say that because I have known of certain instances where belief in God or in the devil never existed, and I know for positive fact and it has been published broadcast in the land that a certain gentleman who came before the Public Accounts Committee, when he was asked to swear, said he did not know how to swear for the simple fact that he never believed in God.

The question which now faces the government is: Has their transaction with the North Atlantic Trading Company been carried on in an honest manner and to the advantage of the country? If so, there should be no fear of the fullest investigation. As I said before the suspicion of crookedness, of the too free use of public funds, if it is not allayed, will lead to the logical conclusion that the government fears to back its action in the present case.

Is this transaction honest or not? If it is honest the government should be fearless of scrutiny. That is the question.

House divided on motion of Mr. Monk.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Ames,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Lalor,
Lavergne (Montmagny),
Lennox,
Lewis,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Bourassa,
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clare,
Clements,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Ganong,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Lake,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Morin,
Northrup,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Robitaille,
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Wilmot,
Wilson (Len. & Adding.),
Wright (Muskoka.)—50.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adamson,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Bourbonnais,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Conmee,
Copp,
Cyr,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin (Wright),
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Harty,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Law,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—99.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Greenway,	Tisdale,
McColl,	Ward,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Brodeur,	Monk,
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),	Haggart,
Black,	Kemp,
Bole,	Lancaster,
Clarke,	Maclean (York, S.),
Belcourt,	Seagram,
Emmerson,	Osler,
Gervais,	Leonard,
Grant,	Broder,
Laurence,	Martin (P.E.I.),
Reid (Restigouche),	Cockshutt,
Sifton,	Smith (Wentworth),
Stewart,	Marshall,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne's),	Forget,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Bristol,
Boyer,	White,
Black,	Gunn,
LeBlanc,	Fowler,
McCool.	Pringle.

Motion negatived.

INSPECTOR GENERAL LORD AYLMER.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I desire to ask the hon. leader of the House (Mr. Fielding) whether it is true that Lord Aylmer has been retired from the position of inspector general of the forces, and if so, for what reason?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). My personal understanding is that his service has expired, but I would not be prepared to give more definite information as I am not aware of the circumstances.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to take the opportunity of stating that, through the kindness of my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), on Tuesday next at three o'clock or as soon after as possible, I shall take occasion to say something with respect to the Royal Insurance Commission and matters connected therewith.

Mr. FIELDING. As another hon. gentleman has already expressed a desire to move an amendment on the motion to go into Supply, that amendment will necessarily come first. But as I understand my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) purposes bringing up the matter he has just mentioned in committee after Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair, no doubt the two will not conflict.

PORTFOLIO OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). It is stated that the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to be filled, in the absence of the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur), by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), and also that the interim position of Minister of Militia is to be filled by the hon. Secretary of State (Hon. Mr. Scott), who will then be in charge of the War Department.

Mr. FOSTER. We will have a lively time.

Mr. BOURASSA. If the rumour with regard to the portfolio of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries be true, it is rather surprising.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is asking a question and cannot discuss the matter.

Mr. BOURASSA. I understand the motion is to go into Supply, and I am putting a question which I want to qualify. Without reflecting on the eminent qualifications of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), it must be admitted that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is one in which the province of Quebec is particularly interested, and it seems surprising that my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), who is the only minister for the province of Quebec living in Montreal, should have been passed over in this matter, and the vast expenditure involved in the improvement of the St. Lawrence channel be placed in the hands of a minister who, though highly qualified no doubt for the position, represents a distant province and cannot possibly have that familiarity with the facts possessed by the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux). When the late Mr. Préfontaine was appointed Minister of Marine and Fisheries, objection was made by some people that the Department of Public Works, which had been held by a representative of the province of Quebec so many years, was given to an Ontario Minister. For my part I must say that I had no great objection because, in my opinion, the moment an honest and qualified man is at the head of a department, it is immaterial whether he comes from one province or another. It must, however, be admitted that as between two members of the Cabinet, a representative of the province which is most interested should be chosen to administer the department in question and not place it under the control of a minister not at all familiar with the work involved. I admit that the province of British Columbia is largely interested in the administration of our fisheries, but that administration is more or less one of routine; whereas the expenditure connected with the St. Lawrence ship channel is one of the most vital interest to the ports of Montreal and Quebec above all others. It seems to me that it would have been far more courteous, not only to the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux)—whom I am not specially charged with defending, because he is able to do that

himself—but also to the province of Quebec, and particularly the city of Montreal, had that interim portfolio been given to the Postmaster General during the absence of its minister in England.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I may say that I have enough work in the Post Office Department and the Department of Labour without wishing to take the responsibility of administering another one, especially so important a department as that of Marine and Fisheries. But I can assure my hon. friend and the members who represent the province of Quebec that my hon. colleague the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) kindly informed me this morning that whenever any question arose which affected the province of Quebec, he would consult the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and myself.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny) I am very glad to have heard the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), because the reports last night and this morning were to the effect that there had been a regular Kilkenny cat fight over this matter. But there is another question to which I wish to call the attention of the leader of the House (Mr. Fielding) and that is the appointment of a Minister of Militia pro tem. I understand that Senator Scott has been appointed, and I would like to know whether he will attend the camp this summer and review the militia.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the camp is to be now fed on a vegetarian diet.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not prepared to give the hon. gentleman any guarantee that any minister will attend the camp this summer.

EXPRESS RATES.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON (West Elgin). I beg to draw the attention of the government to the fact that since the 1st of March the express companies doing business in Canada have materially raised their rates to some points in Ontario, so that in some cases the express rates are practically double what they were before. This is a condition of things that requires the immediate attention of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. I am advised that the express companies have applied to the Railway Commission for a revision of their rates, and I have no doubt the matter will be dealt with at an early day.

THE DUTY ON TOBACCO.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). At the beginning of this session I asked the Minister of Finance if there would be any change made in the customs or excise duties on tobacco, and the Minister of Finance then referred me to the Minister of Inland Revenue. I would now ask the Minister of Inland Revenue, whether we may expect any change in the duties on tobacco? If so, they should be announced soon so that the producers of tobacco in my constituency and in the surrounding counties, may know what to figure on with regard to next season's crop.

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The question of the rearrangement of the excise duties has received the consideration of the government, but it has been deemed impossible to introduce any legislation with regard to it this session. It is not proposed at this present session to make any change in the excise duty on tobacco.

INDUSTRIAL STRIKES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I wish to ask the Minister of Labour whether he has any information to give the House with respect to the threatened strike in the west of which we have read in the press? I also wish to ask him the same question with reference to the strike in Nova Scotia. It is well we should know what the conditions are.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). As to the threatened strike in the west, the miners and the mine proprietors were under the impression that the Industrial Disputes Act had not yet been sanctioned by His Excellency, and consequently was not in force. The department has been in communication with the parties, and I have reason to believe that within twenty-four hours they will come under the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are the men on strike yet?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The last telegram we received was that a strke had not been declared yet, but the news is not very satisfactory. A strike has been declared at Springhill, N.S., and there the same impression prevailed that the law was not yet in force. Immediately after His Excellency assented to the Bill we applied to the Printing Bureau for several thousand copies of the Act, in order to distribute it, but we could not get the supply which we required. This afternoon, after telegraphic communication with the parties at Springhill, we finally received an application from one of the parties asking that a board of arbitration be appointed. The law will be in operation within twenty-four hours, and I may be able to give the House further information to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the meantime are the men actually on strike?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Am I rightly informed that the Springhill strike is not between the miners and mine owners, but between one class of labour and another ; is it not also a fact that the difficulty in the west is a lockout by the employers, and not a strike ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. Our information is that the trouble in the west results from a lockout, although it is denied by one of the parties that such is the case. I understand that the men are contending for an eight hour day, and that the proprietors are asking them to work 10 and 12 hours. In Nova Scotia the difficulty is between union men and non-union men, as I understand it.

THE PATENT MEDICINE BILL.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I wish to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue, if his new office as acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will interfere with his pressing the Proprietary and Patent Medicine Bill this session. During the last four months the Minister of Inland Revenue has not been able to get further with the Bill than its second reading, and now, if he is to be burdened with the responsibilities of an additional department, it would be interesting to figure out how long it will take him to get the Bill through its different stages. Is he going to press the measure this year ?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). A large number of copies of this Bill were circulated throughout the country with a view of eliciting the opinions of the trade and of others on its provisions. We have received from all over Canada the opinions of many wholesale and retail druggists. In the main, the verdict is in favour of such legislation, but, in regard to those clauses of the Bill which impose a revenue tax and registry fee, the verdict is almost unanimously against them. Naturally, the drug trade, like all others, does not want to submit to taxation. There is considerable doubt whether the Bill will be pressed this session of parliament. We believe there should be legislation of this kind, and, if it is not pressed this session, a Bill along similar lines, with some amendments to meet the objections raised, should be submitted to parliament next session. A decision has been arrived at to hold the Bill over until next session rather than go on with legislation which is necessarily contentious.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Minister of Customs some ten days ago was good enough to promise to give me copies of some letters in the Department of Trade and Commerce from J. B. Jackson, of Leeds, England, in reference to German trade. I hope he will be good enough to send them to me.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. PATERSON. That matter has been neglected owing to press of business. I have had the documents for some days, but forgot to bring them. I will bring them down to-morrow.

Mr. BARR. Can the Minister of the Interior tell us whether he intends to go on with the Northwest Land Bill this session ?

Mr. OLIVER. The land Bill is on the order paper, and when reached will be discussed and if possible put through this session.

Mr. AMES. On the 17th of December last an address was passed by this House at my request, for a return of correspondence with regard to the Athabaska Fish Company. Although three and a half months have elapsed, the return has not yet been brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. I have asked the Clerk of the House to be good enough to furnish me with a memorandum of all the returns not yet brought down, and I will do my best to expedite the production of them.

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

Lighthouse and coast service—salaries and allowances to lightkeepers, $285,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is an increase of $22,000 over the vote for the year 1905-6. This increase is asked to enable the department to adjust the salaries of lightkeepers in the different provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the increase to be on a percentage basis ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The lightkeepers are to be divided into classes and the agents are to prepare a schedule of them. The agents have not yet reported to the department. When the report is made, the increases will be given on a percentage basis.

Mr. FOSTER. That I think would be satisfactory. Another basis might be that of favour or political influence. If the department will just sit tight on that principle, and, after having divided the lightkeepers into classes, will make the percentage of increase according to the whole amount voted for the service, I think that will be fair. I am glad to hear the minister say that is the intention.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON. Does that apply to any lighthouse keepers on the inland waters ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It applies to them generally.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON. With reference to the lighthouse keeper at Rondeau, has there not been a special grant to him in the last two or three years on account of his having to keep the light burning the whole year ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know of any increase in the special case mentioned. The department intends making a classification and grades and making its increases based on the importance of the stations.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON. The light at Port Stanley is practically kept going the whole year round. I have been informed by the department that there has been a special grant to the lighthouse keeper at Rondeau, and I would ask whether a similar grant will be made to the keeper of the Port Stanley light.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that that lighthouse keeper has had something done for him but am not sure.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON. Will the hon. minister give me that information as soon as possible ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the minister in a position to say whether those intermittent lights have been a success ? They have been in operation since two or three years. The first season it was found that they did not burn all the time as promised. What is the cost of the light and how much oil does it burn during the whole summer ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. If my hon. friend would raise that question when we are on the vote for automatic buoys, the officer of the department particularly conversant with that matter will be here.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some time during the past year, a lighthouse was erected at the village of Bronte Lake, Ont. What do you allow the lighthouse keeper ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot tell.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps the hon. minister will take a note of this and have his officer look the matter up.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are the lighthouses adjoining the waters on our lakes and sea coast all lighted by their keepers or is there the new system of automatic lighting in operation which saves the cost of a lighthouse keeper ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Wherever practicable the lighthouse keeper is utilized. There are only about half a dozen such lights so far.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are they not much cheaper ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I believe they are.

Mr. J. D. REID. How is it that there is an increase of $22,000 in this item, when lighthouse keepers have been done away with ? I am not objecting to an increase being given the lighthouse keepers because in many cases they are not paid what they deserve, but I understand that a great many have been done away with since the adoption of acetylene gas system, which does not require a lighthouse keeper at all. A boat belonging to the government goes around at certain periods and fixes the lights so that there will be no danger of their going out. While I do not admit that the cost of a lighthouse fitted up with the acetylene gas system is less than with coal oil and a lightkeeper, still the light is much brighter, and I have no objection to a light of that kind being used. But the point I raised is why should the cost of lighthouse keepers increase from year to year when we are doing away with them entirely ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The most of the automatic lights are on the St. Lawrence river, between Montreal and Kingston. They are much cheaper than lighthouses—one caretaker takes charge of six or seven lights. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) will understand that, notwithstanding the increase in automatic lights, the number of lighthouses is increasing very rapidly. I am aware that very large and expensive and powerful lights have been erected on the Pacific coast, and that others will be constructed.

Mr. J. D. REID. I did not understand when the minister spoke at first, that this included the new lighthouses to be erected.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, it is a total vote, and includes everything.

Mr. AMES. I trust that, before any attempt is made at distribution on a percentage basis, the classification will be considerably improved. I had occasion to pass through the great lakes last summer on a cruising trip, and on that trip came in contact with a number of the lighthouse keepers. I found that there were considerable differences in the salaries, even where practically the same work was being done. There are instances of lighthouses almost within sight of one another where the salaries are not proportionate at all. This is specially noticeable in cases where new apparatus has been installed ; for instance, where a fog-horn is installed and the cost of the engineer is covered by an appropriation to the lighthouse keeper. As we know, the wages of engineers has been advancing rapidly within the last three or four years, and, where the appropriation is practically stationary, the lighthouse keeper's salary is a diminishing rather than an increasing one. There is thus a necessity, especially on the great lakes, of careful revision and levelling up before anything like a percentage basis is adopted.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I believe that the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) are timely. I understand that the idea of a classification is being acted upon, and the classification is now being prepared. Care

will be taken in preparing that classification.

Mr. AMES. The point is that the classification should be made by some officer of the department who could take a general view of the entire series of lighthouses in the great lakes. If classification is to be made by a number of local officers, what may seem to one man an adequate salary may not seem so to another. The classification should be made upon a general basis from Kingston to the Sault.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The classification is being made by the resident outside agent.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS. If all the lighthouse keepers throughout the Dominion are paid salaries such as those paid to these officers in my district, I think we can all justify this increase. It is a shame and a disgrace to the department to give the lighthouse keepers in my district the paltry sums they are paid. One man in my riding the department asked me to pay myself; he gets no salary.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. When does the minister expect to make the classification he refers to?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is being made now.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. I would like to ask the minister with regard to the lighthouse at the mouth of the Muskoka river, on the Muskoka lakes. A large deputation waited on the minister and laid this matter before him. The need of this lighthouse is becoming very urgent. The number of vessels on these lakes is increasing very rapidly, the traffic being especially heavy during the tourist season in the summer. The vessels find it exceedingly difficult to make that channel, especially on nights that are at all dark. Is it the intention of the minister to ask for an appropriation for this work this session?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that the lighthouse board has had the matter of a lighthouse on Muskoka river under consideration, but did not, at its last meeting, recommend that the lighthouse should be constructed. The reason for their recommendation I am not at present advised of.

Lighthouse and coast service—agencies, rents and contingencies, $30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this about the same, proportionately, as for the nine months' fiscal period just closed?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The expenditure for the six months ending December 31st last was $15,000. So the vote is about the same as last year.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouse and lightships, $650,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. DANIEL. Can the minister tell me how long the 'Lurcher' lightship has been off her post during last year? Also can he tell me whether it is the intention of the department to put a larger lightship in its place? I understand that the coal capacity of that ship is hardly sufficient, and that she must be supplied more often than a lightship in that exposed position should require. It seems that she frequently goes into port for repairs, and so is off her post quite often.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that the lightship in question has been withdrawn only to be repaired. The officers cannot say how long she has been off, but probably not more than two or three weeks. It is the intention of the department to restore her to her post.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it the intention to put on a larger vessel there? I have been given to understand that her coal capacity is not sufficient for a vessel in that exposed position.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The information of the department is that the lightship was a very good one, and provision is being made now for a spare.

Mr. LAW. The lightship has not been off her station, I think, over three weeks during the past year. Of course she has to be taken off every year to be repaired and repainted, and undergo a general overhauling. She has done excellent service there, and is one of the very best lightships and one of the best aids to navigation on the western shore of Nova Scotia. While perhaps a larger boat might be more convenient and be run at a less expense, I am sure that she has a capacity for coal, about 150 tons, which will last from 45 to 60 days. Of course in winter time it is a little inconvenient to get that coal on board, it has to be discharged on a very calm day when there is no sea. I am well acquainted with the boat and with the way she has been run, because she is right off my county of Yarmouth, and as I say she has only been off the last season not over three weeks.

Mr. DANIEL. I am glad to hear the statement of the hon. member. It shows that those in command of the vessel are attending a little more strictly to their business than they have done formerly. Certainly, I think the lightship was off her station much more frequently and for longer periods than the hon. member has stated to-night. But I take it there has been an improvement in that respect.

Mr. LAW. The statement made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) is entirely incorrect. That boat has never been off her station for one hour longer than she was entitled to be off, barring accident. The captain and crew are men who have attended to their duty from the very first day they

went on that boat until the present time. I do not think they could be replaced in Nova Scotia, or in New Brunswick either. The boat met with one or two accidents in the first place on account of her mooring chains. She is located in one of the very roughest places, so considered, anywhere. She is off the Lurher shoals where the tide constantly runs heavy, she is anchored where she is never still for twenty-four hours during the whole year. When she was first moored there, on account of a defect in her chains, she went adrift and had to come in and wait for another chain to replace the defective chain. But I am confident the boat has never been off one single hour when she could have been on duty.

Mr. DANIEL. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the 'Lurcher' lightship is in a very exposed position. I accept his statement with regard to the frequency and length of time the 'Lurcher' lightship has been off her station. But the statement the hon. gentleman has made to-night with regard to the frequency and length of time that ship has been absent from her station differs from the information I have received, and my information has come from pilots and others who are in a position to know when she is on her station and when she is not.

Construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, submarine signals and purchase of suitable boats for carrying on construction work in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and on the Great Lakes, $1,360,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister should exlain what is to be undertaken under these words 'purchase of suitable boats.' This item, as he will see, covers a great many different branches. I think there should be a definite appropriation for each one of these. Here we are asked to place over a million dollars at the beck of the department which might all be put into boats if the department wished, so far as the appropriation is concerned. I think there ought to be a definite appropriation for the large branches of the service. The building or purchase of boats ought to have been placed in one item by itself and the department restricted to that.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Half of the amount of this vote is for construction and the other half for apparatus. One half this vote, or $680,000, is for the construction of lights and aids to navigation in the various provinces. There is $110,000 for a boat in the Gulf and $75,000 for a boat on the lake at Parry Sound, with $25,000 for maintenance of the boat for the Gulf and $15,000 for maintenance of the boat on the lake. The other half of the total amount is for construction and apparatus, including installation of lightships and apparatus, $250,000; gas buoys, $245,000; derrick, $40,000; lighthouse depot, Prescott, $20,000; submarine signals, $90,000; Parry Sound, $5,000; miscellaneous material for various agencies, $60,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the purchase of boats come in?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. For the first boat on the lake, at Parry Sound, including maintenance, there is $220,000. The first draft of construction included the boat.

Mr. FOSTER. How many boats are you going to purchase?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Two immediately, one for the gulf and one for Parry Sound, for the lakes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will they be purchased or built?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No decision has been arrived at as to whether they will be purchased or built.

Mr. FOSTER. If purchased will they be advertised for and tenders secured?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to refer to a circumstance connected with the wreck of the schooner 'Lena M,' near Whitehead last summer. The Marine Department maintains a buoy on a dangerous sunken ledge, near Whitehead harbour. As at high tide the ledge is not visible it is of the utmost importance that this buoy should be accurately placed. I am instructed that when the buoy was being placed last spring by the captain of the 'Aberdeen,' it was improperly placed so as to be a menace to the vessels navigating these waters. Some time after that this schooner which was on a voyage from Canso to Whitehead, was wrecked; the captain was steering by that buoy as he had a right to do, but owing to the fact that the buoy was wrongly placed his ship struck the ledge and the ship and cargo were lost. Complaints were made to the department and they sent Captain Tingley, a Royal Navy officer then in the employ of the department to make an examination into the circumstances. I understand that he reported that the wreck was caused by the buoy being misplaced owing to the carelessness of the captain of the 'Aberdeen' in putting out the buoy. A claim was made to the department for damages, equal to the cost of the schooner and the cargo, but the claim has not been paid. The owners of the vessel are pressing the claim. In my opinion the claim ought to be paid. I understand that the department contend that they do not pay claims of this kind at all, that notwithstanding the fact that their officer misplaced the buoy and the misplacing of the buoy was the direct cause of the accident that resulted in the loss of the ship the department is not liable for any damages and will not pay them. That is a

legal question on which I shall not express an opinion now. They ought to investigate the conduct of the captain who still has charge of his ship and is in the pay of the department, and if it is through his negligence that this accident occurred I submit that two things should be done, the owners should be paid for their loss and the captain, if he is not able to give the department a satisfactory explanation, should be discharged and a man should be put in his place who could place the buoys safely along the shore.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) goes a good way when he makes both claims. I would agree as far as the disciplining the captain was concerned, that I think is the bounden duty of the department, but I do not think the government undertakes when they place these aids to navigation to do more than attempt to make the navigation as safe as it can be. For the department to undertake to pay claims arising from the accidental absence of a light through the illness of the keeper, &c., would be to insure the whole shipping service of the country on coming within range of those shores. That is a mighty big contract that even this government might fight shy of.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I quite agree that in a case where the light goes out or there is reasonable excuse for the accident such as the drifting of a buoy through a storm, there should be no claim, but here, the information is that the wreck was due to the misplacing of the buoy. It was so placed that a vessel coming from Canso to Whitehead and steering by the buoy would be certain to go on the rocks. That is such gross negligence that it must be separated from other claims.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a strong indictment against the man who placed it certainly.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has stated the departmental view very clearly. I understand they look on it as a matter of grace rather than of duty to put out buoys and I quite agree with the observation of my hon. friend that if an officer of the department misplaced the buoy he ought to be disciplined.

Mr. AMES. There is one phase of this public expenditure illustrated by what we see at pages 58 and 59, which has always been to me a considerable mystery. That is the rule of the department as to what shall be charged to capital and what to revenue account. It seems difficult to understand how the construction of a lighthouse may be charged to revenue account but the construction of a permanent pier, like those at Lake St. Peter on which the permanent lights are placed, is to be charged to capital account. If the construction of a lighthouse is a permanent work it would seem to be chargeable to capital account. If it is not permanent wherein does it differ in any way from the construction of a pier which may be placed under it? We, of course, are very glad to see the government taking from revenue that which can be put into a public work which will inure as a public asset of the country as a whole, and which will not pass away or be used up in a single year. But it seems to me that an explanation is due as to the method whereby the government does decide in connection with expenditures of this character what shall be chargeable to capital and what to revenue.

Mr. ALCORN. I again call the attention of the government to their failure to provide sufficient lights on the Bay of Quinte between the Murray canal and Glenora. Both last session and the session before I drew attention to this matter. Since the opening of the Murray canal the traffic has been very heavy on these narrow waters. Last year, I placed before the department letters from the various navigation companies interested, asking for additional aids to navigation in the form of automatic gas buoys. The minister himself then assured me that a certain number of these buoys would be placed, and that assurance, I assume, was based on an investigation which had taken place as to the necessity for providing such lights. Since then nothing has been done. What is the intention of the department in the matter?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Ontario division of the lighthouse board has not yet presented its report and the officers cannot say whether the matters to which my hon. friend refers will be recommended. I shall take note in 'Hansard' of this and various other inquiries, and ask the officers to supply the information.

Mr. ALCORN. I am asking for the placing of a number of automatic gas buoys, not lighthouses.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They go through the lighthouse board.

Mr. ALCORN. The minister assured me last year that a number of these buoys would be placed in position.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They may be included in the report.

Mr. GANONG. This vote includes $90,000 for submarine signal service; how much money has already been expended on that?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Approximately, between $90,000 and $100,000 has been spent up to the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. What are these submarine signals?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They are bells which ring under the water.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they have to have a ringer?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They are attached to buoys, I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. Do they ring chimes, or what?

Mr. GANONG. Have they proved satisfactory in actual service?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am so advised.

Mr. GANONG. Where are they now located?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Chebucto Head, Louisburg, Yarmouth and Negro Head.

Mr. GANONG. If these aids to navigation are useful, it does seem to me that they should be established in the Bay of Fundy. Will any of this vote be used for this purpose?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. The officers consider that the Bay of Fundy should be supplied with them.

Mr. AMES. To what extent have ships plying in the gulf and river St. Lawrence and on the Bay of Fundy, been fitted up with a receiving apparatus, without which, as I understand, these submarine bells are of no use?

Mr. FIELDING. While there is no doubt that a vessel furnished with a receiving apparatus can get the best results, it was represented to the government that vessels not so fitted can hear the ring sound of the bells. It is a scientific fact that water is one of the best conductors of sound, and so it was said that even in an ordinary trading ship, a man could go down in the hold and place his ear to the side of the vessel and hear the sound of these bells for quite a distance. The design of the system is that the bells would indicate the locality and direction whence the sound comes.

Mr. AMES. The experiments made before the contract was entered into, were all made on vessels carrying the receiving apparatus, as I understand. It is generally considered that these submarine bells are of little value to wooden ships unless they are specially equipped. If this receiving apparatus is not being installed on the vessels of our merchant marine, then I think it would be inadvisable for us to spend so much money on this service.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that thirty ships plying to Canadian ports on the Atlantic have been equipped with receiving apparatus, and its use is rapidly increasing.

Mr. AMES. Have these thirty ships been supplied with the receiving apparatus experimentally and temporarily, or has the installation been of a permanent character?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Permanently, so far as the department knows.

Mr. GANONG. How many stations is it estimated, this $90,000 will equip?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The cost, I understand, is $5,000 a station. There will probably be eighteen.

Mr. GANONG. Is there not some royalty or revenue paid on these?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot say whether this includes royalty or not. There is a payment of $2,000 per station up to fifty stations, after which the patents become the property of the government.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the old method that was brought out in the Public Accounts Committee last year, of employing such interveners as Mr. Merwin, still carried out by the department, and are these purchases being made by Mr. Merwin in the same manner as they were before, with the same rake-offs, or what has the department done?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know that Mr. Merwin has any particular connection with the department at the present time; but I assume that the department, whether under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or under the acting minister, will purchase wherever, in the interest of the department and the government, it seems proper to do so, inviting tenders wherever that can be done, and buying in the cheapest market. That would certainly be the policy of the acting minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we will hold you to that.

To provide for the building and maintenance of Marconi stations, $116,550.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to be informed about this. What has happened and what is going to happen? Is this still an experiment?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The following is an estimate of how this amount is to be expended: Maintaining and operating ten high power stations, at Farm Point, Heath Point, Point Rich, Whittle Rocks, Cape Ray, Cape Race, Cape Sable, Partridge Island, Father Point and Clarke City, at $3,500 each; maintaining and operating three low power stations, at Cape Bear, Belle Isle and Point Armour, at $2,500 each; the salaries of six operators for vessels equipped with wireless, at $900 each; seven proposed stations between Vancouver and Prince Rupert, at $7,000 each; maintaining and operating these seven stations, at $3,000 each; maintaining and operating proposed station at Pictou, $2,000; salary of the superintendent of wireless stations, $2,000; salary of stenographer, $700. The number of stations under the Department of Marine and Fisheries at the present time is fifteen. The Pacific coast has no wireless station whatever, but it is very important that there should be a number of

these stations along that great stretch of coast. It is very difficult to maintain telegraph lines along our precipitous coast, and we believe the wireless telegraph system would be of immense benefit.

Mr. AMES. Can the minister tell us when the Marconi station was established at Clarke City, and what the annual expense of it is?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The cost of maintaining and operating it is $3,500.

Mr. AMES. Has the minister any statistics to show to what extent that station is used?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is not in operation yet; it is in process of erection. It is believed that it will be of considerable use. I understand that there are large pulp works or something of that kind being erected near there.

Mr. AMES. I understand that the Marconi system was intended to take messages over long distances to and from vessels going out to sea or coming from sea Clarke City is near Seven Islands, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and is quite out of the course of any ocean steamer. It has one large enterprise, which has connection by land telegraph with Quebec, so that there is no difficulty in communicating with civilization at all times, summer and winter. Therefore, I cannot see the utility of erecting a Marconi station at that point, or who would be benefited other than the pulp company, with which some interesting gentlemen are connected. I would like to know what return we shall get from the capital invested and the $3,500 annually spent for operation and maintenance?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that the object is to give a continuous line of wireless telegraph stations from Quebec city to the Strait of Belle Isle, about 75 miles apart, and this will be one of the coast stations.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. In the contracts with the Marconi Company, has any provision been made for the use of these lines by the public for the transmission of commercial messages?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The department operates the wireless telegraph stations purely and has nothing to do with commercial business. The company erects the stations and the government pays for them and for the operating of them. Whatever commercial business there may be, the Marconi company handles.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Does the government control the rates for commercial messages?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That question has not arisen yet.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What does the government pay the company for the use of their system?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no payment in excess of the royalty. We pay the company so much for putting up the stations and we pay for the maintenance of the stations.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Do the government pay for their own messages?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. GANONG. Do we pay the salaries and allow them to do commercial business?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. If my hon. friend will reflect, he will find that at Clarke City and along the north shore of the St. Lawrence, there is very little commercial business.

Mr. GANONG. That is a very exceptional case. We pay the company for putting up the stations and maintaining them and they do any commercial business there is.

Mr. AMES. I do not see the utility of such an arrangement. We have recently extended our north shore telegraph system down to the straights of Belle Isle and I do not see why we should have the Marconi system besides.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The great advantage of the Marconi stations is that they may be operated at all times whereas the telegraph line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence is not always capable of being used.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Wireless stations are required along the shore to communicate with cities. In foggy weather, they can be kept continually in touch with the wireless stations between the straits of Belle Isle and Quebec.

Mr. AMES. Vessels do not go along the north shore. A vessel entering and passing through the straits of Belle Isle will not again sight land until she reaches the eastern end of Anticosti Island. Then, the next land sighted after you leave Anticosti is the shore of Gaspé county, and that must be 100 or 125 miles away from the north shore in the neighbourhood of Clarke City.

Mr. GANONG. It does strike me that the minister must have been in error in regard to the question of tolls. Why should the government build the stations and pay all the help necessary to run them, and then give this company the right to charge tolls on commercial messages? This seems a rather odd proposition not merely from the standpoint of present business, but from the standpoint of future business. It is evident that the government are extending this system over different parts of the country; and, while there may not be great com-

mercial business from them at present, there is a possibility that the revenue may grow to considerable sums. There are two instances in which that might be the case. One is that of Prince Edward Island. If the government should decide to establish communication with Prince Edward Island and pay all the cost of installation and the salaries of the officers and the expenses of running the station and then turn over the revenue to the Marconi Company, I think that company would have what is commonly known as a snap. The other instance was suggested by a recent discussion in regard to telegraph communication with the Yukon. I would like to have it distinctly stated by the minister whether that is the position—whether this company has the right to collect the revenues for commercial business while the government pay all the expenses?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The explanation is as I gave it. The Marconi Company collect whatever revenue there is from commercial business in the stations on the north shore of the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic. These stations were not put up because the Marconi Company wanted them put up, but were provided by the government as aids to navigation and as a means of communicating with shipping. The Marconi Company would never have put up stations there to do business. The government owns these stations and is operating them. The government has control and I understand, may at any time discontinue the arrangement with the Marconi Company. But there cannot be any commercial business of consequence over this system. There may be a small income derived from communicating with ships arriving, reaching or leaving our shore. How much that revenue is I do not know. Wireless telegraphy is a new invention, and I suppose improvements are being made all the time. The government has control and, I believe, ought to maintain control, of the wireless telegraph system. That system will be extended on the Pacific coast, no doubt, very rapidly, especially as ships equip themselves with the apparatus. I suppose we may consider the system now beyond the experimental stage. Certainly it has been found very useful. I think that what has been done is in the public interest, and that it is right to continue and extend the system as far as possible.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the Marconi Company supply the operators?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, the company trains and supplies them.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The minister referred to high and low pressure stations. What is the difference between power on in these two classes?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The high pressure carries a message approximately one hundred and twenty miles and the low pressure approximately seventy-five miles. The apparatus generating the electric current is, in high pressure stations, five horse-power and in the low pressure stations three horse-power.

Mr. CROCKET. How much has the department spent on these stations up to the present time?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Approximately, $90,000.

Scientific institutions and hydrographic survey—Department of Marine and Fisheries—hydrographic surveys, $170,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these to be conducted this year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, for this service, was $120,000. The expenditure for the six months of the current year was $62,594. This service includes Lake Superior, the Atlantic coast, Lake St. Louis, Lake St. Frances, Lake Temagami, River St. Lawrence, the Pacific coast, and miscellaneous expenses of these surveys.

Mr. AMES. What is the object of a hydrographic service for Lake Temagami?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Stewart will be here to-morrow and he will give the explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. Why this departure to the small and unimportant lakes of the country? What we have been suffering from in the past and trying to make up, is to have hydrographic surveys of the travelled and much used waterways. For what reason are you now going to cover every little lake in the country which has no navigation worth speaking of?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that there are steamers being placed on Lake Temagami, and we have been asked to survey the lake and to mark on a chart the shoals and rocks, with the idea of placing boats there to improve navigation. I understand that those engaged in transportation have applied to the department for the improvement of Lake Temagami.

Mr. AMES. Lake Temagami is a lake situated about 75 miles north of North Bay, away up in the wilds, in a section of country where all the timber is owned by the Ontario government and none of it can be cut, where there is absolutely no farm land, and where there is but one tiny village. It is simply a sportsman's paradise, and has only been used for camping grounds and visited by canoe parties. If steamers were placed on the lake they would be used for no other purpose than to supply camps with provisions. As there is no agricultural country there and none of the timber can be cut, there can be little traffic or trade. The only interest that can be served is that of the railway companies who advertise this

as a summer paradise. If we commence hydrographic surveys simply for camping parties, it seems to me that we should first exhaust those sections of the country where regular surveys are needed for commercial purposes.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The information I am given is that there are several small steamers there and they have applied to the department for this survey to be made.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be applications from every little lake in the whole country now, if this policy is to be adopted. The minister must consider that we have only a certain amount of money to expend for marking the ways of navigation, and that it must be expended first where there are great waterways. It would be awaste of money to allow these waterways to be unsurveyed and go up into the smaller lakes in the interior where there cannot be much commerce carried on.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I appreciate the force of the hon. gentleman's remarks. We have on the Pacific coast any amount of work done on this line. They are building a hydrographic steamer there.

Mr. AMES. Has Lake Temiskaming been surveyed hydrographically ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. AMES. Lake Temiskaming is a waterway of considerable importance that lies just to the east of Lake Tamagami, forty or fifty miles away. On it there is considerable traffic, because it lies in the Ottawa river and because it opens up the whole Cobalt region from Haileybury westward. If it was proposed to spend the money on Lake Temiskaming I would not object.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think if I had to expend this money I would look into it very carefully, and if it was not in the public interest that Lake Temagami should not be surveyed hydrographically in the interests of transportation, I think I would refrain from making the expenditure. I am speaking now in absolute ignorance of the reason the application was made, and I can only express myself in general terms.

For the construction and completion of steamer for hydrographic survey in British Columbia, and furnishing, $100,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. As hon. gentlemen may know, the imperial government, up to the present time, has carried on the hydrographic survey work on the Pacific ocean, it has cost Canada really nothing. Last year this work was carried on by the department in a small way at Prince Rupert. Much work is carried on there now in small steam launches. The imperial government has a hydrographic steamer, and when we proposed to take over the work the imperial government could not part with that steamer, and it has been found necessary to build a hydrographic steamer on the Pacific coast to carry on this work. I suppose when this steamer gets to work the imperial government will discontinue this survey, at all events in respect to the interior waters, or what is near the ports.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is the steamer being constructed and what will it cost ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A contract has been entered into with a firm in British Columbia to construct an iron steamboat complete at $145,000, a total cost, including a system of forced draft, cold storage and furnishings of $161,000.

Marine hospitals, $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been any change in the administration of these hospitals ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand not.

Mr. DANIEL. When the late Mr. Préfontaine was Minister of Marine it was stated and the minister agreed that the amount of dues taken from vessels for this service is greater than the expense of the service and in fact there is now a very considerable surplus now in the fund. The late minister stated that he had it under consideration to abolish that charge on vessels.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The revenue collected is in excess of the expense and has been for some years. I do not know that there has been any change of policy, but I would take it that the government has no wish to make a profit out of marine hospitals. Whether it would be possible to reduce the fees is a question of policy on which I would not like to make a statement.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister does not intend to lower the dues or abolish them ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I could not say that I had that intention.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I should not like a motion of that kind to pass without opposition. These fees could only be abolished if we adopted the English system of having each ship take care of its own sick. They can do that in England where the shores are dotted with towns and hospitals, but here it would be impossible until we have made more progress. If we have too much money we should extend the system or reduce the dues. An application has been before the department from my constituency for some time for a hospital at Canso for the benefit of the fishermen. There has been a surplus but if we took care of the fishermen as we should there would be no surplus. I would like to see the dues reduced if possible but at the same time I would like to see

no proposal to abandon the present system and introduce the English system.

Mr. McLENNAN. Last year I remember the member for Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) did call attention to the necessity of constructing a marine hospital at Canso. I thought then and I do now that from the various marine institutions built at Canso in the past during the last ten years since I came to parliament, it would be difficult to get room there for the construction of a marine hospital. There are a great many fishing vessels in Guysboro but infinitely more in Lunenburg, Shelburne, etc., and their rendez-vous is principally in the northern part of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, around the Magdalen Islands and off the north part of Cape Breton I can during the fishing season see procession after procession of these Atlantic fishing schooners passing through the Straits of Canso. Fishermen and sailors do nor require a hospital near their homes but on their way to or near the fishing grounds, so I believe that the judgment of parliament was not faulty in choosing the Strait of Canso as a site for a hospital. Vessels constantly pass up and down there between the Atlantic and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. From the grand banks on the Atlantic side ; from the banks in the Bay on the other side, and coming from one fishing ground to another, the vessels invariably have to pass through the Straits of Canso. A marine hospital has been placed at Point Tupper in the Strait of Canso right convenient to the harbour of Mulgrave in the county of Guysboro on the one hand, and the harbour of Hawkesbury on the Cape Breton side, in the county of Inverness, on the other. I quite agree with the hon. member for Guysboro that this old hospital is not a good one, but all the same it has served a very useful purpose. Time and again seamen suffering from accidents or sickness have been provided for there. If there is any money to be expended I submit that it would be more desirable to enlarge this hospital and improve its accommodation generally, than to follow the example of the hon. gentleman who formerly represented Guysboro when he spirited away the quarantine station from Hawkesbury. I am unwilling that Canso should run away with all these marine facilities from the coast of Cape Breton, and have them squatted down at a small point on the coast of Guysboro. I maintain that the Strait of Canso is the most suitable site for an hospital. I will leave it to the medical men in this House, who ought to know something about the subject, whether the Strait of Canso is not the most suitable place in the province of Nova Scotia for a marine hospital, from the point of view of caring for sick or disabled fishermen and sailors.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. I have heard a number of complaints from owners of ships which merely call at Sydney or Halifax for orders or for coal, that their vessels are taxed for the sick mariners fund. When ships come in to take or discharge cargoes and remain in port for any length of time so that the facilities of an hospital may be required, they are quite content to contribute to this fund, but they consider it an exaction that they are charged a large sum for the maintenance of an hospital when they merely call at the port temporarily. A steamer of 4,000 tons net would pay a tax of $80 to this fund.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no charge when a ship merely calls for orders. She does not contribute unless passengers or freight are landed.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. I think the minister is right in saying that there is no charge when a vessel merely calls for orders off the harbour ; but when a vessel calls for some small supplies there is a charge, and if there is any relaxation with respect to the fund it ought to be in the direction of not taxing such vessels, because many of them are now prevented from calling at Nova Scotian ports on that account.

Mr. AMES. If the minister is looking for any purpose on which to expend the surplus of this fund, I would commend to his consideration Doctor Grenfell's station at Harrington. That is practically in No Man's Land ; it has no parliamentary representative, but there is a marine hospital established there, and if some assistance were given to it the money would be well applied. I commend the work done on the Canadian Labrador by Dr. Grenfell, to the favourable consideration of the government.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have seen it stated in the newspapers that the government intends to contribute $5,000 to the good work that Dr. Grenfell is doing on the Labrador coast.

Mr. AMES. I hope it is true.

Mr. DANIEL. The sick sailors at the port of St. John are now treated in the general public hospital, the department paying a certain per diem rate for each marine patient. In the case of sailors who suffer from infectious disease, they are taken to the isolation hospital ; and some years ago a sailor suffering from small-pox was landed at one of the outports of St. John and was taken care of by the board of health of that city, at considerable expense. A detailed account of that expenditure by the board of health has been before the department for a couple of years. When I was in St. John recently, the secretary of the board of

health asked me if I would bring to the attention of the minister, the fact that the bill has remained unpaid for all this length of time. There is now a surplus in the hands of the department which can be applied to paying just such liabilities as this, and if there is any reason why this account of the St. John Board of Health should not be paid, I would like to know it from the minister.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that it is still under consideration, and that correspondence is taking place at the present moment with the collector of customs. All I can say is that I will inquire into the matter, and if it is an account that should be paid, I will facilitate the payment of it. I do not know anything about it, whether it is a fair account or one that will be recognized or not.

Mr. DANIEL. How long is the department going to keep a bill for such a small amount under consideration? It has now been under consideration for two years. The collector of customs has been corresponded with about it, and I think as much information has been obtained from him as can be obtained.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I will inquire into it, and bring it to a head inside of two weeks.

Mr. McLENNAN. Speaking of the surplus of this fund in the department, I would call the attention of the minister to the poor salary paid to their medical attendant at the Hawkesbury hospital. It is only $100, which is not sufficient to compensate a medical man for attending a hospital which is very much frequented.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think it is a very small compensation, though the amount depends upon the extent of the attendance. If the medical man makes very few visits, it may be a good fee, but if he has to go to the hospital two or three times a week or every day it would be a very small fee. I know this is a grievance all over the country.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12 o'clock (midnight).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 5, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

REVISED STATUTES—AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 148) to amend Schedule A to the Revised Statutes, 1906. He said: Schedule A to the Revised Statutes which it is proposed to amend, is a schedule whereby certain statutes that were supposed to be effete were altogether repealed and other statutes substituted for them in the present volume of the Revised Statutes. Among the statutes which have been so dealt with and repealed as no longer of use, were many relating to the Northwest Territories which are replaced by new statutes dealing with like matters in the present volume of the Revised Statutes. But with regard to the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, to which the old statutes which have been repealed had application, the circumstance that these provinces, or that the territory within the confines of these provinces, had ceased to be territory of the Northwest Territories and had now become provincial, was lost sight of at the time the Revised Statutes schedule was being prepared. The result is that several statutes such for instance as the Jurors' Act, which were applicable to the territory within the confines of Alberta and Saskatchewan, having been altogether repealed by this section, the substituted statutes having application only to the territories proper as they are now constituted, Alberta and Saskatchewan, since the Revised Statutes were in force on the 31st of January last, have been without legislation applicable to such matters. To correct that, this measure is introduced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How have we been able to get on in the meantime without any legislation?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. We have been getting on, and this Bill proposes to declare that these statutes shall be deemed to have been in force from the 31st of January last.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no objection to discussing it, but later possibly we might desire to have the Bill printed before it is finally passed. That might be understood.

On section 2,

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I do not know whether I caught the meaning of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) correctly, but as I understand it this Act is intended to declare to be repealed certain Acts which are declared to be effete. Are these Acts of general application or are they Acts simply relating to the two new provinces of the west?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This proposed legislation will not affect any part of Canada except Alberta and Saskatchewan and the effect of it is simply this, that there were certain statutes in force prior to the

31st January, 1907, which had application to the lands and people of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. When the Revised Statutes came into force on that day those statutes regarding the Northwest Territories were altogether repealed and new statutes regarding the Northwest Territories substituted for them, but the new statutes would not have any application to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan because these provinces and the lands of these provinces had ceased to be territorial and had become provincial. This is to restore the applicability of the old statutes to Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. This Act is not of general application and simply affects Acts relating to the two new provinces ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must confess that I had a different idea of what the difficulty was. I thought the Acts had been repealed and it was necessary to re-establish them with respect to the territory outside of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That is not the case ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is to re-establish them as to Alberta and Saskatchewan. They were re-established as to the territory outside eo instanti because the statute which repealed them substituted something else in their place.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The substituted statutes provided only for the territory outside ? I would like to ask whether or not the proposed enactment deals with the statutes relating to petitions in controverted elections ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, does not the Minister of Justice think that they should be included? A most unfortunate condition has prevailed in these two new provinces. There were a considerable number of election petitions filed, I believe, on both sides, but the point was raised that there was no jurisdiction in the court to entertain them. It is not necessary now to go into the considerations which led the majority of the court, or perhaps the unanimous court, to that conclusion. The result was that nothing could be done. I believe that in one case a committee of the House has intervened and has taken some action. If provision is being made in respect to the matters mentioned by the Minister of Justice would it not be proper to pass a declaratory statute with respect to the matter to which I have just alluded ? Perhaps the Minister of Justice has taken that matter into consideration.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The action taken by the provincial legislature relates to its own provincial elections in regard to which this House is not concerned. The difficulty to which my hon. friend alludes was in regard to any court which would have jurisdiction in a Dominion contested election.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, it was not.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Then I have misunderstood it. I assumed that the hon. gentleman was referring to the circumstance that unless jurisdiction was expressly conferred by the parliament of Canada to try controverted elections upon any tribunal that jurisdiction would not exist. I am proposing in a Bill which received its first reading yesterday—a Bill to make certain amendments to the statute law in its application to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta—a measure which is necessitated by the constitution of the new courts for these provinces which has just taken place in each province, to provide for jurisdiction being conferred upon these new courts to deal with controverted Dominion elections. In regard to controverted provincial elections the legislatures of the provinces themselves will no doubt deal with it if they see fit to delegate that jurisdiction to the courts in their provinces.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think that it was the intention of parliament in 1905 to leave matters in such a condition in the new provinces that there would be no appeal to the courts. I was thoroughly under the impression that the then Minister of Justice believed that by the language which he used in reference to the continuance in force of certain provincial statutes he was making provision for the trial of controverted provincial elections. I have no doubt that every one in the House was under that impression. The point was not, I think, very specifically raised although the language of the sections having application to these particular matters was pretty fully discussed and was reconsidered by the then Minister of Justice on two or three different occasions. It seemed to me that it would have been within the jurisdiction of this parliament to make that provision by those Bills. It seems to me that if that provision was not made it was an oversight, and as that provision, according to the judgment of the courts, does not appear to have been made, we might very well inquire now whether we are not in a position to make it. There might be some constitutional difficulty on account of the language of the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1886, because my recollection is that in some respects this parliament is not in a position to make any amendments to what is regarded as the constitution of a new province. I do not know whether that restriction upon our powers extends so far as to prevent what I am now suggesting, but if it does not I am inclined to think we ought to do what parliament intended to do in 1905.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. If I apprehend correctly what is in the mind of my hon. friend it would not strike me that anything is now necessary. The effect of the passing of the Autonomy Bills without there being in them any express delegation to the courts of the power to deal with controverted provincial elections would simply leave all questions of that character for disposition by the respective provincial legislatures themselves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think that is what we intended.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Probably not. I am not presuming to speak of what the intention was but that was the effect, and that having been the result, one of these legislatures has recently dealt with a matter affecting the return of a member of the legislature and dealt with it as this House or any other legislature of an autonomous people would deal with such a subject if the jurisdiction to deal with it had not been referred to any court. That, I take it, will continue to be the situation in each of those provinces until its legislature passes some statute conferring jurisdiction upon the courts in the province to deal with such matters. This is a matter entirely for the legislatures of those provinces which have now been completely constituted, and this House can no more deal with it than it can with controverted elections in any other province. There would be the initial difficulty to which reference has been made that a province having been once constituted, its constitution under the British North America Act, as amended in 1871, is no longer liable to change or amendment at the hands of this parliament.

Progress reported.

BINDER TWINE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House do on Monday next go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved,—That it is expedient to amend chapter 5 of the statutes of 1903, intituled 'An Act respecting the manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada,' and to provide that the following be added thereto after section 1 thereof, viz.:

1a. That the Governor in Council may authorize the payment of a bounty to any corporation, firm or person, manufacturing cordage in Canada from Manilla fibre, such bounty to be equal to the amount paid as export duty in the Philippine Islands on Manilla fibre produced on those islands, and used in the manufacture of cordage in Canada; the said bounty to be payable only in respect of Manilla cordage manufactured in Canada, on and after the first day of January, 1907.

Provided, however, that the bounty shall not exceed three-eighths of one cent per pound on the Manilla fibre so used in the manufacture of cordage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

He said : I beg to say that His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House do on Monday next go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved,—1. That it is expedient to repeal chapter 8 of the statutes of 1899, chapter 68 of the statutes of 1903, and chapter 39 of the statutes of 1904, from and after the 1st January, 1907.

2. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the following bounties on the under-mentioned articles manufactured in Canada for consumption therein, viz.:

(a) In respect of pig iron manufactured from ore, on the proportion from Canadian ore produced during the calendar years,—

1907.. .. ..$2 10 per ton ;
1908.. .. .. 2 10 per ton ;
1909.. .. ..1 70 per ton ; and
1910.. .. .. 0 90 per ton.

(b) In respect of pig iron manufactured from ore, on the proportion from foreign ore produced during the calendar years,—

1907.. .. ..$1 10 per ton.
1908.. .. .. 1 10 per ton ;
1909.. .. .. 0 70 per ton ; and
1910.. .. .. 0 40 per ton.

(c) On puddled iron bars manufactured from pig iron made in Canada during the calendar years,—

1907.. .. ..$1 65 per ton ;
1908.. .. .. 1 65 per ton ;
1909.. .. .. 1 05 per ton ; and
1910.. .. .. 0 60 per ton.

(d) In respect of rolled, round wire rods not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter, manufactured in Canada from steel produced in Canada from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig iron made in Canada, when sold to wire manufacturers for use or when used in making wire in their own factories in Canada, on such wire rods, made after the 31st December, 1906, six dollars per ton ;

(e) In respect of steel ingots manufactured from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig iron made in Canada, on such ingots made during the calendar years,—

1907.. .. ..$1 65 per ton ;
1908.. .. .. 1 65 per ton ;
1909.. .. .. 1 05 per ton ; and
1910.. .. .. 0 60 per ton.

3. That it is expedient to provide that no bounty shall be paid under the foregoing provisions in respect of iron or steel made in Canada by the electric process after the 31st December, 1908.

4. That with a view to the encouragement of the smelting of Canadian iron ore by electricity it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may authorize the payment

out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the following bounties on pig iron and steel ingots manufactured in Canada, for consumption therein, when such pig iron and steel is the product of Canadian iron ores smelted in Canada by electricity, viz.:

(f) On pig iron manufactured from Canadian ore by the process of electricity smelting during the calendar years,—

1909..	$2 10	per ton ;
1910..	2 10	per ton ;
1911..	1 70	per ton ; and
1912..	0 90	per ton.

(g) On steel ingots manufactured by electric process direct from Canadian ore, and on steel ingots manufactured by electric process from pig iron smelted in Canada by electricity from Canadian ore during the calendar years,—

1909..	$1 65	per ton ;
1910..	1 65	per ton ;
1911..	1 05	per ton . and
1912..	0 60	per ton.

5. That it is expedient to provide that bounty shall not be paid on steel ingots from which steel blooms and billets for exportation from Canada are manufactured.

6. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may make regulations to carry out the intentions of these resolutions.

7. That it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Trade and Commerce shall be charged with the administration of the foregoing provisions.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

POSITION AT THE SENATE—MR. GAUVREAU.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Témiscouata). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. 'L'Evénement,' of the 3rd instant, has published about me a short article, which reads as follows:

Were we to be given the lie once more—which will amount to just as much as it did previously—we again affirm that Mr. Gauvreau, the member for Témiscouata, will do like so many Liberal members have done; he will have his little position. Mr. Gauvreau is going to deny that again, as you will see, but he will tell a falsehood. Mr. Gauvreau is to be appointed assistant clerk of the Senate. He is now voting for a government from which he expects that favour. Such is the independence of our good Liberals.

I wish to contradict 'L'Evénement' in the most positive manner. In no way have I been promised that position by the government, and that for two excellent reasons: First, because the position of assistant clerk of the Senate is not vacant; and, second, because that appointment must be made by the Committee of the Contingencies of the Senate, with which the government has nothing to do.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has my hon. friend the Minister of Finance been made acquainted with the various orders for returns which are outstanding? I have a list of them here.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I have requested the Clerk of the House to prepare a list. The clerk informs me that he has a copy of that list. I shall be very happy to look after the matter, and see that every thing is done to expedite the bringing down of the returns.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I leave this list in the hands of the clerk, it will not be necessary for me to refer to it at more length at the present moment?

Mr. FIELDING. No. If there is any difficulty as to any return, I will call the attention of the House to it.

THE SEATING OF MEMBERS.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to know from you if it is not an acknowledged custom of this House that those who sit on this side of the House are supposed to be supporters of the government. If that is supposed to have been the custom ever since this parliament has been in existence, it should be the law. What is the law in the matter, and who is to decide whether a member is a supporter of the government or not?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that we can hardly be expected to answer a question of that nature. Whatever may be the custom, there is no statute law that would enable any one to answer my hon. friend's question. Matters of this kind are generally arranged by a friendly understanding among the members.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If there are a large number of gentlemen on the other side of the House who desire to change their seats, we will try to accommodate them as far as possible on this side.

Mr. PATERSON. How many have you to offer?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We have none.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Fisheries—salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $127,600.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any increase?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries). There is no increase. On a comparison with the last complete fiscal year, 1905-6, there is a decrease.

Mr. BERGERON. Has there been an increase in this expenditure ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no increase.

Mr. BERGERON. Does this apply to the lakes and rivers in the provinces as well as the sea ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes. There are three inspectors for each province.

Mr. BERGERON. In my part of the country the inspection is very bad because the illegal fishing goes on just as before.

Mr. BLAIN. What is a guardian and an inspector ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A guardian is an official employed when required, and an inspector is a permanent official in charge of a district, reporting direct to the department. I shall read the clause of the report dealing with this.

The outside staff of the fisheries branch of the department is larger than may be generally supposed, numbering to over nine hundred and fifty employees, subdivided as follows: Twenty-four inspectors of fisheries and special officers ; 112 overseers of fisheries with magisterial powers ex-officio, and 440 guardians, temporarily employed to assist the other officers in the protection of fish.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has there been any change in the special form of license for winter fishing in the lakes in Manitoba ? I have a copy of the license of 1907, and I am informed that some change has been made in the instructions sent out to the local officers by which great hardship may be worked. The clause to which I refer is :

The present license requires strict conformity with the various provisions of the fishery law now or hereafter in force, and all regulations emanating from the Governor in Council.

And here are the words to which I desire to call attention :

And directions by fishery officers.

It is claimed that these words were not in the licenses issued some years ago or were not acted upon. The size of the mesh for taking yellow pike and jackfish throughout Canada is a 4-inch mesh, but the inspector at Lake Winnipegosis issued instructions that these fish can not be taken in those lakes with a mesh less than 4½ inches, which is very little use for catching these fish. It is said that the size of mesh should be regulated by order in council and should not be left to the local officials.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that this matter has already been straightened out. The overseer in the province of Manitoba did exceed his duty in issuing such instructions and his interpretation was rescinded.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the local fishery officer power to say what sized net shall be used in fishing ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Certainly not, he has to follow the instructions given by the department.

Mr. HAGGART. What rules or regulations have you for the distribution of young fish from the hatcheries ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The distribution is made on application made to the department and every application will be treated on its merits. I think as a usual thing the department complies with all applications.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the hon. minister at hand the names of the overseers or guardians on the river St. Lawrence between Montreal and Cornwall?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. These officers to whom my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) refers are not under the authoritiy of the Dominion, but, within the territorial limits of Quebec, and under the authority of that province.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course, we cannot criticise the work in that case, as a part of this administration. But I may say that the inspection is very badly done—in fact, there is no inspection at all; illegal fishing goes on uncontrolled.

Salaries, building and maintenance of fish breeding establishments, $202,300.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the number of fish hatcheries been increased ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We are building some new hatcheries. Two of these are in the province of Ontario—at Sarnia and Wiarton. One is in the province of Manitoba—a white fish hatchery on Lake Winnipegosis. Also—speaking not from the notes supplied me by the department, but from what I have learned—I believe that it is contemplated to erect two hatcheries for the propagation of that very valuable fish the sockeye salmon, one on the head waters of the Skeena river at Babine and one on the head waters of the Fraser river at Stewart lake.

Mr. BERGERON. In a general way what is the cost of one of these establishments?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Of course it varies with the size and the local conditions. The buildings for the hatcheries proposed in British Columbia will cost very little. They are hundred of miles in the interior, remote from sources of supply and I fancy the lumber will have to be cut on the ground. I am told they will cost not more than $7,000 or $8,000.

Mr. BARR. What will the one at Wiarton cost?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is estimated to cost less than $5,000.

Mr. BARR. Will the contract be let by tender?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, the work will be done by day labour. In the case of the British Columbia hatcheries it is absolutely impossible—I say this from a knowledge of the circumstances—to have the work done by contract.

Mr. BARR. But there is no such difficulty in the way of the work to be done at Wiarton? It will certainly cost more than $5,000 to build that hatchery.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that it will cost not more than $5,000, and therefore the work is to be done by day labour.

Mr. BARR. It may not cost $5,000 to begin, but it will cost more than $5,000 before it is finished. I venture to say that if advertisements were issued calling for tenders the best offer would exceed $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. When was the decision reached to establish a fish hatchery at Wiarton?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It was decided some time ago, and the buildings were started last fall.

Mr. BARR. Can the minister tell me what the work at Wiarton will cost when finished? He must have an estimate—he surely is not going on with the work by day labour without having an estimate?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The whole cost is estimated at $4,700.

Mr. BARR. But surely the hon. gentleman has not included all the items, or his estimate would exceed $5,000. As a matter of fact, is not this low estimate made to avoid putting this work under contract?—for the work is progressing very expensively and very slowly.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I give my hon. friend (Mr. Barr) the information given me by the officers of the department.

Mr. BARR. Then, will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Templeman) say that this work will not cost over $5,000?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have the assurance again of the officers of the department that I may give my hon. friend that answer—the estimate of $5,000 will not be exceeded.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Templeman) said that this work was decided upon some time ago and commenced recently.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It was commenced last fall.

Mr. SPROULE. When was it decided to build a hatchery there?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that the building of hatcheries on Georgian bay has been under consideration for some years. There were rival places and conflicting interests, but it was decided some time last year——

Mr. HENDERSON. About the time of the election there?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I did not know there was an election there.

Mr. BARR. Was not that one of the election pledges ? I think I have heard that it was.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am told that the matter was decided before it was known that there was to be an election there.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw the government official there when the election was going on, and it was then, and not till then, that the fish hatchery was commenced. It was known then—no doubt about that. Now, just a word about what the minister said with regard to the fish hatcheries on the Georgian bay and the conflict of places where they should be built. Many years ago I drew attention to the fact that a fish hatchery should be built on the Beaver river near Thornbury. It was in front of that portion of the Georgian bay from which a large supply of fish ova comes. The acting minister, or the minister, said he would make inquiries and let me know whether the place was suitable or not. Later I renewed the inquiry and was told that the matter had been looked into and the place suggested found suitable, and I was given to understand—but in a very diplomatic way—that I might reasonably expect that a fish hatchery would be built there. We were jollied along with that sort of information—not specific or definite, not frank, open and manly as the information should be given to this House. Next year the statement was repeated in much the same way. The government's own official reported favourably, as the minister told me. The matter was kept hanging in that way another year, and it worked along until last year. I endeavoured to get information last session, but no definite information could be obtained. Straight questions were asked, but no frank answers were given. It was still held out that the conditions there were favourable, and that there would be some fish hatcheries built on the Georgian bay. But no other place was mentioned as suitable. I heard nothing more about it until the election took place in Bruce. I happened to be up at that election, and one of the men I met there was the government official who had gone to select a place for the fish hatchery. It was going to be commenced at once, some kind of understanding was reached. We could not ascertain whether it was to be done by day's labour or by contract; but, at any rate, at that particular time it was convenient that a government official should be found there telling the people what an

important thing it was to have a fish hatchery built there. I presume they have been going on with that hatchery since that time. Now, I don't think this is a proceeding fair to the people. I believe the whole thing is tainted with corruption. I say it publicly in this House, and I wish to give the word the strongest meaning it will bear. It was designed to influence the honest electors of that riding in the election that was coming on. It was improper, it was not right. When we condemn people for buying votes at $2 a head, I think we have just as good a right to condemn the government for employing the power that is in their hands improperly to influence the electorate in favour of the government candidate.

Mr. BARR. There is no doubt that Wiarton was promised the fish hatchery owing to the fact that an election was coming on. My hon. friend's opponents pledged themselves that there would be a fish hatchery in Meaford if their candidate was elected; he was elected, and I think he got some votes in consequence. But as he was not elected, of course the government were not disposed to carry that out. Wiarton is a place not as convenient as Meaford, and in no way as suitable for a hatchery. But an election was coming on in the near future, and they had to show good work in order that my hon. friend might be elected again. It is well known that this hatchery will never be finished with $5,000; but the government, in order to keep the thing going on a long time and influence as many electors as possible, prefer to vote the cost in small instalments like this $4,786. I am afraid this state of affairs is going on in every part of the Dominion, so far as the Fishery Department is concerned.

Mr. TELFORD. I had considerable to do with that fish hatchery, and tried to get it for my own riding. I used every influence that I could command to secure it for my riding, but the authorities told me long before the election took place that Wiarton was the proper place for it. They could get spawn four miles from the shore, the water is deep and cold close to the shore. Although I did my level best to get it for Owen Sound, they shut me off and told me Wiarton was the most suitable place. That is the reason Wiarton got the fish hatchery.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Telford) says the authorities told him that Wiarton was the proper place long before the election. Well, this House prorogued last July, and up to that time the government gave no information as to where they would make the selection So it could not have been a long time before the election that a decision was reached. I had it from the official who was there to look after the business that they had decided lately to go on with the hatchery, and that happened to be at the very time the election was coming on.

Mr. TELFORD. If the hon. member for East Grey will take the trouble to look up the fyles of a Wiraton newspaper, he will find the people there were informed before Mr. Bland's death the hatchery would be built there. It was months before the election that the government decided that the fish hatchery should go to Wiraton. From my personal knowledge, Wiraton is the best point for the hatchery. If you ask any man who knows anything about the circumstances, that is the answer you will get. I made particular inquiries about the matter, as I was anxoius to get it for Owen Sound.

Mr. SPROULE. There are other places than Owen Sound. The information I obtained from the government official was that the Beaver river, which empties into the Georgian bay at Thornbury, was as suitable a place for a fish hatchery as could be desired. So far as I know the locality of Wiarton and along the Beaver river, Thornbury is just as far ahead of Wiarton as anything could be. I was given to understand by the minister himself two years in succession that there could not be any better place, and I was given to understand that probably the selection would be made there. But still it was held back and held back. It did duty in one of my elections and did duty afterwards, and yet the government come out and say: We will build it there, or we will not build it there. I think that is improper. They hold back, in my judgment, only for the duty that it will do when there is an election on. The fact that we found government officials there at the time that an election was going on, and the additional fact that they decided to build this work, not by contract, but by day labour, or in some other way that would give employment to the largest number of labourers there, makes the suspicion very strong that there was some other motive in view than that of saving the country's money by doing the work at the cheapest possible rate.

Mr. TELFORD. Let me say that I made particular inquiries with respect to the use of spring water. Capital spring water comes in at Owen Sound and for that reason I thought that Owen Sound was the proper place to build the hatchery. We have at Owen Sound as good spring water as that of the Beaver river. The gentleman at the head of this branch of the department who ought to understand the question better than any individual in this House told me that that kind of water was not suitable, that neither the Beaver, nor the Sydenham

nor any other river water is suitable for hatching salmon trout. It must be lake water.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tell me across the floor of the House that the stream was admirably suited for it ?

Mr. TELFORD. I do not suppose that he knew as well as the head of the hatchery branch who is an expert and who told me himself that it was not suitable.

Mr. SPROULE. But the minister's information to me was that he had sent his official to inquire and that he had reported himself that it was not suitable.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me that this is a question which is too important to be lightly passed over. It has been a burning question about election time around the Georgian bay as to where this hatchery should be placed. When the late minister decided that he would not occupy a seat in this House again owing to family afflictions, steps were taken to establish a hatchery and commence work. But, there was not much accomplished. The work was going on during the election. While the question has been under discussion for the last ten or fifteen years it is significant that work on the hatchery was not commenced until it was known that there was an election going on. I venture to say that if my hon. friend (Mr. Tolmie) had not been elected work would not have been continued and that the question of building the hatchery would have come up again at future elections. The dangerous part of it is that they are doing it by day's work. We know that they are just simply keeping on the work in order that their friends may be satisfied and that my hon. friend's hand may be strengthened in the coming election.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to corroborate what has been said by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Telford). During the late Mr. Préfontaine's time this matter was fought out. The hon. member for North Grey, on behalf of his town, favoured the erection of a hatchery at Owen Sound, and I, as the member for the south riding of Bruce, took an interest in the question on behalf of the people of Wiarton. It was just as good as decided by Mr. Préfontaine that the fish hatchery should go to Wiarton.

Mr. BENNETT. Why did the work not go on then ?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not prepared to say why the work did not go on then. We know that there was a hitch in the business of the department at the time Mr. Préfontaine died, and I think that is possibly the reason, but the matter was as good as decided by Mr. Préfontaine, and he promised myself and a deputation that waited upon him that the fish hatchery would be placed at Wiarton. I think there is no need for any discussion about it. The fact that an election was going at the time was merely a coincidence.

Mr. BARR. Is it the opinion of the hon. gentleman that it should be done by day's work ?

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not prepared to give any opinion about that. I suppose that those who have the matter in hand will likely do the best for the country and the department.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I want to ask the minister if favourable consideration has been given to the large number of petitions which have been sent from the district of Rondeau on Lake Erie asking for the establishment of a fish hatchery at that place? I am not prepared to say whether there should be one there or not because I do not know enough about fish hatcheries to be able to express an opinion upon the subject. But I do know that in that section of the country we get more fish than are taken from the great lakes in any other part of the province of Ontario. A great many petitions have been sent in asking for the establishment of a fish hatchery at Rondeau which, as far as I am able to judge, is a very suitable place. Our fishermen there claim that it is an absolute necessity that a fish hatchery should be established there to keep up the supply of fish. I asked a question in this House some few weeks ago as to the amount of money that was spent in the different provinces of the Dominion for the propagation of fish. I find that in British Columbia $48,000 is spent yearly while in the province of Ontario some $13,000 or $14,000 is spent. I do not know whether this is due to the fact that we have more members from the province of British Columbia supporting the government, but I want to say in all fairness that the fisheries of the great lakes deserve more encouragement than they get from the paltry sum that is spent in the province of Ontario. The fish that are caught in the great lakes will bring from $40 to $45 a ton more in the New York market than is obtained for British Columbia fish, so that Ontario produces the best fish for the market in so far as the price is concerned. For that reason an equal share of the money expended upon our fisheries should be spent in the province of Ontario and particularly in the section of the country from which I come in order to encourage the propagation of the class of fish to which I refer. I am not finding any fault with the department at all, but I would like the minister to tell me if any encouragement has been given or is under consideration in so far as the fish hatchery which I speak of is concerned.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The question of fish hatcheries for all of the great lakes is under

consideration of the department and no doubt the demand for more hatcheries will be supplied as rapidly as possible. In regard to the proposal to erect a hatchery at Rondeau, I am informed that Lake Erie is pretty well supplied with white fish from the Sandwich hatchery and by the American hatcheries. The Sandwich hatchery's output is from 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 per annum, and I am also informed that the supply of white fish is maintained in Lake Erie and it is largely attributable to the operation of the hatcheries I have named. It is rather an extraordinary thing in this House to hear any hon. member say that the province of British Columbia is getting any more than it is entitled to or would require in comparison with any other province of the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. You mean with reference to the last election outcome?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. With reference to anything. If there is a province in the Dominion in which it will pay to spend money to protect, increase and continue the fish wealth, it is British Columbia, and I can say that without making invidious comparisons with the great province of Ontario. The fish wealth of Ontario is very great indeed but I want my hon. friend to understand that in 1905, British Columbia led all the provinces in the value of its catch of fish. It will not be many years before British Columbia exceeds any or every other province of the Dominion. The increase of fish wealth, particularly the propagation of the sockeye salmon, is a matter which the government cannot ignore without running the risk of killing for ever an industry which is of very great importance to British Columbia. I do not think my hon. friend is quite fair when he says that British Columbia has had $40,000 for fish hatcheries, and Ontario considerably less. However, it is unnecessary to make comparisons; it should be the duty of the government to build up the fishing interest of the whole Dominion wherever they may be, and I am convinced that if the government can do anything to maintain and improve the fish wealth of the great lakes it is certainly their bounden duty to do so, and to do the same thing in regard to all the provinces of Canada. The expenditure under this head is increasing fairly rapidly. I would be willing to see it increase even more rapidly if it is found to be always warranted as I believe it is in regard to the establishment of fish hatcheries, and the improvement of the fishing industry. The department has not as yet determined to erect a fish hatchery at Rondeau, believing that up to the present time, at any rate, the institution at Sandwich maintains the whitefish in Lake Erie to its full average, at least there is not known to be any depletion of fish in that lake.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I presume that the fish commission is for the purpose of taking up such matters as the Rondeau Fish Hatchery. I think the minister has possibly done more unfair criticism than I did myself. I have no fault to find with what British Columbia got for her hatcheries for propagating fish, but I say that Ontario has not got what she ought to get and that the fishing interests of this province are being neglected. British Columbia has got more than her proportion but she has not got more than she deserves. The fish interest of this province is an asset that should be taken care of. I have had great experience with the fishermen in the district from which I come who should know the subject thoroughly, and that is why I claim that a fish hatchery at Rondeau would be a great help in encouraging the industry and could be kept up with very little expense.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that the establishment of fish hatcheries is one of the subjects into which the fish commission will inquire and report.

Mr. BERGERON. I would imagine that the acting minister would be particularly interested in protecting the fishing interests of British Columbia, and I would ask him as acting minister to see that that fish is protected. I understood when I was in British Columbia that there were a great many complaints owing to the fact that the Americans were taking the great part of the fishing wealth of British Columbia. Whether that can be settled in Washington or here I do not know, but the minister is more interested perhaps than any one else in seeing that the industry is protected.

Mr. GANONG. What proportion of this vote is to be expended on fish hatcheries in the Bay of Fundy?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In Nova Scotia we have the Bedford hatchery, the Margaree, the Windsor, the Bay View lobster hatchery and the Canso lobster hatchery.

Mr. GANONG. I was referring to the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend will know whether these places are on the Bay of Fundy better than I do. In the province of New Brunswick we have the Restigouche hatchery, the Grand Falls hatchery, the Shippegan hatchery the Shemogue lobster hatchery. These are the names of the places in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia on which there will be expenditures.

Mr. GANONG. As I understand those are past expenditures, I was referring to the present vote.

Mr. BERGERON. How many are there in Quebec?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is the Gaspé hatchery, the Magog hatchery, the Mont Tremblant hatchery, the St. Alexis hatchery and the Tadousac hatchery.

Mr. GANONG. I asked how many were being built this year in the Bay of Fundy?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I gave the complete list in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These are already in operation. I did not know how many were on the Bay of Fundy. The question of building further hatcheries on the Bay of Fundy is under consideration and is being investigated at the present time. Considerable information has to be obtained and I am informed that the question is being carefully considered and when additional information is obtained action may be taken.

Mr. GANONG. I understand from this that no portion of this vote is to be devoted to hatcheries on the Bay of Fundy. It is a rather remarkable position, because we had an election in Charlotte as some of you may know, and at that time we had a great many promises made to the candidate and to the citizens for the purpose of influencing the vote. Happily for the candidate who represented the Reform party he has gone to his reward in the Senate, he is a gentleman who resides in Montreal and represents a New Brunswick constituency. The people down there are not so much interested in the reward given to the gentleman who was the Reform candidate as in the promises that came directly to them, political promises of wharfs, breakwaters and so on. So many of these promises were made that people actually believed we would rival Queens and Shelburne. It is estimated that at least one-third has been added to the area of that county, since this government came into power, through the erection of wharfs and breakwaters. The fish hatchery was one of the promises given. We have the best spawning grown in the maritime provinces, according to the report of the Fishery Commission appointed to investigate. We have been promised a lobster hatchery there for years by the gentlemen who were tramping the county over in the endeavour to influence votes. It is admitted that there is no such good food ground for fisheries as at Charlotte, but apparently we have to be penalized down there by this government simply because we have a vote that is not purchaseable either by wharfs or promises of fish hatcheries.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend says that those establishments cost on an average from $5,000 to $10,000 according to where they are situated.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Some cost more.

Mr. BERGERON. But that is the average cost. What are the expenses of maintenance ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The salaries of the men and the cost of collecting fry and distributing it afterwards. The number of men employed is about five to each station and the term of employment is about five and a half months in the year. The work continues night and day. During the off season there is an officer in charge.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the expense per year ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have the figures here for the province of Quebec. The expense in connection with the Magog hatchery is $1,000 ; St. Alexis, $1,500 ; Lake Lester, $1,500 ; Tadousac, $4,500. That is the cost of maintenance.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What fish hatcheries are there in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There are two, the Gillies Point hatchery, cost of maintenance, $2,000 ; the Charlottetown lobster hatchery, $3,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The western part of the island is as much interested in the fish industry as the east, yet there is no fish hatchery there at all. The matter has been before the department for the last three or four years, and they have been promising us a suitable location and it is about time something was done. The catch has been falling off from year to year so that unless the department takes some active steps we will eventually have no lobster catch on the southern side of Prince Edward Island at all. The attention of the department has been called a number of times to Egmont bay, where as large a number of lobsters is caught as at any other place. I would like to know if any definite decision has been arrived at ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, but the department is cognizant of the demands and the necessity for further aid to hatcheries in the island, and is at present investigating the matter. We hope to do something by next year.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That is the same story as two years ago.

Mr. McLENNAN. Last year I called attention to the urgency of having a retaining pond in connection with the hatchery at Margaree, and the minister said he expected to make a visit to that part of the country when he would look into the matter. Unfortunately some other business prevented his coming. I know that the contention on the part of the officials was that the hatchery in St. John river was ample to supply ova to the various other hatcheries throughout the maritime provinces ; but I called the attention of the minister to the fact that in all instances where the source of supply was at hand retaining ponds were established, and while it is all right to have a central depot in St. John harbour a retaining pond is very desirable at the Margaree river, which is, next to the Restigouche, the finest salmon river in the maritime provinces. The fishery inspector, who has had thirty years' experience and consequently ought to be an expert, has reported in favour

of a retaining pond in connection with the Margaree hatchery. I might add that on looking over the report of the department last year, I find that it states that the water in St. John harbour, where this central retaining pond is situated, has been contaminated by sewage. This makes it the more important that a retaining pond should be established in connection with the Margaree hatchery. The source of supply is within one hundred yards of this hatchery. It seems like carrying coals to Newcastle to send 300 or 400 miles away for salmon fry when the finest salmon perhaps in the world are to be had within a hundred yards. Besides, bringing the fry that long distance always subjects it to the risks and vicissitudes incidental to the carriage by railway train and transfer to steamer and all the handling in that connection. It is quite true that a very large supply of salmon fry has been sent out from the Margaree hatchery but it is equally true that a considerable proportion is destroyed in transit.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I shall be very pleased to look into the matter as early as possible.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. minister give us an idea about what the capital cost is for the construction of a fish hatchery with a capacity of from 500,000 to 1,000,000 per season, such as the Lake Lester hatchery or the Magog hatchery ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It depends on locality. 500,000 to 1,000,000 would be a very small hatchery. As a rule the fish hatcheries out west are in very remote places, where the cost of bringing in supplies is very heavy. At a convenient place such a hatchery should not cost more than $4,000 or $5,000.

Mr. AMES. I wish to ascertain further if it has ever been suggested to the department that possibly some of the large fishing clubs would be willing to enter into a joint arrangement for the propagation of fish in the streams over which their leases extend. If a small salmon hatchery could be established at the mouth of a river like the Grand Cascapedia for the exclusive use of the river, the wealthy lessees would be very likely willing to contribute one half or the entire expense, and in that way the government could get an expenditure of two dollars at the cost of one. I would suggest to the department that they should make an effort to negotiate with some of the large fishing clubs to this end.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The suggestion of my hon. friend may be very worthy of further consideration, although I must confess that the matter has been already considered at various times by the department. We have in the west hatcheries owned by cannery men, which are supervised by the department and report to it. The owners bear all the expenses but the hatcheries are under the supervision of our officers. Whether it would be convenient or advisable to make such an arrangement with a sporting club, holding fishing rights over a specific territory, is a question I would not be prepared to answer offhand. As a matter of fact, I understand that many of the lakes fished over by these clubs are supplied at present from the Dominion government hatcheries. The suggestion, however, is one worthy of being carefully considered.

Mr. AMES. I would like to ask the minister if he will give the suggestion some consideration in the course of this coming summer. If plans could be brought out and the estimated cost was not more than $3,000 or $4,000, it is probable that a number of the wealthy fishing clubs would undertake to entirely maintain or contribute largely to the maintenance of hatcheries on their own waters. In that way we would largely increase the fish production because the fish could be hatched and put into the river close by the hatcheries and avoid the dangers incident to their being sent long distances.

I would ask also whether the question of regulation of netting privileges, especially in the province of Quebec, has been satisfactorily settled with the local governments. At present the Dominion government are stocking the rivers in the province of Quebec with salmon and trout, and the local government is issuing netting privileges which deplete the entire population in the rivers. Down the Gaspé and along the north shore, while the Dominion government is making efforts to propagate the salmon, the salmon are being destroyed by the netting. If that question be not settled in the near future and stricter regulations enforced so as to permit a fair number of the salmon to reach the spawning grounds, many of the rivers, especially in the lower St. Lawrence, will be depleted of salmon.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The point raised is another evidence of the unfortunate condition in which we stand at present owing to conflict of jurisdiction.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the present arrangement ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The question is still sub judice and I cannot even express the hope that it is near settlement.

Mr. SPROULE. Who exercises jurisdiction over the fisheries at present?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec give licenses and define the size of the nets. We make the laws with regard to stocking the rivers. Nothing has been done to come to an agreement although I am continually pressing to have a satisfactory arrangement made. My hon.

friend further asked the department to consider the suggestion with regard to obtaining the assistance of private fishing clubs in establishing and maintaining hatcheries. I think the suggestion a very good one. Whether it is possible for the government to join in the maintenance of a hatchery owned by a private fishing club is a matter on which I would reserve judgment, but I am sure that the department would be only too willing to give every assistance possible in such a work, as it would lessen the responsibility of the government to that extent.

Mr. AMES. If the department facilitates the commercial operations of fishing companies in British Columbia, I should think it might apply the same principle to the operation of fishing clubs in the east. The fishing club is of very great assistance in the maintenance of the fish supply. The number of fish which are actually captured in the rivers by members of fishing clubs is a very small percentage compared with those caught by nets on the coast. When a fishing club at great expense protects the spawning salmon or trout in the rivers, it contributes very greatly to the protection of the fish supply, and I think the department would be wise to work with it as far as possible in doing so.

Fishery protection service, $225,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What arrangements are the government making to settle the differences between the Dominion and provincial authorities with reference to the control of the inland and inshore fisheries? Some time ago it was decided by the Privy Council that the federal authorities had control of certain parts of the fisheries, while the local authorities owned the shores, and had the right to lease or set aside different portions of them for fishing purposes. The provincial legislatures have passed Acts for the leasing of portions of the shores, but there seems to be a conflict of authority which for some years past the Dominion and provincial governments have been endeavouring to settle. I would like to know how far they have succeeded in making an arrangement. In the maritime provinces there are vast oyster fisheries which could be greatly increased if these disputes were settled. This is a matter which should engage the immediate attention of the government.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is a very large question, and my hon. friend knows the position in which it has been for a number of years.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is growing larger every year.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I suppose it is. It was hoped that this question would have been taken up at the conference of the provincial premiers and adjusted satisfactorily, but it appears that it was not. I may say that no progress in the settlement of the question has been made in recent years.

To provide for the construction of a fisheries protection cruiser for the Pacific coast, $225,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done in that regard?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Dominion government has only one small vessel on the Pacific coast as a fisheries protection cruiser, and it has been found absolutely necessary to provide another.

Mr. MACPHERSON. There should be two more.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, two or three are really required.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not as to the necessity of one that I asked the question, but what steps are being taken towards the building of it? Where is it to be built, and what is the probable cost?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Tenders have not yet been obtained. They will be called for in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the size of the vessel?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Two hundred and twenty-five feet long. It will have about 800 tons displacement, with a speed of 17½ knots. It is necessary that this vessel should be built as soon as possible. The fisheries protection vessel on the Pacific coast, the 'Kestrel,' is altogether too slow and affords little or no protection to our fisheries there. On three separate occasions United States fishing schooners were seen poaching in Canadaian waters, and were able to get away owing to the slowness of the 'Kestrel.' Tenders for the vessel will be called for by public announcement.

Mr. MACPHERSON. This is an instance in which I would be somewhat in opposition to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We have shipbuilding facilities on the Pacific coast, and I think this is an excellent opportunity for the government to encourage the shipbuilding industry there by having this ship built on the Pacific coast. We have shipbuilding facilities at Vancouver, Victoria and New Westminster.

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing but punts there.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman has not been there, or he would not say that. The 'Beatrice,' owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway, an excellent boat, was built in British Columbia. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is doing a great deal towards building up the industry of shipbuilding on the Pacific coast, and I think this is an instance in which our government might

rise above the criticisms of the opposition, and decide not to call for tenders for this boat outside of the province of British Columbia.

Mr. BENNETT. How many companies are there ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not know exactly how many there are—there may be four or five, but I know of three. I am speaking from the standpoint of a Canadian operating on the Pacific coast. I think this would be an excellent opportunity for the department to let that contract in the province of British Columbia, because the building of this boat there will do a great deal to encourage shipbuilding on the coast. And I believe the House will back up the department if it does as I propose.

Mr. BERGERON. Where else could the boat be built ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Well, the Polsons build boats.

Mr. BERGERON. But how could she be transported to the Pacific coast ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Her hull could be built out there. Or the boat might be built on the Atlantic coast and sent around.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is done. We have quite a number of boats on that coast that came from Halifax and were sent around the Horn to British Columbia. The government did a good thing when they had the 'Kestrel' built, but that was only spasmodic. They could follow that up by building the present boat there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the 'Kestrel' built on the Pacific coast ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes, by Wallace Brothers. She is a good boat.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How large ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Oh, she is only a little Jim Crow of a boat, about as long as this room. The American government did a good thing in encouraging the establishment of the shipbuilding yards of Moran Brothers in Seattle. They have done a great deal to build up that city. Now, I wish to impress upon the minister—and I am very much in earnest in this matter—that the government could do a great deal toward building up the Pacific coast by encouraging the establishment of a shipbuilding industry there.

Mr. FOSTER. I would go with my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) part of the way. I do not think it would be wise for the government to call for tenders with the declaration that this boat shall not be built anywhere but on the Pacific coast. I think it would be perfectly right for the government to take into consideration certain things. If we build a boat on this side of the continent to be run in Pacific waters, you have to get her on the other side of the continent. In the first place this involves expense. Possibly—considering the government's general record—this boat will be built before the Panama Canal is ready. In that case, she will have to be taken round the Horn. This would consume a great deal of time. So the time and the expense might well be taken into account. And, even if there was a little balance against the British Columbia tenderers, I do not think this House would criticise the government very strongly—if the balance were not too large—if they should give the best British Columbia tenderer the preference. But I would protest against putting in a clause in the call for tenders excluding any citizen of this country from tendering in the case of so large an expenditure. Giving this preference, and with the facilities at their hand, I think that the government would have a very fair chance of getting the work done on the pacific coast. Besides that, it would be a fine thing for my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) and his colleagues in British Columbia to look in at the building of that vessel now and then and think how their own part of the Dominion was going ahead, that it was becoming a manufacturing country as well as a great fruit-growing and mining country. I do not see any reason why British Columbia should not be a great manufacturing part of our Dominion, considering its resources in coal and its facilities, particularly its geographical position. It comes into trade competition with our Japanese allies and neighbours on the other side of the Pacific and must take cognizance of that fact. It is a significant thing that Mr. Hill does not feel justified in replacing the very fine steamer which was burned, and which cost him three and a half millions. The reason why he does not replace her is because of the close and energetic competition of our allies and friends on the other side of the Pacific.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Because the Japanese will only patronize their own boats.

Mr. FOSTER. If anything can be done fairly to set on its feet the boatbuilding industry on the Pacific coast, I think the government should do it.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Canadian fisheries exhibit, $6,500.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Out of a vote of $7,000 there was expended, in 1905-6, $5,-351. This exhibit is in charge of Mr. Andrew Halkett, whose salary is $1,600 per annum. The department intends to procure additional specimens.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this money intended to be all used for the fishery exhibit on O'Connor street?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Oyster culture, $7,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The work for the coming year is to be carried on at Richmond bay, Shediac bay, Murray Harbour bay and Bras d'Or lake, N.B.

Mr. SPROULE. What success is attending the efforts being made in that direction?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that considerable success has been met with, and more applications are coming in to the department than can be granted.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Does the Dominion government recognize the fact that the provincial governments have authority and power to locate and limit oyster beds?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is a large constitutional question; I am not prepared to express an opinion.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. If the minister cannot admit that, there is very little use in this government spending money in the culture of oysters. Suppose that I were to go on and sow a bed of oysters, look after them three or four years and get them to pay, and any other person came along and took those oysters away from me, what encouragement would I have to go into the culture again? All the provincial legislatures of the maritime provinces have passed laws empowering them to lease oyster beds. There seems to be a doubt as to whether the jurisdiction or power to pass those laws belongs to the provincial governments. The Dominion government have known that for the last six or seven years, but they have taken no steps to have the question settled. There is a great deal of money invested in oyster culture, and a great number of men are engaged in it. In the United States each state of the union on the Atlantic sea-board passes laws to regulate the culture of oysters. But now we are spending money year after year in this business, and it goes for nothing, the oyster beds are diminishing. I can tell the minister from my personal knowledge that the beds are being depleted. Instead of getting an oyster of the proper size, you get a small oyster that is apt to be useless. Unless the Dominion government does something to make an arrangement with the provincial government in reference to the clashing of authority, there is very little use in our passing votes here.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Does my hon. friend oppose this vote?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. No, I think the money is well spent; but I think they should settle this constitutional question first.

Mr. SPROULE. If the money is being wasted because of a conflict of jurisdiction, would it not be better to hold the expenditure until some conclusion is reached?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Until that time arrives and the question is settled, I think it would be inadvisable to suspend this vote. The government is doing what it can in the propagation and culture of oysters on the Atlantic coast, in which Prince Edward Island is largely interested. Simply because you have dual jurisdiction, and some regulations of the provincial governments interfere with the object the Dominion government have in view, is no reason why we should not pass this appropriation. It involves the large question of the jurisdiction over the fisheries.

Mr. SPROULE. The government should make an extra effort to reach a settlement.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Quite true.

To assist in the establishment, maintenance and inspection of cold storage of bait for deep sea fishermen, $85,000.

Mr. SPROULE. There has been a large vote for some years back for this purpose. What has been accomplished?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The following is a statement of the expenditures for 1905-6:

Construction of freezers completed in 1905-6—		
Balance—		
Canso	$11,865 00	
Anse à la Barbe	119 56	
Louisburg	382 50	
Drumhead	244 68	
Quoddy	95 11	
Big Island	439 47	
Repairs—		
Spuris	157 16	
Ballantyne	25 37	
Paspebiac	336 16	
		$13,665 01
Built in 1905-6—		
St. Godfroy	781 70	
Maria Capes	714 62	
Cabin Cove	782 55	
Etang du Nord	745 86	
Arisaig	459 58	
Bonaventure East	441 40	
Anse aux Gascons	738 59	
Lunenburg	1,750 00	
Caraquet	813 06	
		7,237 36
Commenced in 1905-6—		
Cape Cove	300 00	
Newport Point	400 00	
Digby	1,000 00	
Halifax	25,000 00	
		26,700 00
Salaries and travelling expenses staff		16,865 82
Insulating paper and tubing		1,469 55
Bonuses to freezers		2,980 96
Printing		14 54
C. A. Sahlstrom, experimenting		250 00
		69,183 24

Herring fishery..	$16,503 39	
Less sales of herring..	1,007 73	
		15,495 66
		84,678 90

Out of this vote the assistance given to fishermen (50 per cent of the cost) in establishing fishermen's small bait freezers throughout the maritime provinces, has been paid; also one half the cost up to $30,000 of the establishment of a large bait freezer for the bankers at Halifax.

In addition to these, the cost of Scottish herring curing experiment, which was this year conducted at Caraquet, N.B., was paid.

The usual amount of this vote is $85,000, but as it is contemplated to extend the scheme of development of the fisheries, in the way of assisting in the establishment of large cold storage plants for bait, which are being asked for on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic, it will be necessary to provide for equal assistance to what was given to the large bait freezers at Halifax and Canso to another bait freezer on the Pacific coast, and, as in 1905-6 the sum of $36,865 was paid for assistance to the large bait freezers at Halifax and Canso out of this vote, it is expected that the present vote of $85,000 will be ample to provide equal assistance to a freezer on the Pacific coast.

Mr. SPROULE. Has it been a success?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes; my officer says that the experiment has been most successful all over.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) what is the position of the question as to who has control of the oyster fishery? I understood from one of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken that there is some conflict between the local and Dominion government, that there has been some decision given, and that the position is now that there must be an arrangement made between the provinces and the Dominion in order that either one of them shall have absolute control over this question. I understand that there is a very serious loss to the Dominion, and not only that, but that the oysters that we are getting are not as good as they were on account of neither authority having control. I understand that there has been some decision given by the Privy Council that the Dominion government have the regulating of the seasons in which the oysters may be fished, while the local government have another jurisdiction. As the Finance Minister is interested in the lower provinces and, of course, would be more interested than any other member of the House in this question, probably he will be able to give us some information.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN

Mr. FIELDING. I would not like to undertake to give very definitely an opinion as to the legal decision which has been given in connection with the fishery question. My recollection is that there was no special judgment in reference to the oyster fishery. It was a general judgment as to the rights of the provinces in the shore fisheries; and, roughly speaking, if a layman may venture to state the substance of the decision, it was that what is called the property interest in the fisheries belongs to the provinces who are the owners of the soil, and the regulation of the fisheries is a matter to be managed and controlled by the Dominion authorities. There is some confusion no doubt, and we, looking at it from the Dominion point of view, think it most desirable that there should be united action. We would be very much pleased if the provinces would waive their claims and allow the whole matter to be dealt with by the Dominion government. But the provinces are disposed to think that these fisheries are of some financial value to them, and that the Dominion should pay for the privilege of acquiring them. We have not reached any conclusion in the matter, but we are rather disposed to advance the argument that when we take over the full and unlimited control of these fisheries we are taking over that which will be of no financial benefit to us, but which will be the cause of considerable outlay. But, nevertheless, in the public interest generally, we think it most desirable that we should get control. The only difficulty in getting control is that several of the provinces would be very happy to sell their interest in the fisheries to us. Some of the provinces attach very great importance to their interest in the fisheries. The province of Prince Edward Island is disposed to attach a monetary value to its interest, while some of the other provinces take the view that while the fisheries are of importance, it is in the interest of all concerned that the Dominion should control them. The province of Ontario is disposed to attach importance to its own management of the fisheries, and it would not be willing to yield that control to us without some consideration. These difficulties create complications which are unfortunate, and I do not know what can be done at the moment to bring about a settlement, except it be that by correspondence and negotiation we will be able to persuade the local governments that while they may have the legal right to hold control of the fisheries, it is not wise, in the public interest, that they should exercise that right. We are hopeful that before long a settlement of this question will be reached.

Mr. J. D. REID. As it is, the provincial governments issue the licenses?

Mr. FIELDING. In some cases.

Mr. J. D. REID. They do in Ontario, and I suppose it is the same in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. I think Prince Edward Island only issue them for oysters.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Clams.

Mr. J. D. REID. If they issue them for oysters, I suppose the Dominion recognize that they have the right to do so?

Mr. FIELDING. They would have the right to impose fees. I think they could require that any person who fishes for oysters on the shores of Prince Edward Island should pay tribute to the Prince Edward Island government, but the regulation of the seasons during which that fishery may be carried on would probably come within the control of the Dominion. However, these are complicated legal questions, and I do not ask the House to accept, with too much confidence, the rough statement I have made of the situation, although I think it is substantially correct.

Mr. BERGERON. What arrangement has been made between the provincial and Dominion authorities as far as the lakes are concerned? I asked a question this morning about the St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Cornwall. I remember the time when an overseer was appointed by this government, but I am informed that the jurisdiction has now passed to the provincial government, and that the provincial government issue the licenses. The law is very lax; these licenses do not mean anything, and the fish are being destroyed in large quantities.

Mr. FIELDING. Since the judgment was given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, three or four years ago, the provinces have been claiming a degree of authority that had not been previously exercised by them. I think the province of Ontario is one of them.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think there is a little doubt about the meaning of that decision and I believe that if the Dominion government would get the provincial governments to state a case and get the rights of the several governments finally adjudicated upon in the public interest it would be a wise thing. That should be done with the least possible delay, because there is so much doubt about it now that the business is suffering.

Mr. FIELDING. The provinces are not disposed to admit the doubt, they think they have them.

Mr. J. D. REID. Could not a case be decided? All along the St. Lawrence now the local government have assumed control and they have their fishery inspectors. At one time we had a Dominion inspector on the St. Lawrence, but for the last few years the inspection has been under the Ontario government and the licenses are issued by them, in fact they have entire control. That being the case, and as there seems to be some doubt, the matter will have to be settled sooner or later, and as it is now two or three years since the judgment was given I would suggest prompt action.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no doubt that something must be done to settle the question in the near future. The department has been endeavouring for some time to come to an agreement with the provinces in respect to a reference to the Privy Council with a view to a settlement of this for ever, but the terms of that reference have not yet been agreed upon.

Mr. LEFURGEY. In the meantime can the Prince Edward Island government go ahead and lease oyster beds to parties pending a settlement of this question? There is great dissatisfaction and I have had a good deal of correspondence from people interested in this. This applies especially to the estuaries of Malpeque bay and Malpeque bay itself.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. As I understand the government of Prince Edward Island leases the foreshore for the purpose of taking oysters.

Mr. LEFURGEY. No, they have not done so, but they have passed a law in relation to it. There are only one or two leases extant on the island, but last year they passed a law dealing with the lease of what are called the barren beds.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Dominion government did not interfere or do anything to oppose that legislation, but they do not recognize thus far the direct right of the province to make such a lease, just as in British Columbia, to my personal knowledge, the provincial government has undertaken to lease the foreshore for the planting of traps to take salmon. We have neither affirmed nor denied their right to do so. The Dominion government has to make the regulations under which salmon shall be taken, the character of the trap, the season in which fish may be taken, &c. We have not disputed the right of a province to lease the foreshore, although, if I am correctly informed, we neither affirm nor deny the right. The whole question must ultimately be settled by a reference to the Privy Council.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would suggest that the Dominion government take some active steps, especially in the case of the oyster beds, where so much difficulty will arise

from disputed jurisdiction. A reference should be arranged.

Mr. FIELDING. It takes two to make a bargain.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I pointed out what I consider a very dangerous state of affairs. Conflicting interests might result in great damage to the oyster beds.

Mr. AMES. Are the regulations with respect to the size of the mesh of the nets for catching salmon and with respect to the lifting of the nets on Sunday federal regulations and is their enforcement under federal authority?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, of course the regulations are absolutely and altogether federal.

Mr. AMES. Then I desire to point out that along the coast of Gaspé and Bonaventure these laws are absolutely disregarded and are a matter of ridicule, the mesh used in salmon nets is smaller than the law allows and the fishermen, relying on the support of their parliamentary representatives, are very rarely willing to take up their nets on Sunday. The department, if it is going to preserve the salmon, must insist that the nets that are too small be confiscated and that all nets be lifted on Sunday.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that this subject has received considerable attention; that on a representation of the Restigouche Fishing Club an investigation took place and officers were put on to compel fishermen to raise their nets on Sunday with the result that, for the time being at all events, the regulations were complied with. A representative of the Restigouche Club was on the steamer making the rounds at that time. Of course I can say in a general way that there could be no doubt at all that the duty of the department under such circumstances would be to enforce the law and the regulations. I would assume that is what has been done; it is certainly what ought to be done.

Mr. AMES. I may tell the minister for his own information that the law is practically a dead letter and a matter of ridicule along the Gaspé and Bonaventure coast inasmuch as the people feel that the sympathy of the government is entirely with the man who owns the net rather than with the man who protects the fish. You have only to drive along the shore of the Baie des Chaleurs to see the nets on the fences and measure them to find they are several inches smaller than they have any right to be, yet no confiscation has taken place and it is very rarely that the nets are lifted in many of these rivers. The fish are small, and sometimes even a six or eight pound fish is all net marked, showing that they have great difficulty in working their way through the nets. If the legal size of the mesh is maintained, a salmon of ten or twelve pounds weight could go through without a scratch, but as it is, it is impossible to catch an eight or ten pound salmon in these rivers without marks on them.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. What should be the legal size?

Mr. AMES. I am not sure what the legal size is, but I think it is ten inches. At any rate, there is a size fixed by statute, and I know that it is not lived up to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The officer in charge of that district, Dr. Wakeham, is at present in the city of Ottawa, and I will obtain from him a report in regard to the question which my hon. friend has brought to our attention.

Mr. AMES. Dr. Wakeham covers the eastern Gaspé coast and the north shore, but I do not think he has this matter in hand in the Baie des Chaleurs.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He goes all over.

Mr. AMES. Then he ought to take more precaution than he does at present.

Mr. LOGGIE. I would like to say, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that the true legal size of the mesh for salmon is 5 inches, and that the mesh used is from 6½ to 7 inches, that is, for the Gulf of St. Lawrence salmon. For the large salmon that goes up the Restigouche river the size of the mesh used is 7 inches; that is for a salmon of from 20 to 25 lbs. A mesh of from 6¼ to 6⅜ inches is used for a 10-pound salmon. The law does not provide that nets along the sea-coast shall be raised over Sunday, it is an impossibility. In the afternoon the sea breeze that comes up makes it impossible to bring them on shore. On the Miramichi river the nets are put up on pickets from Saturday night till Monday morning or after midnight on Sunday.

Mr. GANONG. It will be interesting to know if the same law applies on the north shore to herring. On the south shore of New Brunswick we have to allow the herring to have Sunday as well as the working man. Perhaps the gentlemen from the northern part of New Brunswick will tell us whether they have a different law on the north shore in regard to herring nets from what we have in the county of Charlotte. We would like to hear from the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie).

Mr. LOGGIE. I would like to say for the information of the hon. gentleman that herring are not caught to any great extent on the Miramichi river. What herring fishing is done is on the seacoast, and I understand that there is no law with regard to it. Ordinary gill-nets are used, and there is nothing in the way of pound-nets such as

are used in the Bay of Fundy. There is no law fixing any particular time for catching herring. In the spring there is what is known as the spring run, when immense quantities are caught mostly used for lobster bait. Then there are no herring of any consequence until the fall, and they are taken entirely by gill-nets, and not by traps as in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. GANONG. We have heard a good deal this session and last session about the destruction of herring along the shores of Charlotte county, and I wanted to know how they destroy them on the north shore. The minister knows that it is contrary to law to leave the nets out over Sunday. I think there are a few herrings caught off the shores of Gloucester county, and we would like to hear something from the hon. member for that county in regard to their habits.

Mr. TURGEON. The herring industry has become a very interesting industry in the county of Gloucester. I am not prepared to say from memory what the size of the net is, but I may say that our fishermen come home on Saturday very early, and there has never been a herring caught on Sunday in Gloucester county.

Mr. GANONG. Before we leave this item, I would like to ask the minister regarding the result of the Scotch method of curing herring. We had a Mr. Cowie out here making some experiments. I would like to know what the total cost of these experiments up to date has been, and also where the experiments were made.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that the experiment carried on by the Scottish herring expert has been extremely successful, the herring put up under the Scottish method obtaining a much higher price in the market than the herring put up in the ordinary way. I understand also that the business of Mr. Cowie on the Pacific coast has been very highly appreciated, although he has been there only one or two years. A number of men with capital have investted in the herring industry, which is a rapidly growing industry on the Pacific coast, very largely due to the education introduced there by Mr. Cowie and his associates. I believe that the experiment has been very successful, and fully justified the expenditure incurred.

Mr. GANONG. It is remarkable how frequently the experiments of the government are remarkably successful. We have heard that in regard to butter, cheese and chickens, and in every instance we have had to foot the bill. I think we should have more definite information. I am not speaking against this experiment, because I think it is in the interest of this country that we should have the best possible method of curing our fish: but I would like to have more positive evidence that it has been so successful. I would like to know how many herring have been packed according to that method, and what prices they have brought. Then you will have something tangible. This mere statement that the experiment was successful is not altogether satisfactory.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Some of these experiments were conducted in my constituency and gave very good results indeed. The packing of herring by the Scotch method is not yet however fully understood by our people and it may take them some time to learn it. I know of people who attempted to pack the herring in that way, after having seen Mr. Cowie do it, and the herring were not so good and did not command so high a price. They were the same kind of herring, but the skill in packing was lacking, which those people who came from Scotland have, and that cannot be picked up in a moment. In the end however the experiment will prove of great benefit to our fishing industry. Take the 'Fishing Gazette' of New York and look through the prices any day you please, and you will find that the Nova Scotia herring, packed according to the Scotch method, is selling at $9 or $10 a barrel in New York, whereas we only get about $5 a barrel under the old method. But the hon. gentleman seems to be disappointed that the experiment has proved a success. My ideas would be to continue it and do more to teach our people this new method. There is a market for all the herring we can put up. The herring packed under this method is not relished at present by our people, but it is in the foreign markets. St. Petersburg furnishes a large market and great centres like Chicago and New York want the herring packed in that way. While it may take some time to work up this industry and while the number of barrels may not be large at present, still the fact that our herring in bringing $10 a barrel in the New York market, packed according to the Scotch method, is very satisfactory.

Mr. GANONG. The hon. gentleman's judgment of my opinion is not worth much either to me or to the House. I was simply asking for information, and I am as much interested as any one can be in the success of this experiment. I have some Scotch people coming out to my county who intend going into that industry? The government however did not see fit to go to the county which produces the fattest herring and make the experiment there where it would have a reasonable chance of success. It chose instead to go where the class of fish is not as good as it is in my county. The Quoddy river herring are known all over as the fattest and best in the country. Still the government did not see fit to send down there, where the experiment could have been conducted to much more advan-

tage than in a place where the herring are known to be not nearly so good. It is because I am interested in the success of this new method that I am anxious to know the result, and all the information we are given is that a few barrels, which went to New York, sold at $8 or $10. I presume that is the full barrel because half barrels sell from $5 to $6. It would be interesting to the fishing industry to know just what is being done and how many fish have been successfully marketed, which were packed under this method.

Mr. McLENNAN. I do not see that it matters very much how many fish were put up in this way. If the method has proved a success, that is ample justification for the government. I have often heard the chicken fattening process sneered at in this House, but I do not remember the government ever instituting that as a means of deriving profit. Indirectly however it is of the greatest value to the people. In the county I have the honour to represent, this method of fattening chickens was lately shown to the people and they have followed it ever since and the industry is most profitable. The same no doubt will be the case in the matter of the herring industry. From watching the process I have come to the conclusion that the Scotch method of curing herring is a decided success. Whether the investment would be a profitable one in the first season or two is problematical, but it is really a great improvement on the old method. What I regret is that the method has not been more widely taught our people. A demonstration of this method should be carried on in more places. What called my attention to the matter particularly is that I was in receipt of a couple of letters from the department asking where the herring were most abundantly caught along the gulf, and I pointed out two localities where they could be caught very plentifully. That is the last I have heard about the matter, and I would be glad if the minister would in the near future give that matter his attention. But as regards the success of the new method of curing herring, that has amply demonstrated that the government have followed the right course.

Mr. GANONG. One of the difficulties is largely in the packages. The packages used formerly not to be of a suitable class to hold the pickle. I think the government imported some few Scotch packages. Perhaps the minister can tell what kind of wood these packages were made of.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The barrels were imported from Scotland and also the salt and parties to pack the herring were brought in at the same time. These barrels have been used as samples by some of the other makers along the coast.

Mr. GANONG. What kind of wood was used in these barrels ? Spruce was largely used formerly, I believe.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am not able to answer that question. Spruce is all right if made tight.

Mr. GANONG. Is spruce being used in Nova Scotia now ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

To provide for the construction and the maintenance of experimental work for the reduction of dogfish, &c., $80,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What facilities are provided for this work ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The expenditure in 1905-6 was $52,000. In addition to operating works at Canso and Shippegan, it is proposed to erect a third establishment at Clarke's harbour. It is expected that this latter will cost about $25,000. The machinery has been arranged for. The Canso works were the only works that were carried on all last season. The cost of operating these establishments, including raw material bought from the fishermen, amounted to about $18,000 for each establishment. The present estimate is based upon $54,000 for maintenance and operation of three establishments, and the cost of the new works at Clarke's harbour, $25,000—total, $79,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the receipts ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Canso establishment produced 176 tons of fertilizer and the Shippegan establishment 84 tons, a total of 260 tons, the estimated value of which is $30 a ton. The material is not yet sold, but it can be sold to the farmers in the locality or elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure that I understand that fully. What was the cost of the maintaining of the Canso dogfish factory ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have not the figures before me showing the cost of that one separately, and cannot come nearer it than to say that these factories cost about $18,000 each for operation and maintenance.

Mr. FOSTER. But the minister must have had the matter worked out so far as the Canso operations are concerned, for, of course, that would be the first thing that parliament would be likely to ask.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that the figures can be procured ; they are in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know the cost of construction of this Canso establishment, the cost of operation and maintenance, including raw material, the estimated value of the output. Do I understand that they make nothing but fertilizer ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. And oil.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Templeman) mentioned only the fertilizer.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Do I understand that none of it has been sold ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Neither the fertilizer nor the oil has been sold.

Mr. FOSTER. But you know the values ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The fertilizer is about $30 a ton. As to the oil, negotiations for the sale are now in progress. I have not been able to get an estimate of the value.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the government has only two objects in view in this whole affair : One is to destroy the dogfish, and the other is to carry on the work in such a way that the country will be recouped its expense, or even make a profit. The latter, I should think, would be the real justification for the industry. If you are going to make appropriations to destroy all the dogfish on the coasts of Canada, you are entering upon a life operation, I think. But, if you can carry on the destruction of them in such a way as to make the operation pay, you have every justification for going on. Here we are put to an expense of $150,000 or $160,000 already, and yet the minister cannot tell us anything that will enable us to judge of the real results of these operations. Have the dogfish in the vicinity of these factories been killed? Has the present generation of dogfish been diminished, and to what extent ? What proportion of this dogfish evil still remains to be dealt with ? How often do the dogfish breed ? It does not make any matter with this government if only they get a chance to spend a lot of money in the way of patronage, what the results may be. They do not think that parliament has any particular right to know just what has been doing. Unless inroads are being made on the dogfish so that this evil is being lessened in an appreciable degree, and unless we have a prospect of exterminating them at a reasonable expenditure of money, the government are entering upon an enterprise which they should not enter upon. We should like to see the dogfish killed, but we should like to see it done with a profit. And certainly we want from the department data which will enable us to understand what they are doing.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the government killing off the dogfish ?

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine that they increase very rapidly. I should think that if you could get an antidote or bane for the dogfish it would be better. If you had a germ that would kill off the dogfish, that would be the scientific way to meet the evil. Why does not the department offer a prize of $100,000 to the scientist who would discover the germ to destroy the dogfish ?

Mr. SPROULE. We should then be in the happy position of the old lady when some one came from a distant part of the country and told her that in that section they had a bug that was eating the potato bug, she said : 'May the Lord increase his appetite and give him great capacity.'

Mr. LEFURGEY. Was not the government approached last year by parties who offered to take over the whole dogfish plant under some arrangement that they proposed ? And is it not true that these parties carried on experiments by which they proved that certain portions of the dogfish were valuable for food, having had some of them canned and analyzed ? I know the government was approached by parties to take this expensive machinery off their hands. I should like to know what the proposition was.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised there was a proposition made to take over the plant, but it was entirely unsatisfactory. Some of the dogfish were canned, I do not know with what result. I believe on the Pacific coast large quantities of dogfish are canned, the Japanese are fond of dogfish for food.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understood the government was in possession of information showing that some of these dogfish were canned and put on the market.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a private concern in Nova Scotia which has been putting up dogfish for the last season, somewhat experimentally. But I know from conversation I had with a gentleman connected with it, that he regarded the experiment as very successful. They have produced a very useful food, and that has led to the question whether the operations of the government might not be extended into turning these fish into food as well as into fertilizers. The whole thing is necessary for the present an experiment. These dogfish have never been converted to any useful purpose, and have been a great nuisance to the fishermen. The object is to ascertain by what method they may be converted into an article of commercial value.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What would you call the food?

Mr. FIELDING. If you convert them into food and call it dogfish, people would not be likely to take to them. I believe it is sold under another name, which correctly describes the article. I understand it is likely to be quite successful.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that instead of spending money on new plants the government should finish up the experiment with the number of plants they have. What is the use of extending the establishment until you have actually completed your experiments through the establishments you have now? If the experiment is satisfactory, and the fish can be converted into oil and fer-

tilizer, or a food product, then the industry would take care of itself. If it can be done with the co-operation of the government, there would be another plan. But first of all, let us have the experiment well tried out before we go to doubling the expenditure in the way of new establishments.

Mr. FIELDING. I know that the government does not contemplate increasing the number of establishments. It has decided to have three experimental plants at widely separated points along the extended coast. Two of these have been in operation, and the machinery for the other I understand is on the ground and about to be erected. But it is not contemplated to enlarge the sphere of experiment until we ascertain more completely what the results of the present expenditures are going to be.

Mr. SPROULE. How long have they been in operation?

Mr. FIELDING. Only one season.

Mr. SPROULE. How did the government reach the decision that they were worth $30 a ton as fertilizer?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The fertilizer was analyzed and was compared in value with other fertilizers whose cost was known. None of it has been sold as yet. Applications have been made to buy it, but none has been sold.

Mr. DANIEL. What remuneration is paid to the fishermen to supply dogfish? How do these reduction plants get their raw material?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand all the dogfish are bought from fishermen, who are paid $4 per ton.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Has anything similar been done by the department to extend carp? I think years ago there was something of that kind proposed. I understand that carp is not considered a good eatable fish. The district I have the honour to represent produces tons upon tons of carp, and while these were not supposed to be a saleable fish until a short time ago, our fishermen at present are getting eight cents a pound for them. There are some dogfish there to, and they find a market in New York, so does the carp.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Nothing has been done with respect to carp.

To provide for the management and expenses of a government educational fish curing establishment, the proceeds of sale to revert to the appropriation, $12,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This vote is for a drying establishment, the object of which is to demonstrate to fishermen the advantages of drying their fish according to the most improved modern methods. It began operations in July, 1905, at Souris, Prince Edward Island, and has not only proved an eminent success as regards the drying of fish, but the proceeds of the sales of fish when they are received will show a favourable balance for the department.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The appropriation says that this shall be an educational fish-curing establishment. So far as the establishment has been run, it has not been used as a fish-curing educational establishment, it has been used simply as a business establishment by the government. The professed object of this institution, when it was first mooted in parliament, was to enable the fishermen to take their fish to this establishment and have them cured at the actual cost of the operation. But no fish have been cured in that way at all, and the fishermen have received no benefit whatever from that establishment. The government have placed the money in the hands of a private individual at Souris to buy fish from the fishermen. Now what has become of the fish received from the fishermen to be handled and matured for the fishermen? The fish were simply purchased by the government, cured for the government and sold by the government. They were shipped by the government in the name of the Occidental Fish Company to New York, Havana, Porto Rico and other ports. The government paid for the transportation not in the interest of the fishermen but in the interest of the government. The government have ever since this work was instituted, competed there with the other traders in the purchasing of fish. The fishermen, I am credibly informed, were not paid the market value for the fish which they sold to this factory or drying establishment and they induced some men to go from Canso to Souris to compete with the government. They did go up and they increased the price of fish to the fishermen something like thirty, forty or fifty per cent in some cases. The consequence was that last season the private firm received nearly three-quarters of the fish that were produced at Souris. An individual representing a Halifax firm went to this establishment with a large amount of fish and asked the manager to allow him to cure the fish in that factory, but he was told that it would not be permitted to him to have the fish cured in that establishment, but if the member for the county consented it was possible that it could be done.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I did not catch that statement.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. A gentleman from Halifax went to the establishment last summer and requested that he be permitted to have some fish cured. He was told by the manager of the factory that he would not be permitted to have the fish cured unless he went to the member for the county and received his permission. This establishment was not constructed for the benefit of a

few politicians but was constructed for the benefit of the trade of the country and more particularly for the benefit of the fishermen in that particular vicinity. It is an educational institution. I think that when an institution of this kind is started men should be sent to that institution in order to have them instructed in the proper way of curing fish. The educational part has been altogether ignored and the establishment has been run by the government in such a way that no person outside of the man who was operating it knew anything about it. I do not know whether this matter has been brought to the attention of the minister, but as the minister introduced this matter first three or four years ago explained to the House it was to be in the interest of the fishermen and it was the intention that any person who had fish to cure could get them cured there. It is my opinion that that policy should be continued instead of the government using this establishment to compete with the ordinary merchants living in Souris and vicinity. The merchants have to supply the fishermen with salt, bait and nets on credit and yet the government purchase the fish over the heads of the merchants. It is not a fair way for the government to deal. I do not think that the government should do business in the same way as a merchant as they are doing in this instance.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Evidently my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. McLean) knows nothing about the particulars of this matter himself.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I read the account up in the Public Accounts Committee and that may be turned up to verify what I say now.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. My hon. friend has made statements that are not to be found in the records of the Public Accounts Committee or in any records of the government or of parliament, and I repeat that I am quite satisfied that he knows nothing about the facts of the case. Further, I make the statement that the information which has been supplied to him is entirely incorrect. The statements made by my hon. friend are contradictory. They contradict themselves.

Mr. DANIEL. In what respect are they incorrect ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Pardon me for a moment and I will come to that. One of the statements made by my hon. friend was that this fish curing establishment was of no benefit whatever to the fishermen of the locality and then a little later on he said that it was for the purpose of adding to the popularity of the local candidate. How could it add to the popularity of the local candidate if it could be of no possible advantage to the fishermen ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I did not make that statement.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I think my hon. friend did.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That was the inference.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Well then I come to the more specific charge that he made towards the latter part of his remarks that a gentleman from Halifax who had a large quantity of fish in that place made application to the manager of the dryer to have them cured there and that he was informed by the manager that it could not be done unless he would apply to the local member. That would be to myself. I am quite satisfied that the statement is absolutely incorrect. Personally I do not know what the manager stated, but I am sure he did not make that statement because, in so far as I am personally concerned, it would be absolutely incorrect. I know all the particulars about that case. A vessel laden with fish bound to Halifax from Gaspé was cast away on the shore and the fish were damaged. The sea water had come in. A man from Halifax purchased them and either himself or through another he made application to have them dried in this establishment. I was informed by the manager and also by the man from Halifax that the answer was that he could not dry them at that particular time because they had all they could do to dry the fish that were brought in by the local fishermen. The gentleman from Halifax said that unless the dryer could begin drying the fish and do nothing else, that is stop drying for the local fishermen altogether until his cargo was completed, he would rather not have them begun at all. He said that he wanted the whole cargo dried within a few days, or a few weeks, or as quickly as it could be done, or that the drying should not be begun at all. It was not for that purpose that the dryer was established. It was chiefly to take care of the fish coming from the local fishermen. That was the answer that the gentleman from Halifax received and I know that to be a fact. I would ask the hon. gentleman to get further and more reliable information on that point.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I will get the information.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Further than that, my hon. friend made the specific statement that not one kentle of fish was dried for the fishermen of that place. That is entirely incorrect. Several kentles have been received. I could give the names of several persons who had fish dried there. The fish are taken in and dried and the fishermen are charged for the drying of them. This experiment is carried on in the drying of fish very much on the lines adopted by Professor Robertson, when he was in the Depart-

ment of Agriculture and established experimental cheese curing stations. He found that in order to inaugurate the experiment and make it a success he had to buy the milk from the farmers, convert it into cheese and sell the product. After some time the farmers were able to establish curing stations of their own. The fishermen could not do so and every man in this House would know that the fishermen themselves could not find a market for their fish if left to themselves entirely.

The only way to make the experiment a success was to buy fish from the fishermen, properly cure these and sell them and show what could be done by private enterprise, when private enterprise would be ready to take the matter up. It has proved a success in every way and my hon. friend will not go down to that part of the country and say that the fishermen have not received any benefit from the fish curing establishment, because every fisherman will tell him that this is one of the best things the government has ever done towards showing the fishermen the best method of putting up their fish for sale in the market. The fish cured in this establishment I am safe in saying is worth from 25 to 50 cents a quintal more than that cured in the ordinary way. Further than this at certain seasons of the year it is simply impossible to dry fish by the open air method particularly in the fall because there is not sufficient wind and sun. My friends from the maritime provinces will understand that very well, there is a time when you could not get two or three bright sunny days in succession with cold westerly winds, and for that reason this has proved to be the greatest boon to the fishermen. What is more, it has been no expense to the government, it has proved a success financially and in every other way and the hon. member for North Toronto, who wishes experiments conducted along that line will I am sure approve of this one. These are all the points I remember being brought out by the member for Queen's, who as I have already stated, knows nothing at all about the question or about the merits of the case.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I have heard the hon. member make that statement before with reference to remarks by myself and by other members. He is very apt to say that a gentleman who speaks knows nothing about the subject under discussion. I know what I see in the public accounts of this country. I have seen the statements produced in the Public Accounts Committee and I tell the hon. gentleman that he will not find $20 placed to the credit of the government of Canada by any man who got fish cured in that establishment. All the fish were purchased by the government to be cured for the government as a trading transaction by the government. That is not the proper way to run this institution, and when the hon. gentleman says that I know nothing about it, he is not making a statement which is correct. I know exactly what the papers and documents say about the transaction, and the statements I made are absolutely and positively correct. The government have no right to be running this institution against ordinary merchants. He says the fishermen cannot sell the fish themselves. What have they been doing the last hundred years in that country? They cured their own fish and sold them.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Oh, no, no.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN That is the only way they could do. They shipped the fish to the merchants, the fishermen sold to the merchants and the fishermen cured the fish themselves. I suppose the hon. gentleman would give credit to some other people for knowing a little about what is going on in his own country. I know I have been all around the shores and I have seen fish being cured by the fishermen. I know the merchants bought that fish and if this establishment was used for the curing of fish owned by the fishermen the fishermen could get the fish out of the establishment and sell it to the merchants; that is the proper way to run this establishment. The government has no right to compete with the merchants in a matter of this kind. The fishermen have a right to get fish cured there and that is what the establishment was erected for.

Mr. GANONG. I understand the fish are cured by what is called the Whitman Patent Process. Does the department pay a royalty?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. Do the Whitman Company install it or the government?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The government install it and paid a royalty. I understand the amount paid last year for the use of the plant was about $242. It is very very hard indeed, to please our friends down on the Atlantic coast. We are running a dogfish establishment and losing money on it with a view to accomplishing certain results. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)) objects to that. We are running a fish drying establishment on Prince Edward Island and strange to say it has made a small profit of $460 after paying all expenses and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island objects to that and probably wants us to discontinue that establishment on Prince Edward Island, the first and best example of government ownership in showing how to cure fish.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not object to the government erecting that establishmen, but I do object to them running this against the interests of merchants.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The government will not run any commercial business on the Atlantic coast against any private company. Just as soon as we have demonstrated to the fishermen of Prince Edward Island that this is the best method of drying fish and just as soon as private enterprise will take it up, I would deem it the duty of the government to retire from the business in the same way as when private enterprise will take up the dogfish enterprise and carry it on we should abandon it. The whole object of the government is to educate the people down there how to do business just as in the case of bringing the Scotchmen here to show them how to cure herring.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask a few questions. This I understand is an educational not a business institution and it would not be approved of by parliament if it were a business institution. How is it made educational? We have heard it stated that very little if any of the fish of the surrounding fishermen are brought in and cured, the fish is purchased, so how is the fisherman to be led to adopt it in his own manufacture or the curing of his fish?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. My hon. friend is mistaken. All the processes are open to the fishermen and are taken advantage of. The fishermen are there every day and look through the establishment, it is not difficult to understand the process, they see how it is done and know it all thoroughly. There is no such thing as concealment, the object is to show the fishermen all about it. The fishermen understand it very well and a better grade of salt is being used, the whole quality of the fish is being raised and improved, and the fishermen are taking a greater interest in the catching and curing of fish and are making the whole thing a success. It is really and truly an educational establishment.

Mr. FOSTER. My only object is to get at the basis of this thing and to see how it is really being carried out, whether it is the educational arrangement that was proposed. Is it a fairly expensive process to install or can it be taken advantage of by the individual fishermen or will it have to be taken up by certain capitalists? That I suppose is the idea. The process is not of such a simple and inexpensive nature that it would be possible for every small fisherman to cure his fish by that process.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It would be too expensive probably for the individual fisherman. In one instance the construction of the warehouse, office and machinery cost $3,609, and the labour and the salaries of the manager and staff cost $2,475. This is the expenditure for 1905-6.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the cost is so small comparatively that it comes within the capacity of a number of fishermen co-operating together or an individual fisherman if he has a little capital at his command to have this establishment installed. The object of the government, I understand, is to show to the people that this is the better process, that it is adaptable for their fish, and that if it is brought into vogue their fish will be better cured and will bring them a better return. My whole question is, how do the government do that? From what my hon. friend says, I take it that the government buy fish and cure them, and invite anybody to come in and see the process, and demonstrate it in that way. Only the local fishermen could by any great possibility visit that establishment from time to time and see the process. If it became a matter of great interest, people from outlying localities might come and see it. But it would seem to me that what would bring a direct interest to it would be for the establishment to be ready to cure the fish of any fisherman within the vicinity. Let him catch the fish, take them to that establishment, watch the process, and after the process take them away and put them on the market. If he finds that he gets a better price, that is the practical way to convince him that it is a good thing. But if the government buy the fish, cure them and send them to the market, the minimum of instruction is already given, and the establishment competes with other fish curers in the district, and that is not what the government wants to do. If it be true that not more than $20 represents the payment for fish brought in by the local fishermen to be cured, it would go to show that very little is done in the way of education. During the process a lecture might be given by the foreman of the establishment explaining everything, and bulletins might afterwards be issued, making the whole fishing district thoroughly acquainted with the process and the results of the process. In that way, you would promote a spirit for its adoption; and, having performed your work in one district, you could move on to another and leave that perfected demonstration to bear its results.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I may say that much of what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) suggests has already been done. The fishermen have been instructed in preparing the fish beforehand, the establishment is open at all times, and the fishermen take full advantage of it. There is no competition with the local trade, because there is no man in the locality who makes a special business of shipping or curing fish. The fish are shipped by men in other branches of trade.

Mr. FOSTER. That would not affect the principle.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. But it is no disadvantage to anybody. On the contrary, it

is a great advantage to every body, because whatever improves the general condition of the fishermen must improve the trade of everybody. The establishment works along both lines: it takes the fish outright, cures them, markets them and shows that that can be done successfully and profitably. It also takes fish from any person and cures them for him; but in order to be properly cured, they must be prepared in the proper way. The process of fishing is changing. A few years ago the fishermen who caught the fish, dried and cured them themselves, and the result was a comparative failure. From this time forward, in order that the best results may be obtained, there must be two classes of men engaged in the business, the fishermen and the curers; and that is what is being gradually brought about. The fishermen cannot properly cure the fish and also catch them. This establishment is bringing about a change in that respect, which of itself will be of great advantage.

Mr. SPROULE. From what the hon. member says it would seem that there are two processes, each of which is distinct in itself. The first, to instruct the fishermen how to prepare the fish, ought to be done by educational work, and surely instructors can be put in different places to give the fishermen information on that point. Then, if there is anything special in the curing, I do not see why this factory should not receive the fish from the fishermen and cure them, and let it be demonstrated that the fish so cured command a higher price and therefore bring a better return to the fishermen. That ought to be done and then you would distribute the benefits to all parties interested and not make this factory a competitor with the private individuals engaged in the same business. If there is something superior in this method of curing, then the educational work should be extended as much as possible so as to give the information to all the fishermen and not confine it to a few. When some years ago the late government undertook to put butter through a certain process and send it to the old country so as to demonstrate that Canadian butter, manufactured under proper supervision and sent to the market in cold storage, would realize higher prices, there was most vigorous opposition from hon. gentlemen opposite on the ground that the government was becoming a competitor to private enterprise. In that case, however, the education was given to every one, and if the same thing were done with regard to the curing of fish and the government not allowed to become a competitor with private individuals, I think the maximum of good results would be obtained. If the method is a good one, there is no reason why the fishermen should not have their fish cured at that factory.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). The hon. minister has said that the government are losing money by this factory. I would suggest that a private company has offered to undertake the business of converting the dogfish into food and placing it on a large scale in foreign markets, if the government would give it some aid. In this way the government would be saved the necessity of spending a large amount of money to destroy an article which may be converted into food.

To provide for the construction and maintenance of marine biological stations and investigation, $15,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In 1899 a government biological station was established for the purpose of obtaining knowledge with respect to the nature and sources of sustenance of marketable fish as well as the natural history of marine animals in Canadian waters. The first station was placed at St. Andrews, N.B. Then a station was established at Canso, N.S., and in the succeeding year one was erected at Malpeque. In 1906 one was built at Gaspé. Next year it is intended to establish a biological station on the Pacific coast, and the vote has consequently been increased from $3,000 to $15,000. The report of last year's work will be found in the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Towards the encouragement of better transportation and conservation of fish, $25,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is for the better transportation and conservation of fresh fish from the points of capture and shipment to the larger cities. At present the same freight charges are made per quarter or half car as for a full car, and as it is difficult to always succeed in purchasing a full car at any one point, the freight charges on small quantities are almost prohibitive. The exact manner of giving the assistance is not yet developed, but information is being gathered and the best arrangement possible will be carried out.

Mr. BENNETT. Has there ever been anything of the kind done before?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, this is entirely new.

Mr. BENNETT. To whom will it be given? Are you going to give it to the fish vendor or the man who buys the fish or to the railway companies?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I believe this is largely a transportation question—it is with a view to bringing fish from the maritime provinces to Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto and other Ontario centres in cold storage. That is the primary object—to encourage the transportation and sale in Ontario and Quebec of fish caught in the Atlantic ocean.

Mr. BENNETT. When is it to be applied to chickens to be brought from the maritime provinces to Ontario, and what department would look after that ?

Mr. FIELDING. This applies to Digby chickens.

Mr. BENNETT. No, no, we want an explanation of this. This is going too far altogether. Who is to be the officer who is to distribute these advantages ? Why should it not apply to the shipper of fish on Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, Lake Erie or any other ? Surely we have the same rights to have our fishermen paid a bonus for shipping their fish as the people of the maritime provinces have.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The fishermen of Georgian bay will come in, just the same as others. This is for the better encouragement and transportation of fresh fish. The Georgian bay fishermen who want to send their fish to Toronto and Montreal will reap the benefit of this.

Mr. BENNETT. And upon whose recommendation ? The local member ? Who is to select the lucky parties to have a piece of this graft ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The officers of the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that in the whole province of Ontario he has only two fishery inspectors, Mr. O. B. Shepherd, of Toronto, and Mr. Jeremiah Hurley, of Belleville. Are they to stand in high judgment and say that Tom. Smith shall have so much, and Jim Brown so much, and the rest nothing ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that an officer of the department will make a report in the first place.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is in prospect as the occupant of this new office ? Is he a member of parliament ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He will be one of the present staff at headquarters.

Mr. HAGGART. What possible object can the minister have in introducing such a vote as this ? This is a new doctrine indeed—that we are to give the producers in a certain industry money for the purpose of carrying their goods to market. If it were for providing transportation facilities or anything of that kind, I could understand it. But it seems most monstruous to call for this vote without defining it or explaining it to the House.

Mr. LOGGIE. May I be permitted to say a word ? I think one reason why this encouragement is proposed, is that at the present time, the express rates from Boston, Portland and New York to Montreal and Toronto are very much less than from the maritime provinces ; and, as the product is perishable and must be carried by express, our fish cannot be placed on the Ontario market in competition with fish from Boston and New York.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, dear ! that is worse still.

Mr. LOGGIE. As I understand it, the money will probably be used under some arrangement with the express companies, so that the fish from the east can be placed on the markets of Ontario and Quebec, which cannot be done at the present time.

Mr. BENNETT. But we have fish in Ontario too.

Mr. LOGGIE. But you want variety. You have not the salt sea salmon we have been talking about, or the fresh lobster. If you want these and other salt water fish at reasonable prices, and brought from the Nova Scotia coast instead of from the Maine coast, this will help to do it. As a matter of fact, the express rates from Halifax to Toronto are excessive—they represent figures 2 cents per pound. It is impossible to lay the goods down in any other way than by express. If this project can be carried into effect it will benefit the whole Dominion, especially the eastern portion. But both consumers and producers will be benefited.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loggie) express the same idea the minister has with regard to this matter? —that because fish can be sent cheaper from American ports than Canadian, the producers must be compensated by paying part of the transportation rates to get the goods into the market ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The object is, as I have stated, to assist in the better transportation and conservation of fish. The money will be used, I understand, to encourage the fishing industry on the Great Lakes, as well as on the Fraser and elsewhere, by establishing cold storage. The object is to place fish on the market at as low a rate and in as good condition as possible. I cannot say that I followed every thing that my hon. friend (Mr. Loggie) said, so I cannot say whether he expressed the views of the department or not. But this movement is exactly along the line of the votes taken by the Agricultural Department to encourage cold storage.

Mr. HAGGART. But why does not the minister confine his vote to that—to cold storage for fish ? But that is not at all what he is asking for.

Mr. FOSTER. You are surely not going to pay freight rates.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand it, the previous votes for cold storage covered cold storage in the transportation and handling of fish.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Only bait I think.

Mr. SPROULE. No, fish and fish bait. The question was asked, whether provision was made for cold storage, and for transportation in cold storage.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, it was for bait only.

Mr. SPROULE. I can hardly believe that my memory is so much at fault. I certainly thought that the same provision had been made for fish as for any other perishable products.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the item pass ?

Mr. HAGGART. No ; no such item can carry until it is more clearly explained.

Mr. BENNETT. The Georgian Bay fishermen must at least get a share of this. I live in a town into which large quantities of fish are brought. The fishermen have ice houses in which they store ice in the winter for use in the boxes in which they pack the fish for shipment. Is this allowance to be made on a basis of so much per pound, or how ? And how will this officer who is to manage this business be everywhere at once ? He will have to be a bird. The hon. minister must remember also that some of his political friends like Mr. Markey, and Mr. McNee, of Windsor, have complete control of certain fishing privileges. Are they to have part of this on account of the fish they ship? Why, look at the frauds that may be perpetrated on the department under this system. There may not be fish in these boxes at all ; they may fill them with stone or iron, for the official cannot be there to inspect them all. This is the most fearful and wonderful vote that I ever heard of.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I can only say that the plan has not yet been outlined. A report will be prepared, and on that the whole question will be matured, and the plan of campaign will be put into effect the coming year. The object is, as I have said, simply to encourage fishermen to send their fish into the Canadian market. I think it is a fact that the market to-day in Montreal is largely controlled from the United States. In the case of British Columbia halibut, for instance, it goes down to Boston free of duty, and comes back and is sold in Ottawa after paying the Canadian customs. We would prefer, if we can, to have Canadian fish brought direct from the place where they are caught to the place where they are consumed. I do not think that the scheme can be conducted along the lines suggested by the hon. gentleman. There is no graft in it, there is no possibility of dividing the money improperly. I think when the report is made the hon. gentleman will find next year that the money has been properly expended.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister asks us to vote money and he cannot explain any plan upon which it is to be expended. He only says: Give us the money and we will sometime, in the course of the year, mature some plan to spend it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I said as to the details of the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not information upon which we can vote money in this House. I am not blaming the acting minister, he is not the father of the estimate, and it is unfair to him, in a sense, that he has to stand sponsor for it. But as to how it is to be done, we are entirely at sea. We do not give appropriations of money in this House for things in the air. We want to know, not only the principle upon which the money is to be expended, but the plan. There is a diversity of opinion. One gentleman says he thinks it is to pay for freight rates, so that a man who is on the favoured base line can get the government to help him in paying his freight out of the public purse. I do not think that can be so, I do not believe any Canadian government would attempt to get an appropriation from us to apply it to a certain class to aid them to send their goods to market. If you do that for fishermen, why not for the raisers of wheat, for the manufacturers of any other article ? Now what you can do is to use the money towards improving transportation in the way of cold storage, for instance, that is, an experiment to help transportation companies in certain lines to install a cold storage plant, so that the companies will take these products at a certain rate of freight and put them on the market.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the only room for criticism of this vote is along the line of what has just been said by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). The minister who asked for this vote is not able to be here to give explanations, but I do not think that is a reason why the vote should not be given. If the object is a good one, and if the vote is not too large, let the minister have it, and it is for him to work out the details in a satisfactory manner. Several things the hon. gentleman suggests as being unreasonable might be reasonable. For instance, I do not think it unreasonable to make arrangements with express companies whereby they would reduce rates. We have done that in the case of rates for transportation by ocean steamers. I think the government have paid for fitting up cold storage arrangements on board ships in order that the owners might be able to offer a lower rate. The hon. gentleman says :

Why not do this for the farmer's wheat? Well, it is only a few years ago since we made a special arrangement whereby, in consideration of certain moneys, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed to reduce its rates on all the wheat of the Northwest, and on the principal articles of goods going in. That was a concession in rates purchased directly by the money of Canada. I think also in the development of our agricultural resources in other directions, in the butter and cheese industry, it will be found that arrangements have been made to put cold storage cars on the railways, and I think sometimes we have paid part of the freight on the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. FIELDING. That is my impression. I think in one of these arrangements it was provided that wherever a car was not full we paid for a full car, even though we only had half a one. You have to meet the varying industries of Canada by varying methods. In the one case we had the rates affected in the way I have described; in the case of butter and cheese you did it in another way. In the case of this industry, with our long line of territory, transportation is difficult, and the object is to get the white fish of the lakes and bring them down to the lower provinces, if necessary, to help us in our great need; and also to bring the salt water fish of the ocean west for the help of hon. gentlemen in Ontario and further west. That is a legitimate object. We have a vast market for fish in middle Canada which is being supplied by the United States, and it is a perfectly legitimate thing that we should devise ways and means whereby that American fish shall be displaced by fish coming from the Atlantic provinces. Surely the hon. gentleman will sympathize with that object. I do not think the methods which have occurred to him as being objectionable will, on reflection, seem to be half so objectionable. I admit that the absence of a detailed scheme is open to some criticism, and in that view the hon. gentleman's observations are reasonable. But I would ask him, I know he must have sympathy with the object of this vote, to give the minister that vote and trust him to work out the details which will accomplish the good purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. I would have no objection to going a good way if we could get an assurance from the minister that this money is not intended to pay freight rates, but that it is to help the establishment of cold storage facilities on these transportation lines by way of experiment. That is quite a different thing and on a very different principle. We have gone that far with reference to agricultural products on the steamers, though it has been done at a heavy expense. But we have never gone so far, and I hope we never will, as to pay out of the appropriations of this country part of a fisherman's freight from the place where he catches his fish to the market. Surely we are not going that far. If the minister will say that this is an experimental plan for inducing better transportation with cold storage facilities on these lines in regard to that special trade in fish I sympathize with the idea. That would make it a little different, but for the department to come down here and ask for a lump sum wihout any definite plan to put before the members is a breach of the privileges of the minister. It grows out of the idea that we are 'it,' and that all we need is simply to put our wishes in gross block form before the House and they must fall in with them whether we have any plan or not. The minister or the department must know, in fact I do not see how the Minister of Finance can help but know, that we must have something definite before us. These matters go through council because the minister must bring his estimates before council and explain every one of them unless things are done in a different manner from what they used to be, and I do not think they are. I do not think my hon. friend would act as Minister of Finance and allow estimates to be put through without a proper explanation, so that the minister must have placed his plan before his colleagues before they granted him power to come to this House and ask for an appropriation. The department is the repository of this plan and of the information concerning it. Surely the department must have this information. What has been the motive power in the department? What have they worked up to? The only other explanation of it is that the minister who has the patronage to dispense wants to do something which will make a name for himself amongst the fisher folk.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman says if this vote was for the establishment of a cold storage system he would have no objection. I have no doubt that it is for cold storage, but the minister would not like to be limited to the expenditure of it only for cold storage. If the minister desires to expend this in any other way to serve a good end I do not think we should tie his hands. The hon. gentleman thinks it would be unreasonable if we should apply this to the payment of freight, but suppose the minister could arrange with an express company for and in consideration of part of this vote that they would reduce their freight rates and make it possible to carry fish at a lower rate would the hon. gentleman object to that?

Mr. FOSTER. I would oppose that just as long as I had the power of opposition. What would it mean? You simply say to a carrier: We will pay you so much of the freight. You are making no experiment

there. You are simply hiring an express or transportation company and when you have paid them their wage for a year they have done their duty and you are no farther ahead than before. But if you could demonstrate that if they had proper storage facilities along these transportation routes a trade could be developed which would make it to the benefit of the carrier to go on with it after it has been experimented upon just as we did with cold storage on the Atlantic in reference to agricultural products some good would be accomplished. You are demonstrating to the carrier that if he should do so and so a trade could be developed and that it would make it profitable to him to carry these goods thereafter. But in the other case you simply hire him to carry for a certain time. After he has done that he has done his work, the contract is finished and we have simply to go on and hire him again. So it will be a continuous appropriation.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am in full sympathy with this vote and I think that very important results can be worked out from it. I do not know what the idea of the department is, but I have heard certain proposals that if carried out might be very useful. For example, I understand there has been a system adopted by the Department of Agricultural by which small shipments of goods are made possible by the government guaranteeing that a cold storage car will, on arrival at Montreal or Toronto or wherever it is bound, have a certain proportion of a load. Then there are a great many small shipments which might be made but at the present time a fish merchant can only send a carload. A carload, I understand, is about twenty tons. It is only a large dealer who can buy ten or twenty tons of fish, and that can be shipped only at very low rates, that is at rates with which we can compete with Gloucester. But suppose you want to send four or five tons of fish from the coast of Nova Scotia to Montreal or some point in the west, you cannot do it at the prevailing rates and if this appropriation is made that trade might be assisted. It would increase the trade enormously if we could send small shipments at a reasonable rate. Small shipments cost $1.50 for every 100 pounds, and you must remember also that there is a large quantity of weight in the boxes and ice. I do not know what the proportion is, but it is a very large proportion. There is no other way at present to send fish in small lots except by express, and as the rates now are nobody can carry on business at all and compete with Gloucester in New England. Is there any objection to a system somewhat like this: The Intercolonial Railway will put a train on between Mulgrave or Halifax and Montreal and take fish in small lots and if it turns out that the shipment is less than ten tons—ten tons may pay a car to run to Montreal, but seven or nine tons would not—would it not be a proper proposal that the government should say to the railway company: We will pay the difference between the quantity we get and the quantity we require in order to make the venture pay? That, I understand, is somewhat like the system they are carrying out in regard to agricultural products in certain parts of Canada. That is one of the proposals that has been made to the minister. I do not know what his proposal is. I have also heard that it has been proposed that small refrigerator cars would be provided and that these refrigerator cars would be put inside the other cars. They could be returned to the fishermen filled up with small lots of fish, one ton, two tons, or half a ton, and they would not require to have a large refrigerator car at all because the small refrigerator car on wheels could be left on the wharf and pushed inside the large one. That is a scheme which the railway people are attempting to work out, but whether it will succeed or not I do not know. I do not think it would be possible for any person to say just what system should be adopted by the department, but something should be done to enable the fish merchants to send forward small shipments at better rates than the express rates which are now maintained by the different companies.

Mr. SPROULE. My objection to this is that we are putting in a separate item for cold storage whereas we have already voted an amount for that purpose. The report of the Minister of Agriculture shows how that vote was used heretofore.

Shippers were charged 'the current less than carload' rates, without extra charge for icing.

The government paid for the icing. That is part of the cold storage system.

This service was in operation from May 18 to October 15. The department guaranteed two-thirds of the earnings of a minimum car (20,000 pounds) plus $4 a car for icing. When the earnings exceeded the guarantee, there was no charge against the department. If the traffic on any route exceeded one carload, the whole service on that route was held to be self-sustaining, and no claim could be made on the department, even if the earnings of the extra cars did not reach the amount of the guarantee. The arrangement did not apply to special cars ordered for taking a full carload from a single point.

If this policy had been carried out, there would seem to be no reason for this special item.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Fish do not come under agriculture.

Mr. SPROULE. But it was cold storage for perishable food products, and fish is a perishable food product.

Mr. HAGGART. As I understand, they did not pay any portion of the freight, but they paid for the icing just as if it was a full car.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it moved to strike it out?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Strike it out.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, no.

Mr. HAGGART. Place it in the same category as butter, cheese or anything else.

Mr. FIELDING. That is all it is intended to do.

Mr. HAGGART. If we have an assurance of that from the minister, we have no objection to the vote.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want to be tied to any limitation, but the general principle is to do for the fishing industry what we have done for agricultural products for years. The object is not only to demonstrate what the carriers can do, but to demonstrate to the consumers that there is a valuable fish supply with which they are not now acquainted.

Mr. FOSTER. To put it on the same ground?

Mr. FIELDING. As nearly as may be.

Mr. HAGGART. Then there is no objection to the vote.

Fishery commissions, $15,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that include the commission composed of Professor Prince, Mr. Birnie and Mr. Noble?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes; that was principally for fishery commissions to be held in Ontario, in the Georgian bay.

Mr. BENNETT. How much money has been expended already on behalf of the Prince Commission up to date, and when is it expected they will complete their labours?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The British Columbia commissioners will be occupied until January or February next. The Georgian bay commission has had its scope extended by order in council of August 4, 1906, and has over twenty sittings along Lake Erie and the connecting water between Lake Erie and Lake Huron still to be held. It is expected that $15,000 will still be expended on the two commissions.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it expected that the $15,000 will be expended on this commission composed of Professor Prince, Mr. Birnie and Mr. Noble? How much is it expected will be still spent on these three gentlemen, and what amount has already been expended for them?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Birnie's account has not yet been adjusted; there has been no final payment.

Mr. BENNETT. How much has been paid on account of this commission composed of Professor Prince, Mr. Birnie and Mr. Noble, and how much more is it expected will be paid to them?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have not the figures here. We estimate that $15,000 will complete both the Georgian bay and the British Columbia commission, of which the British Columbia commission must have a considerable amount.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to enter my protest against a dollar being paid to Mr. Noble or Mr. Birnie. This is a pure sample of Ontario graft that the department has had pushed upon it. Who are these men? I have not a word to say against Professor Prince, who has a reputation from one end of this country to the other as an expert, and it was very proper to have him act. I wish to know if this is the Mr. Noble who was engaged in a very celebrated dispute with the department a few years ago for illegal fishing?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The name of the gentleman is J. J. Noble.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister has his officers who were in the department when the investigation occurred, and I would request him to ask them if this is the same Noble who figured in the celebrated dispute with the Marine Department a few years ago.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My officers cannot say.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it shows a great deal of ignorance on the part of the gentleman's officers, because the celebrated case of the Nobles for illegal fishing was discussed in this House again and again.

Mr. FOSTER. And they are perfectly well known to the department.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Assuming that it is, what about it?

Mr. BENNETT. Assuming that it is, I say that the presence on this commission of one of these men, who was paid large sums by this country is a most reprehensible thing, and in the locality where they are known it will be condemned strongly not only by Conservatives, but by Liberals as well. With reference to the other gentlemen on the commmission, Mr. Birnie, he also belongs to the town of Collingwood, and I want nothing better than the report of the hon. gentleman's own department in the Auditor General's Report, where the deputy minister, under date of December 23, 1906, reports as follows:

In reply to your letter of the 21st instant on the matter of the accounts of the British Columbia and Georgian Bay Fishery Commission, I find that the chairman, Professor Prince, had difficulty in obtaining detailed accounts of dis-

bursements, owing to the fact that the commissioners claim that they were to be paid a per diem allowance for disbursements, in addition to the per diem honorarium for their services.

What Mr. Birnie may know about fishing will certainly puzzle people who know him. That he is a political hanger-on to hon. gentlemen opposite everybody knows. He is a defeated candidate for the local assembly, and very much defeated too. I have looked over these accounts which I had brought down to the Public Accounts Committee, and the House can judge of them from a sample. Here is a bill, some of the details of which Professor Prince could not get from Mr. Birnie, and among the charges are these: 'Marion Douglas, or order, a cheque for a typewriter, $40.' This is a cheque issued by Mr. Birnie to pay for a typewriting machine, and I hope that the department will see that is returned. I find that a large amount is being paid at the rate of $3 per day to a Miss Perdue for acting as stenographer. If my information is correct, this Miss Perdue is in the employ of Mr. Birnie, and I suppose he has been locking up his office while he has been away, because any man who can afford to perambulate around the country for $7 a day cannot have a very large practice. How much more does the minister expect will be paid to Messrs. Birnie and Noble on this account?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is impossible to say. The total vote is only $15,000, and this is divided between British Columbia and the Georgian bay.

Mr. BENNETT. How is it to be divided?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The estimate of $15,000 was made by Professor Prince, and I am advised that the larger half of that is for British Columbia. How much Mr. Birnie will obtain out of this if he gets only $7 or $10 a day I do not know. It seems to me that the remuneration for these commissioners is very small indeed. I do not happen to know Mr. Birnie. Evidently my hon. friend does, and it is rather against him than against the commission that my hon. friend directs his criticism.

Mr. BENNETT. It is against the minister, who, I regret to say, is absent, for appointing this Mr. Birnie on the commission. I find something in yesterday's paper with reference to Mr. Birnie, and I am sorry that the Minister of Justice is not present. This Mr. Birnie is on the list of applicants for a county judgeship in the province of Ontario, this $7-a-day lawyer is expected to be appointed a judge; and yet people are sometimes complained of when they discuss the character of the judiciary of that province. In yesterday's paper occurs an account of a most astounding case in Owen Sound. An imbecile child of 13 years of age was seduced, and the parents of the child had her and the man who seduced her before this Mr. Birnie. The seducer paid $800 in November to Mr. Birnie to settle the case, and according to the newspaper report Mr. Birnie hands over $200 to the doctor who had attended the child—and it is fair to the doctor to say that this was partly for other services. Mr. Birnie therefore retained $600 of this money. I will read what the paper says:

> Mr. Birnie, in explanation of his retention of the money, stated that he heard rumours that the Crown was about to take the matter up, and thought it best not to pay over the money to the parents.

He seems to have that faculty of retaining money which Professor Prince complains of. I am sorry that there are none of the Ontario ministers here, because this is a fair sample of the class of men whom this government is dealing with in the province of Ontario, particularly in the neighbourhood of the Georgian bay and Lake Huron, I care not what department it is. Men appointed to do dredging really farm it out to somebody else, and then cheerfully certify that the work has been done, though they have never been near it. This Mr. Birnie, I assume, will have another bill next year for a stenographer at $3 a day. I happen to know this so-called stenographer who attended on this famous commission, which is simply the laughing stock of people up there, so much so that Professor Prince does not attend its meetings. I ask the minister has Professor Prince attended the meetings of this commission held at the different points on the Georgian bay?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that he attended some of the meetings, and he spent considerable time in British Columbia attending meetings of the Fishery Commission there.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not ask about British Columbia. I ask about the Georgian bay.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I expanded the answer by saying that he had attended meetings in British Columbia, which prevented him from attending some of the meetings on the Georgian bay.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the same will turn out to be very few. I regret that the minister of the department is not here, because the acting minister had nothing to do with this matter and knows nothing about it. Mr. Noble may know something about the fish business, but so far as Mr. Birnie is concerned, I can see no reason why he was appointed on that commission except as a matter of political graft. I ask the minister on whose recommendation Mr. Birnie was appointed on this commission?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot tell, and my officers cannot tell.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps the minister will let this vote stand over until he can secure some information for the House.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What information ?

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to know in the first place how many meetings of this commission on the Georgian bay Professor Prince has attended, how many Messrs. Birnie and Noble have attended, and whether it is a fact that a stenographer accompanies them at their meetings.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Professor Prince is not at present in the city, and I do not know that by letting the vote stand over I can obtain for my hon. friend more information than I have given. A vote was necessary to wind up both these commissions. I know nothing about Birnie, but the minister who appointed him will take the full responsibility. I am advised however by the officers of the department present that instructions were given by the minister before he left that the account of Mr. Birnie is not to be settled until he returns.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the minister suspects that there is something rotten in Denmark. Therefore the information vouchsafed me must be pretty nearly correct. There was an investigation into the Collingwood dry dock, and the name of Birnie figures there too, and very considerably, for dollars and cents. The acting minister had better tell the House that he will give this commission orders to halt. He will find upon inquiry that Professor Prince has simply left the commission alone. I do not think that Mr. Noble is attending any of the meetings. He is a practical fisherman. The whole thing is a farce and is so considered in Georgian bay. If the minister would direct that the commission should stand still until the minister returns, not only will he stop any further payment but all the proceedings of the committee. I have done my duty and it is up to the minister to do likewise. Does he intend that Mr. Birnie and Mr. Noble are to travel to British Columbia.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, they do not travel outside of Ontario ; British Columbia has its own local commission. The work is completed as far as British Columbia is concerned. Mr. Prince leaves for there in a few days, and in a few weeks the work of the British Columbia commission will be concluded altogether.

Mr. BENNETT. As far as Mr. Birnie is concerned, the payment of his bills will be brought to a conclusion as rapidly as possible. I think that the minister had better in the meantime order this commission to stand still and incur no other expenses. Will he promise the House that ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that there will be nothing done until Professor Prince returns from the west after concluding the work of the British Columbia Commission.

Mr. BENNETT. And also that nothing will be done until the return of the Minister of Marine by the Georgian Bay Commission.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I would not undertake to make any such promise. If Mr. Prince says it is important that the work of the Georgian Bay Commission should be completed, I shall instruct him to go on and complete it and not wait the return of the minister.

Mr. BENNETT. I would ask the leader of the House if he will call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this item which is going the rounds of the papers in reference to the case I have referred to, so that when it comes before the minister or the department it may be weighed on its merits.

Mr. FIELDING. I promise that.

Further amount required for repairs to government steamers and ice-breakers, $72,250.

Mr. FOSTER. What amount has been already voted ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The details of this vote are as follows. The 'Stanley' for repairs, $30,000 ; the 'Borden,' $3,500; the 'Montcalm,' $13,000 ; the 'Lady Laurier,' $13,000; the 'Druid,' $33,000; the charter of the 'King Edward,' $7,250.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the government intend providing a boat to keep up navigation a little longer on Lake Superior ? Most of the winter Lake Superior is open except around the shores, and navigation could be continued a month longer if there was a suitable ice breaker to keep the harbours open.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, a sum was put in the estimates of $25,000 or $30,000 to provide for a boat to keep the harbours open on Lake Superior.

Further amount requred for the construction of a patrol boat for the Northwest Mounted Police in Hudson bay, $32,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a new boat ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The supplementary estimates for 1905-6 provided $40,000 for the construction of this steamer. Further supplementaries provided a fresh sum of $15,000, making a total of $55,000. She cost in all $87,000 for construction, and the balance $32,000 is required to pay the ship yard at Sorel the balance due on this vessel.

To provide for a settlement of the Quebec Coal Company's claim overlapping the wharf at Quebec, $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by overlapping the wharf ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The company paid claimed damages on account of the encroachments by the Dominion steamers on their wharf. They claimed $2,700 about the 13th of November, 1904. There was a counter claim made by the Marine Department for the use of their wharf by the company's vessels. The minister thought that $1,000 was a reasonable sum to offer in full settlement and the company accepted.

Lighthouse and coast service—maintenance and repairs to lighthouses—further amount required to pay for the services of expert and staff reorganizing the system of bookkeeping to assimilate with all the branches of the department throughout the Dominion, $25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the preceding vote ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The deputy minister tells me there is no other vote.

Mr. FOSTER. It says 'further amount.'

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am still advised that there is no other amount for this purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, this is a new vote. What is proposed to do with the money ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. To pay experts to examine into the system of bookkeeping and reorganize the whole system and assimilate with all the branches of the department throughout the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we had better know what that means. Here is a department, established since confederation, supposed to have been well established and kept up to date. Moreover, we have in the civil service here in Ottawa expert men in bookkeeping and finance. The Department of Finance and the Auditor General's Department are both expert departments in matters of bookkeeping, familiar with the work of auditing the accounts of all the departments and consequently able to give advice as to the best uniform system. And here is a vote to pay somebody $25,000 to write out a plan of bookkeeping for the Marine Department. It seems to me absurd. What is proposed to be done?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot give my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) any more information than is contained in this brief memorandum, other than that I understand the whole system of bookkeeping, not only of the department, but throughout all the agencies connected with the department is to be completely reorganized and put on a different basis altogether, and this sum is to pay for the expert and staff required to make that change. It involves a large amount of work.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not for books, but simply to pay the expert and staff for organizing the new system.

Mr. FIELDING. The officers of neither the Finance Department nor the Department of the Auditor General could give the necessary time to travel over the Dominion to make the inspection necessary for the arranging of this new system. The minister contemplates having experts go through the bookkeeping of the Marine and Fisheries Department throughout the Dominion. Whether the sum is a reasonable one or not is another question. I simply wanted to show that the work could not be done by officers of the Auditor General's Department.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that a level headed man in either the Finance or Audit Department could, without a great deal of expenditure of time and trouble, give an idea of the best system to adopt. That does not involve expense. Why should this travelling all over the Dominion be necessary. This expert is not to audit the accounts. He simply wants to know the needs of the case, and these he could learn by inspecting one outside office, for the same laws and regulations govern one as govern the others; there is the same system of receipts, payments, vouchers and everything of that kind for all. With this knowledge, an officer of the Auditor General's Department or the Finance Department could devise some system of bookkeeping. And, as to travelling, why $25,000 would pay for three or four men circumnavigating the globe.

Mr. FIELDING. Not if they were chartered accountants—experts. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries found it necessary to employ two or three such men in different parts of the Dominion, $25,000 would soon be eaten up.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason for it all ?

Mr. FIELDING. In view of the criticism levelled at the department, I must say I sympathize with the minister in his desire to have a thorough renovation of his bookkeeping arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. So do I.

Mr. FIELDING. And I would give the minister a free hand in carrying that out. If it means calling in expert accountants from outside the department and sending them to the different offices of the department throughout the Dominion, the results will certainly be of service to the country. While I am not prepared to say that $25,000 is the proper sum for this work, yet, as the minister has put in that estimate, I would rather give the money than let him feel that he is restricted in carrying out a purpose, which, I am sure, will appeal to the sympathy of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the plan. Who is to be employed ?

Mr. FIELDING. I take it for granted that they are not going to displace anybody but will get expert outside help. It is occasionally necessary to go outside for expert assistance in this way.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely there is sufficient intelligence and knowledge of bookkeeping amongst the fourteen or fifteen hundred civil servants in Ottawa to give advice for the establishment of a system of accounts suitable for keeping charge of the lighthouse supplies and that kind of thing. But when you have a system that will suit the central office, you have the system complete. Any ordinarily intelligent man who has charge of an outside office for the department could learn from instructions which might accompany the books just how the system is to work. Or. if it is absolutely necessary, you could send a man out to each of the offices to instruct the officer in charge in the use of the system. It seems to me that that is all the outlay you need. It is a mystery to me why you need $25,000 for any such purpose as this. Such an item as this must leave the impression in the public mind that there are enormous sums to be paid to some person or persons who will give very little return for the money.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not going to invent a new system of bookkeeping. The principles of bookkeeping are well established, and expert accountants know exactly what they are. The variations of bookkeeping are simply in the forms in which the accounts shall be kept. It is in Ottawa that the system would have to be prepared.

Mr. FIELDING. To some extent.

Mr. FOSTER. He would have to know the kind of business that comes and goes between this office and the offices outside. Here is the fountain head, and he is not going to invent a system of bookkeeping in order to provide uniformity. It is simply a matter of preparing forms and instructing agents as to the use of these forms. It is done in ninety cases out of a hundred without any travelling at all. Surely $25,000 is too much for that.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DANIEL. At six o'clock the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was asking for the minister for some more information than he had vouchsafed to the House in regard to the mode in which this $25,000 is to be expended. We have had no information as to the number of experts to be employed or the length of their service. In fact, we have little information except what is printed in the supplementary estimates. Has the minister obtained additional information during the recess?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have not obtained any further information since six o'clock. I understand that it was in the mind of the hon. minister to employ a chartered accountant, Mr. Falconer, of the city of Montreal, who has, I think, been employed in a similar way in some other departments and has done very effective work. What staff he would require I do not know. Very clearly he would have considerable work to do as he would have to go over the books of the department for the last year with a view to ascertaining the defects in the present system, and in all probability changing the entire system of keeping the accounts of the department at headquarters. He would also have to revise the system of account keeping of the various branches of the department throughout the Dominion and for that purpose would necessarily have to visit most of the important offices, either he or some assistant. It is expected that the work will take considerable time. I am not advised as to the remuneration to be paid to the chief of the staff, but these experienced accountants of this class, men who are capable of reorganizing the bookkeeping of a department, are necessary high-salaried officials. Whether this entire amount will be required I do not know. It is considered ample for the work, but the minister may have had in his mind some further details of which I am not advised. I think the amount is reasonable; the work is a good work. It is conceived altogether with the intention and desire to reform, if I may use that word, the bookkeeping in the department with the view of making it more accurate and more in the interest of the service. Further information than that I cannot give the House. I have no doubt the money is needed for the purpose and will be expended as judiciously and economically as possible.

Mr. DANIEL. If the system of bookkeeping employed in the Department of Marine and Fisheries is a bad system, I am sure the House and the country would be very glad to have that matter remedied as soon as possible. With so little information before us it appears to me that $25,000 is a very large amount to pay for the reorganization and changing of the system of bookkeeping in a single department.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the fact of the department requiring to place in the estimates $25,000 to reorganize the bookkeeping system of the department is in itself a condemnation of the government. While I agree that it is important we should have an up to date system in every department of the government and while I am in favour

of having good men and paying them well in connection with the bookkeeping staff, &c., I am of the opinion that there must be in the department men who are better qualified to undertake this work if it is necessary, than any chartered accountant. Here are men who have been engaged in this work all their lives; have watched its progress and development; who are in touch with the work and have been for a great many years, and surely, I repeat, it is a condemnation of the government and a special condemnation of the department that they now ask parliament for $25,000 to reorganize the bookkeeping of a department which we have been told during the last few sessions was up to date in every respect. I enter my protest against what I regard as an extravagant expenditure. The explanation of the acting leader of the House simply meant that he was prepared to give all the money they required up to $25,000 so that the bookkeeping of the department should be put in a proper and modern condition. The country will be very much displeased and surprised to find that at this late date in the development of Canada, in a department that has been in operation for a great many years, such a step as this is necessary, that the outside branches are not in touch with the main department at Ottawa, for I notice that in this item it says it is to bring them in touch and to make a uniform system between the headquarters at Ottawa and the branches to be found in every part of Canada. I am sure the acting minister will not oppose this policy, coming as he does from a western province. He must be surprised himself to learn the condition of this department, to which we have given such large amounts of money to expend. I cannot quite understand how this amount passed the hon. the Finance Minister who is so watchful. I think he must be getting generous.

Mr. FIELDING. For all good purposes, yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I have listened to the hon. minister's defence of this department before. He was always ready and very capable in the defence of this department, telling us that it was an up-to-date department and worthy of a developing Canada. Now they come forward and tell us that they were all wrong, that the various branches of the department were out of touch with each other, and they ask for $25,000 to bring in an outside accountant in order to put things right. I suppose most of these wrongs must have taken place since this government came into power, because I do not remember having heard any complaints made about it before.

Mr. CROCKET. I would ask the minister if the government has at any previous time ever taken a similar appropriation for reorganizing the bookkeeping system of any other department of the government?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am informed that the chartered accountant whom it is proposed to employ in this work did similar work for one of the other departments. I am inclined to think it was the Department of Railways and Canals, and I am informed that he did very good work, and a work that effected a considerable saving.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the amount of that appropriation?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think there was any special appropriation. If there was such a service it was probably paid out of the general vote.

Mr. CROCKET. How many employees are there in the accountant's branch of the Marine and Fisheries Department?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am told there are fifteen employees in that branch of the Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CROCKET. It seems to me that this is an extraordinary appropriation for the government to ask from the House, $25,000 for the simple reorganization of the bookkeeping system of one department. I should think that some of the established modes of bookkeeping with which the accountants of the department are surely familiar ought to be sufficient for the proper administration of this department. If they are not and some special system, peculiarly adapted to the special needs of the department be required, then it occurs to me that the accountants of the department, who must be more familiar with the requirements in this regard than any body of outside expert chartered accountants could possibly make themselves, would be in a better position than any to advise any new system that it may be advisable to introduce. To me it is an astonishing amount to ask for such a purpose, and I wish to join in the protest that has already been made against the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the taxpayers of the country will be astonished when they learn that this great spending department has been carried on for so many years under what is now admitted to be an inefficient system of bookkeeping so inefficient that the government are asking for $25,000 to employ an expert accountant to set it right. What do you think a farmer would say if he were told about this? Here you propose to hire an expert accountant and pay him a sum more than a farmer could accumulate in his whole lifetime, perhaps twice over. I imagine you could pick out a hundred men in this country any one of whom would be able to map out a suitable system of bookkeeping for any branch of this government that would be both economical, convenient and accurate, and having mapped out a system

you could send some man around to the various offices and instruct them how to use it. The whole thing could be done for $4,000 or $5,000. In fact the only part of the scheme that would be necessarily expensive is the travelling expenses of this instructor. The minister says that expert accountants are very dear. It would seem that they are if he has to pay such a price as this. A travelling instructor could give instructions to the other accountants concerning the system, and most people would consider him well paid if you gave him $5,000. Around these departments at Ottawa I always notice how easy it is to spend money after the House has voted it, but the representatives of the people are not doing their duty in voting money without knowing that it is required or in voting more than is necessary to do the work contemplated. There is another phase of the matter. It is the duty of the government to give this House that information. They must have had some information or estimate when they submitted that item to council. We have none of that before us—no estimate of how much would be needed for this or for that. We have simply a round sum of $25,000 to commence a system of bookkeeping.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Will my hon. friend permit me? The deputy minister has given me some further information with regard to this vote, which is to this effect, that the expert accountant, with five or six and sometimes eight assistants, has been at work in the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the last five or six months making a complete review, practically an audit, of all the transactions which have taken place in that department for the last fiscal year. They have been opening complete sets of books, and the work is of a very large and important character. This is information which I did not have before. This work has been recommended to be done by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, who has employed these expert accountants to do similar work in his department. It has been represented that the work done there has been, in the opinion of the minister and the deputy minister, of great practical utility and a vast improvement in the system of bookkeeping—a safer and better system in every respect. I am further informed that the Auditor General has approved of the work being done.

Mr. BLAIN. If this staff of accountants have been at work for several months, I have no doubt the minister can tell us how much money has been expended for that purpose and whether the department undertook this work without first communicating it to parliament at the last session.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have been advised that there has been about $12,000 already expended.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there any appropriation for this before ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think not. The money thus far paid has been charged to the ship channel vote, most of the work being done at Sorel and applying to that district.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that they are New York experts.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, he is a Montreal chartered accountant.

Mr. BLAIN. I am informed that Mr. Merion, Mr. Hopewell and a Mr. Ellis are all engaged in one of the departments at the present time, or were engaged ; one of them has gone back to New York. I think some member of the government should tell us where these gentlemen are at work. I understand that they are at work in the Eastern or Western Block, and have been for several months, and that they have a boarding house somewhere in the city.

Mr. FIELDING. I will inquire, and give my hon. friend the information at a later stage. I have no recollection of it, though it is quite possible.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand, then, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took an appropriation that was voted last session for a ship channel and applied it to placing in the department a brand new set of officials to reorganize the bookkeeping system ? That is the policy we have been complaining of ; the government asked parliament for an appropriation for a specific purpose, and we find that they have taken that money and applied it to another purpose altogether.

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General would not allow that.

Mr. BLAIN. I am only stating what the minister has stated—that no appropriation was made at the last session for this specific work.

Mr. FIELDING. Not specifically, but that would not prove that there was no appropriation. If the vote were big enough to stand it, it could be devoted to clerical service.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. Minister of Finance not admit that it was rather misleading parliament to get an appropriation for a ship channel and take $12,000 out of it to be paid for expert accountants?

Mr. FIELDING. Not if the services related to that particular branch of public business.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it broad enough for that ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the words before me, and cannot say. It would be quite improper to take a portion of that

vote for the Finance Department or the Interior Department, but I think it would be quite legitimate to take a portion of it for the bookkeeping in connection with the ship channel.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that $25,000 have already been expended ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, I understand so.

Mr. BLAIN. At the beginning of the discussion we were told that no person had been employed.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. When that item was introduced that was my impression. I did not know that the work was going on.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite sure the acting minister has given the committee all the information in his possession, but I do not understand that any department has the right to take this large amount of money and appropriate it for a specific purpose without taking parliament into its confidence. I rather think this will be a note of warning to the acting minister to be a little careful of the money he is asking parliament to vote.

Mr. DANIEL. As this amount has been already expended by the 31st of March past, I think the minister ought to be able to tell us how it has been expended. It would allay any feelings of surprise or dissent if he would tell us how this $25,000 has been expended and to whom it has been paid.

Mr. LENNOX. Also particulars of the expenditure before the $25,000. The item reads 'further amount required to pay for the services of expert and staff reorganizing the system of bookkeeping to assimilate with all the branches of the department throughout the Dominion.' It is quite evident, therefore, that something has been expended before the $25,000. We ought to have the particulars of both. I understood the present leader of the House (Mr. Fielding) to say that money to the extent of $5,000 or $6,000 for clerical expenses might be paid out of this vote.

Mr. FIELDING. Out of any general vote.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think the committee would understand that an item of a new character would be paid out of money voted for clerical assistance. But the main thing is that we should have the particulars of this $25,000 and the previous expenditure.

Mr. FIELDING. That is right.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A statement of the amount already paid can be brought down Monday and also an outline of the proposed payment of $25,000.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. DANIEL. But I understand that has already been expended.

Mr. FIELDING. Incurred but not expended. It cannot have been paid or a vote would not be required.

Mr. DANIEL. It is due.

Mr. FIELDING. Probably.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister say to whom it is due ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think that statement should be given.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister of Finance to say that money voted for a ship channel could be used for civil government.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say civil government. I said that any general vote might be charged a reasonable sum for clerical services in connection with it.

Mr. SPROULE. But this item is certainly misleading. It is headed for maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, and we are asked to vote $25,000 for that purpose. But the money is expended on something that has nothing to do with lighthouses. It is expended on reorganizing a system of bookkeeping. The proper heading for that expenditure would be for civil government and not lighthouse and coast service. Then we would know what we were voting the money for. The whole system is wrong. I fail to see how money voted by parliament for one purpose can be expended on another.

Mr. FIELDING. We all agree to that.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not that what you are doing here ? Would you not be doing that if you took money voted for the ship channel and used it for the purpose of employing expert accountants to go over and audit the accounts or devise a new system of bookkeeping ? I am surprised that the Auditor General allowed this to pass. There is another feature to this. Why should the government expend so much money without having had a dollar of it voted ? After the money is spent, they ask parliament to vote the expenditure. The minister says that five or six of these men have been employed five or six months in the department steadily. Why were they employed that length of time ? Was there anything rotten or dishonest, or was the bookkeeping such as made it possible for money to be expended and no proper return given ? Was there anything found wrong in the departmental bookkeeping which induced the government to review it for the last five or six years ? What was it that necessitated the employment of expert accountants to go over and practically audit the books for several years past ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Only last year.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not object to this if it was found that there was something wrong. But we ought to have a report on what was found before being asked to vote the money. We should be told what wages these men are getting, what work they are doing, how many are employed, and for how long. This is a large amount of money for a purpose that, as far as we can tell, should not require one-quarter of that expenditure. And even the $25,000 does not represent it all because $12,000 has been expended already. That makes an expenditure of $37,000 to adopt a new system of bookkeeping and go over the books for the last year in one department. There must be something very bad which has not been disclosed which would justify this extraordinary expenditure and this misapplication of public funds. But, then to begin the expenditure of this money without the consent of parliament and without consulting parliament is not a proper way to carry on the business of the country. I think we ought to have the fullest information before we are asked to vote this item.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the minister to state that the chief expert had five or six assistants. Are there among them any employees of the department?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No. I may say that the request for information is quite a proper one. I will promise to bring down full and complete information as to those employed, the number and the names, the amount paid, how long they have been employed and when the work will be finished. I think the item might pass and this information will be given to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Give us the report.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, I will have the deputy minister prepare a full report.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes; and the item can stand until then.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Might as well pass the item.

Mr. SPROULE. No, no.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) wishes the item to stand that is reasonable enough, but if the item is passed he will get the information just the same.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was not in the House when this discussion commenced. Possibly had I heard the whole discussion I might have felt called upon to differ with some hon. members on this side. Investigation which I have made leads me to believe that a thorough scrutiny of some of the public accounts of this country is desirable. From whatever cause, whether because of an insufficient staff—I mean insufficient in numbers, for I have no reason to suppose that the qualifications of the staff are not all that could be desired—or for some other reason, there is a good deal of what I call gross carelessness in our public records. It is a matter of regret that records concerning our finances that will be quoted fifty and one hundred years from now should show so many misstatements and blunders. I drew attention to this over a year ago, on which occasion an explanation was given of one matter by the Minister of Finance. I have not been able to verify his explanation. But let us take an illustration of what I mean. If you turn to the Public Accounts of 1904, page 41, you find the statement of the assets of Canada from July 1867, to June 30, 1904. Amongst others is a statement of suspense account of Nova Scotia which is given at $15,090.41. If you turn to the back part of the same volume you will find that the actual suspense account for Nova Scotia was $40,502.81. It would not matter so much if that mistake occurred in only one volume of our public accounts, but that error is carried down year after year. If you examine the public accounts of the following year, you will find that that item is continued $15,090.41, instead of, as it should be, $40,502.81. I have not examined the Public Accounts for 1906 but, I assume that the error is still continued. Once an error creeps in in that way, under our system of bookkeeping it goes on and becomes very confusing. Or turn to page 9 of the Public Accounts of 1904, the balance sheet of the Dominion of Canada for the year ending June 30, 1904. The account is balanced, the amount on either side being $390,066,047.72. But if you add up the items of the credit side you can not make the amount by $10,000. This may be a pure error, or it may be that it is covered by $10,000 of a cross entry; and, though I may not be able to place my hand on the cross entry at this moment, I am aware that there is another entry in which there is an error of $10,000. All these things make our accounts a little suspicious. A man who had time to go into them might find some very interesting things. I confess I have not had that time; and besides I have had such confidence in our Finance Department that, perhaps I did not deem it necessary to make this examination. But these matters, taken in connection with what we have heard here to-night—that it is actually necessaray to spend $37,000 to put the system of bookkeeping in the Marine and Fisheries Department on a proper basis—rather arouses suspicion. The money may be well spent. Perhaps, if we would spend $25,000 more to introduce a system that would prevent a repetition of that sort of thing, it might be wise expenditure. Let me refer to one other item—a case of pure clerical error, as I am aware, but still one that goes to show that our public accounts are not kept with the care that ought to

be devoted to them by the accountant. This is a case where the account is balanced, the amount on the credit to make the two sides equal being in the neighbourhood of $36,727,274.80. Then, instead of that sum being brought down to commence the account for the next year, the sum of $18,226,-482.37 is brought down. That certainly indicates carelessness. I admit that before the public accounts for the succeeding year were made out that error was discovered and correted. But that the error was allowed to occur indicates lack of the care that ought to be exercised, more especially by the Finance Department. I might point out a score of discrepancies of this kind. The puzzle to me is how these accountants can make their books balance with a system of double entry where these errors occur. Yet they make them balance, and present them to the House as properly balanced accounts. Therefore, I am not going to object so much to this appropriation if it is an absolute necessity. I hope that when the minister has brought about this new system it will avoid the errors that appear in some of our public accounts. I hope that good may come out of this ; at the same time, I think it is regrettable that after so many years we are bound to confess that we have had a system that is altogether inaccurate. I should think that the men who have been in these departments for so many years ought to be and are in every respect as well qualified to keep accounts as any strange accountant, even though he may be a chartered accountant, because he must be an utter stranger to the general system.

Mr. FIELDING. Before six o'clock the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) rather argued that this special service was not necessary because he was able to certify that the officials of the Finance Department were such expert accountants that no better officers were needed. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) has rather destroyed that argument by alleging that the officials of the Finance Department are no better than they ought to be. Let me say that most of what the hon. gentleman has said regarding the public accounts is new to me. I think about a year ago he called attention to one item which did seem to me to require some explanation. I found it was a typographical error ; and I sent an official of the department to call on my hon. friend and explain the matter to him.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, he did not call upon me.

Mr. FIELDING. My recollection is that I asked the official to explain to my hon. friend the particular point to which he had called attention. Now the officials of the Finance Department may not deserve the very high praise which the member for North Toronto gave them to-night when he said they were good enough to do this work; but on the other hand, I do not think they deserve the criticism of my hon. friend who has just spoken. No doubt a reasonable explanation could be made of each of these things to which he has called attention. We do not regard the Finance Department as perfect ; there are spots on the sun.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not wish the Minister of Finance to think for a moment that I stated that I believed there was anything radically wrong.

Mr. FIELDING. He said it was a little suspicious.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, I confess that it is, and certainly they cannot explain away the substitution of the sum of $15,000 in that suspense account instead of $40,000.

Mr. FIELDING. You had better suspend judgment.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am perfectly willing to suspend judgment. What I intended to say was that it was a result, to use a mild term, of carelessness ; I think I am justified in using that expression. These errors ought not to occur, and certainly when you find them multiplied we cannot but feel a little suspicious that there may be something else we have not discovered. In these times when everybody is suspicious of everybody else, it is just as well to have absolute correctness if we can.

Mr. FIELDING. So far from complaining, I am glad my hon. friend has had the patience to look into these things. I feel much like the Frenchman in the old story who was with his wife late at night when she said : John get up, there is a burglar in the house. He said : Oh, don't mind. In a little while she said again, John get up there's a burglar in the House. Well, he said, you just wait, and if he can find anything we will get up and take it from him.

Meteorological service—to provide for two months' gratuity to the widow of the late Thomas Harrison, in his lifetime observer at the meteorological station at Fredericton, New Brunswick, $50.

Mr. CROCKET. Is $300 the salary of the meteorological observer at Fredericton ? I was under the impression it was $600.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Dr. Thomas Harrison was the meteorological observer at Fredericton for the past 32 years, at a salary of $300 per annum.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it the practice to limit the gratuity to two months ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is the usual custom.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to see in this case, as in other cases the limit extended if it can be done.

Fisheries protection service—further amount required, $39,520.

Mr. BENNETT. Turning to the public accounts we find that the department under which is the lighthouse and coast service, in the year 1896-7 cost this Dominion $445,-742. Last year the lighthouse and coast service ran to the enormous figure of $2,530,-337. I am free to admit that the Marine Department of Canada should cost more today than it did in former years, owing to the fact that certain work on the St. Lawrence river has been taken in charge by this department. But when I look at the expenditures in detail in this department I am surprised that they do not go up to $3,000,000. We have been discussing the need of extra bookkeepers at the head of that department in order to go over the books and scrutinize the accounts and see what was wrong. Why, last year this department was held up before the public as so perfect that no one could point a finger to any act of wrong-doing in the matter of bookkeeping; no such question was ever hinted at. But the whole complaint before the Public Accounts Committee was against the scandalous and outrageous deals that were committed in the department, not due to anything wrong in the bookkeeper who simply dealt with the figures that were placed before him. It was the maladministration of the department that we complained of, and of the officers under the minister; that is what came up for review. The outrageous acts that were permitted in the name of this man Merwin and others in that department had nothing at all to do with the system of bookkeeping. That was simply the acquiescence and not only the acquiescence but the positive action of the minister in bringing about these results while paying two and three times the price. So, we have a department here that has increased its expenditure over $2,000,-000. I see my genial friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) sitting before me. He often comes to the riding of East Simcoe and I do hope and trust that he will come again to that riding during the next election and that he will hold a joint meeting with me. I will be pleased to hold a joint meeting and I will endeavour to show the people how millions of public money are being dissipated and thrown away. We have a certain number of boats employed in the public service. I am free to admit that men who are on the sea should be fed and well fed, but I want to say that neither the Minister of Customs nor any other man will attempt to justify the outrageous expenditures that go on in connection with these boats. Who would think of feeding sailors on these vessels on MacLaren's potted cheese? This is an item that you will find at page P—185 of the Auditor General's Report under the expenditure of the boat 'Kestrel.' MacLaren's cheese to the tune of $30.20. It is only the most extravagant livers, or the high class livers that use that kind of cheese. Let us go a little farther.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. I hear some hon. gentlemen laughing. I do not think they buy that kind of cheese.

An hon. MEMBER. We all eat it.

Mr. BENNETT. It may be that they do so at the House of Mirth in Ottawa kept by the railway companies or reputed to be. Let us see some more. Asparagus, one case at $9. I suppose that was Christmas time and they paid a good high price. Eggs, 30 cents a dozen. Oh those husky sailors; grapes, 25 cents a pound, turkey, 25 cents a pound, fowl, $1.75 a pair, oysters by the barrel, walnuts and candy and the candy is nothing less than forty cents a pound. And then there was a little extra, extra—perhaps some members of parliament were out on this vessel at this time —English Stilton cheese at 50 cents a pound. I think the Minister of Customs ought to give North Brant a chance. The farmers up there cannot sell their's for 50 cents a pound. Radnor splits, half case, $1.50.

Mr. DANIEL. What are those?

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know. The Minister of Customs can explain that.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the name?

Mr. BENNETT. Radnor splits. When I pointed out to the Minister of Customs the other night that this government was buying quilts at $65 a piece he would hardly believe it until I read it over to him twice. The Minister of Customs does not know what is going on in the country as far as expenditures are concerned.

Mr. PATERSON. I know about the money coming in.

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly, and I wish for the good of this country that my hon. friend were at the head of one of the spending departments instead of one of the taxing ones. If he were I think that this outrageous farce would not go on because I will give my hon. friend credit for this that he is an upright man personally. I say the same for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and I only regret that these two gentlemen are not at the head of spending departments because if they were I do not believe that the expenditure of this country would be increased by millions and millions as it is. Let us go a little farther. Ginger ale at $1.40 a dozen; spittoons, $2; maple sugar, 87 pounds at 10 cents and so on.

Mr. PATERSON. That maple sugar is all right.

Mr. BENNETT. What is that for? I know what the hon. Minister of Customs

has in his mind; he has in his mind that it is for the benefit of the sailors when they are at anchor at night. They can make candy out of the maple sugar that is costing the government 40 cents a pound. I say that the items that I have read—turkey at 25 cents a pound, cheese at 50 cents a pound and candy at 40 cents a pound—are fair examples of the expenditures that are going on in connection with these boats. It is a disgrace that the ministers are spending the people's money and that it should be thrown away in this manner. Does any man believe that in the mercantile marine of this country sailors are fed in this way. It is an absurd thing. These are some of the items which can be taken as sample bricks to show why the expenditure of this department has swollen by over $2,000,000 in ten years. I think it is up to the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give us a little explanation as to why these expenditures are permitted and encouraged.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I would be glad to give the hon. gentleman any information with respect to the item under discussion. The item is:

Further amount required for fisheries protection service, $39,520.

And this is made up as follows: 'Curlew,' repairs, $1,420; 'Vigilant,' repairs, $2,000; 'Constance,' new shaft, $2,100; 'Petrel,' new shaft and deck repairs, $3,000; Canada, repairs to boilers and general overhauling, $2,000; repairs to hull and engine, $15,095; guns and ammunition for crews of 'Vigilant,' last year, $14,000; making a total of $39,520.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Last year the minister said he was going to send the 'Stanley' home to be repaired. What determination has the department arrived at in reference to sending that steamer over to receive new boilers and other repairs?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that the 'Stanley' is going immediately after her work is completed.

Mr. FOWLER. I see at page P—178 of the Auditor General's Report an item, 1960 pounds of anti-Pitt compound XXX at 25 cents per pound. I would like the minister to explain what that means.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is lubricating oil for machinery.

Mr. FOWLER. I was asking the minister.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The acting minister confesses ignornance as to what the article is.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman means to tell me that he does not know?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. U. WILSON. I would like to know how many fishery inspectors there are in Ontario, where they are located, what their salaries are and what is allowed them for expenses?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is not in reference to this item.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is there another item under which that goes?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That was voted last night.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. We get no revenue from the fisheries and I cannot see why an arrangement should not be made with the provincial government whereby they would take care of the fisheries as well as get the revenue. I do not know much about this, but it must cost the government a good deal to look after the fisheries. Could we have a statement of the salaries and expenses of the inspectors, overseers, &c.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I have instructed the deputy minister to take a note of my hon. friend's request.

Mr. BENNETT. Where is the steamer 'Canada' on which they were eating cucumbers at $1 a dozen? I think that the Minister of Customs' mouth waters at that, I know mine does. Where was that boat and were there high and mighty personages going about on her or why was she thus fitted out as to the larder?

Mr. FIELDING. That is the flagship of the Canadian navy.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that the same boat on which they were eating partridges at $1 a pair and new potatoes at $4 a barrel? And who were the distinguished persons thus honoured?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The occasion on which they had cucumbers at $1 a dozen on the 'Canada' was, I am informed, when the 'Canada' met the 'Virginian' out in the Straits of Cabot, and took the mail and passengers to Sydney.

Mr. FOWLER. How about the partridges?

Mr. FIELDING. They were probably out of season and cost more.

Mr. FOWLER. I have no objection to the officers of our navy being fed well, but I think the plain people of this country will rather object to such luxuries as partridges at $1 a pair for some six pairs. The number is not the point. If these gentlemen in their gold-lace uniforms want to live on luxuries of this kind let them pay for them out of their own pockets as the ministers would have to do. Why should the country have to pay for that sort of thing? New potatoes at $4.50 a barrel!

The moment they come in, new strawberries at 25 cents to 50 cents a box! Oranges when out of season, 80 cents a dozen—all these things purchased at the expense of the government! Hon. gentlemen smile as though that was a very small matter for criticism. It does not seem to me that the man who is paying the taxes will think it a very small matter for criticism and it is no wonder that, as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has pointed out, the expenditure in connection with this department has increased so tremendously without the efficiency of the service having increased proportionally. Personally I have no objection and I think the people would have no objection to feeding the men who go down to the sea in ships in our navy well, but when it comes to luxuries like this, buying Radnor splits and ginger ale and partridges and strawberries when they first come in, and peaches, hothouse peaches, and hothouse grapes and these things for these dilettanti gentlemen, I think it is carrying the thing a little too far and that the people of this country will think so too. I would like to have the minister's opinion as to whether he approves of that sort of thing.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My knowledge of how the men on the government steamers are fed is very limited indeed. Some of the prices quoted by my hon. friend do not seem to me to be very extravagant. Probably our views in the far west as to prices are somewhat different from my hon. friends', but certainly some of the prices quoted and some of the articles alluded to by hon. friend do not appear to ordinary men in these days to be great luxuries, and if there have been some small quantities of these luxuries purchased on special occasions, I do not see there is any great harm in it, and I do not believe that my hon. friend or any other person can impress the people of Canada with the idea that any great extravagance has taken place because on some of the steamers on the Atlantic or the Pacific—because he has quoted the 'Kestrel'—a few strawberries have been purchased, a few peaches, new potatoes and a few oranges. I take it that the men who are on our ships were not unused to what he calls luxuries of this kind before they went on board these ships. I do not suppose any large amount has been expended in this way. It is easy to go over the Auditor General's Report and pick out a few items here and there. My hon. friend quotes strawberries at 25 cents a box. That is very cheap indeed when they are selling probably in Ottawa to-day at double that price and the same with other things. It seems to me that while it may be the case that the expenditure has perhaps in some things been more than it should be, still it does appear to me that this is picayune politics of the first order, talking about the purchasing of a few delicacies for the officers and men on board of the cruisers and ships belonging to the government of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. It is really charming and refreshing to hear this hon. gentleman dilating to the people of this country about picayune politics. We are talking of a department whose expenditure has increased in ten years by $2,000,000. Is that a picayune matter. Does he mean to tell the people of this country when it was shown in the Public Accounts Committee that nothing less than highway robbery had been perpetrated in that department that this was picayune? The minister himself stood up here last year and voted for all the actions in connection with the sending of the 'Arctic' expedition and then he says that hon. gentlemen on this side are pursuing a picayune policy. I would invite him to come to East Simcoe, and I promise him an audience of 1,000 people——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. He always does that.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, and I invite my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) who was one of the chief sponsors for the 'Arctic' bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I accept the invitation.

Mr. BENNETT. I would be happy to have the hon. gentleman stand there and apologize for $2,000,000 increase in one department. This department is behind in the upper lakes. What has it done in the port of Midland, say, in the last few years? The department has not built a single lighthouse. The lighthouses that are there were all built prior to 1896 except a couple of little picayune lights that are stuck up on a couple of sticks and are a disgrace to the Dominion; and when representations are made to the department that there are rocks against which vessels are bumping season after season, what is the answer? That there is no money. Hundreds of thousands of dollars can be thrown away in this manner, but there is no money for public works which are manifestly necessary. I want to ask the hon. Minister and the officers of the department, what have they done for the service in Georgian bay in the neighbourhood of the port of Midland? You have a little spar buoy sticking up in the middle of the lake where there happens to be a shoal, but you cannot provide a gas buoy because the department is too hard up. You find the vessels still piling up on this shoal, and then you try to better the situation—how? By putting a couple of little electric lights flickering on the top of the hill, which mariners imagine to be boys with lanterns, hunting for fishworms.

I will bring these matters to the attention of the people of the riding which I represent, and I will point out to them that while the expenditure of the department has risen over $2,000,000 in ten years, these are sample bricks of how the public money is being dissipated.

Mr. FOWLER. It is beautiful to see how the hon. minister has expanded with the expense of the times. The hon. minister, I have no doubt, can cast his mind back to the pioneer days of the west when he started his little newspaper and probably made his lunch off biscuit and cheese while sitting on a packing box. To-day with a salary of $7,000 a year as a minister of the Crown and a sessional idemnity of $2,500, he forgets those early days, and considers that strawberries at twenty-five cents a box, cheese at fifty cents a pound, hothouse grapes, hothouse peaches and oranges, are all proper and necessary things for the sailors who man the ships of the Canadian navy. I say this is just an evidence of how the hon. gentleman has expanded with the expanding times. In the hon. gentleman's early days he would have thought that these were luxuries fit only for princes and kings; but to-day he thinks they are only ordinary food for the sailors of the Canadian navy. I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the expansion of his mind; but to the ordinary people of this country who have not reached the giddy height to which he has climbed, these prices will seem excessive, and these articles will seem superfluous luxuries which should be paid for, not by the people of this country, but by these gentlemen themselves out of their own pockets. It is a rather expensive navy which we are keeping up, and in the interest of the country I shall be opposed to the expansion of this navy if it is going to continue to run along these lines. We had Commander Spain a short time ago taking the whole price of a timber limit on an island in the Georgian Bay—Hope Island, I believe it is called—and putting it into a fur-lined overcoat in order that he might go to Newfoundland. No doubt they are buying silver-lined spittoons at $2 or $4 a piece in order that these sailors of ours may have an opportunity to expectorate. Why, Sir, in a country hotel, if there is a common box filled with sawdust, it is considered good enough for the rugged farmers who are paying the taxes of this country; but we must have silver-lined spittoons for the gentlemen who are spending these taxes. My hon. friend from East Simcoe spoke in highly laudatory terms of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance as being very honest men, who administered their departments properly and well. But these hon. gentlemen have not yet been exposed to the temptations of heads of spending departments, and I do not know what might happen if they were. If the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries were at the head of a collecting department, he might not view these matters with the equanimity that he does now. A man is very apt to be corrupted when he gets at the head of a spending department and is surrounded by gentlemen like the head of the Canadian navy and the officers under him. This is not a small matter; the aggregate of these expenditures is very large. I have looked through these accounts in the Auditor General's Report, a report with which the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries says he is not familiar. I think he had better familiarize himself with the items in that report before he makes the statement that he thinks all these prices are perfectly fair and reasonable and that these are not undue luxuries for the officers and men of that service. In almost every instance the prices are excessive. The prices of beef and pork are three or four cents above the ordinary market price, and the price of every thing else is in proportion. If the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries will look carefully through the Auditor General's Report, I think he will be very apt to revise his opinion.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to say a further word that did not occur to me when I spoke before. In the Department of Marine and Fisheries there is lying a request from certain parties, recommended by Mr. Gunn, my late opponent, that there should be placed on some of the very dangerous rocks at the entrance to the harbour of Waubaushene, where night after night during the summer months gasoline yachts and steam yachts containing excursion parties are obliged to pass, a small, cheap, light frame, which would not cost more than $100, and which might have the effect of saving many lives which would be lost if any of these yachts went on these rocks. One yacht did go on the rocks last summer, and if it had not been for timely assistance upwards of a dozen people would have perished. Although the owners of the mill at Waubaushene have offerred to furnish the electric light free of charge, the department says there is no money to enable them to meet a request of that kind. Is it any wonder that the expenditures of this government are regarded as they were by a witness yesterday in the Public Accounts Committee, who could not see anything wrong in securing a job from this government at $3 a day and farming it out to another at $1.25 a day?

Why it has come to this stage in Ontario that the public do not expect anything honest from this government. More particularly is that the case in the district of Georgian bay and Lake Huron. The people read these reports of the Auditor General,

and I take good care that some of the choicest tit bits are published in the newspapers in that part of the country. Such expenditures are repugnant to respectable Liberals, and we are not only doing our duty to the country but a great kindness to the government when we point out that certain ministers of the Crown, not only permit these expenditures, but aid and abet them. I do hope the acting minister will see that a lighthouse is erected at Waubashene this summer. The lumber company there will, from humane motives, give the light free of charge but they do not propose to erect the framework. They say that if the country can afford to expend $100,000,000 a year, surely they can afford to pay what the minister would call a picayune few hundred dollars to save vessels from being wrecked.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that all applications for aids to navigation in the shape of lighthouses are referred to the lighthouse board and considered on their merits and usually granted. If there is any merit in the application which my hon. friend says has been made for a light at Waubashene, and a light company will supply the light, and a picayune outlay is all that is necessary, there is no reason why the application should not be granted. I have personal knowledge that the appropriations taken this year for lights and lighthouses were determined by the board.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not want to defend extravagance in any shape or form but like to see a little fair-play in discussing these things. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has picked out a few items in the bills sent in for the steamer 'Kestrel.' Well, a great many of these items are exactly what he would find in any bill from any logging camp in British Columbia. The men there are fed like men and not like beasts. They are fed well and it pays to feed them well.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman is all wrong. The most of my quotations were from the vessel 'Canada.'

Mr. KENNEDY. Did he not quote from the 'Kestrel'?

Mr. BENNETT. One or two items.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, I am speaking about them. If you will examine the accounts of supplies going into any logging camp in British Columbia, you will find items of the same kind. Last year when Lord Grey and party were out in that province, they came up from Victoria to New Westminster on the 'Kestrel' and they probably went to other places on the same boat. You would not want to feed that party on pork and potatoes but would like to give them something similar to what they are accustomed to. And because there may be a few items of the kind the hon. gentleman criticises the whole account. I do not see why the whole list should be spoken of as of the same kind. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said that those items he quoted were fair samples. I say they were anything but fair. What he has done is to pick out a few of the highest priced articles and give them as fair samples of the average.

Mr. BENNETT. I would call attention to this fact that of all the items I quoted, there was only one from the 'Kestrel.' The item of MacLaren's cheese $30 and asparagus were taken from the 'Canada.' Will the hon. member for Westminster say that he can go to the lumber camps of British Columbia and find standing on the tables for the men what is known as MacLaren's cheese in those little delicate white porcelain jars?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, nor will you find them on the boats.

Mr. BENNETT. The trouble is they are on the boats.

Mr. KENNEDY. Not every day but only in some special case.

Mr. BENNETT. It must have been a very special case when they consumed in one day $30 worth.

Mr. KENNEDY. You will find the same thing in the lumber camps at holiday time.

Mr. BENNETT. What, MacLaren's cheese?

Mr. KENNEDY. Anything and everything in the shape of luxuries.

To provide for legal services in connection with claims of provincial government to the fisheries, $1,190.

Mr. DANIEL. How were these legal expenses contracted and to whom paid?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The maritime provinces and the province of Quebec had set up a claim to a share of the Washington treaty damages award, on the ground that by the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council a few years ago they had exclusive legislation over the fisheries in the matter of property. Therefore any compensation which came from allowing foreigners to use those fisheries, they claimed, should go to the provinces. A stated case was suggested for reference to the Supreme Court, and it was in this connection that Mr. Gibbons was retained by the Minister of Justice and rendered the services charged for.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that Mr. George C. Gibbons, of London, Ont.?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know. The firm of Gibbons & Harper.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the decision of the Privy Council was that the Atlantic and Pacific fisheries were under the control of the Dominion but that the inland fisheries belonged to the provinces. If that be correct, I cannot see how the provinces could be entitled to any portion of the fishery award, which is for damages done the Atlantic fisheries and not the inland fisheries.

Mr. FIELDING. The decision of the Privy Council was not limited to the inland waters and the provinces claim, under that decision, right to the Atlantic fisheries.

Mr. FIELDING. The provinces claim rights in the Atlantic fisheries—rights on the foreshore. Of course, the regulation is still with the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not so understand it when the Minister of Justice made his explantation, and when he said——

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say that the claim of the provinces is just; but they certainly do make it, and they claim that we should give them compensation.

To provide for the expenses of fishery commissions, $15,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is this for ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Owing to a misunderstanding and the absence of the chairmain of Fishery Commission, British Columbia and Georgian bay, provision was not made to meet the expenses of the two commissions during the present fiscal year 1906-7. The British Columbia commission held international conferences with the State of Washington commissioners in August and September, carried out in June, July and October visits of investigation on the salmon fishing ground, held a series of executive sittings and made three interim reports, that of October 20 embodying a series of important recommendations on Fraser river fishery questions and international regulations. The Georgian Bay Fishery Commission, after submitting a lengthy interim report in 1906, arranged for a series of sittings commencing at Midland on July 24 and continuing daily at Georgian bay stations including Penetang, Parry Sound, Pointe au Baril, Byng Inlet, Tobermory, The Ducks, and other places. Sittings were held in October: and executive sittings will be held in Toronto and Ottawa in June, 1907, Additional work was given to the commission by Lake Erie being added to the scope of its investigation. In the spring the north shore of Lake Erie will be visited, and a series of between twenty and thirty sittings will be held to meet with the wishes of the fishermen. A final report will be framed after a series of executive sittings next fall.

Mr. BENNETT. How much of that is to be expended on what I may call Mr. Birnie's Commission, the Georgian Bay Commission ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Just as in respect of the items of the coming year and which was passed some time ago, I am unable to say how much was expended on the Georgian Bay Commission and how much on British Columbia.

Mr. BENNETT—How much is Mr. Birnie being paid now for the work he is doing ? Or, how much will he be paid ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The deputy minister informs me that Mr. Birnie has not been paid anything. In the British Columbia commission—and I think the payment would be about the same—it was $10 a day for the commissioners.

Mr. BENNETT. There is no use telling me that Mr. Birnie has not been paid anything unless the minister will tell us that this report is misleading—I refer to the Auditor General's Report, page P—201. If the minister will say that this report is not correct, I will accept his statement and not refer to the matter again. This shows that he was paid for 44 days at $7 and a lump sum for travelling expenses. Is that what he is being paid for his services—$7 a day ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The deputy minister says that the Auditor General's Report which my hon. friend has quoted is for 1905-6, while this item is for 1906-7. In regard to this Mr. Birnie has not been paid anything.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, will he be paid at the rate of $7 a day ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Whatever the order in council states, and I believe it is $7 a day.

Mr. BENNETT. This gentleman has the high sounding title of K.C. I think it about shows the estimate of this commission when a K.C. will lock up his office and go for a trip around the lakes at $7 a day.

Mr. FIELDING. If we pay high prices hon. gentlemen opposite object, and if we pay low prices they are not satisfied.

Mr. BENNETT. I think so low priced a K.C. would hardly be good enough for a fishery commissioner.

Mr. DANIEL. Reverting to the cruiser 'Canada,' I notice that several kinds of flags have been bought for her,—there is a blue ensign, and the red ensign and also the Minister of Marine flag. That is a new flag to me. I did not know such a flag was known in the Dominion. Would the minister please describe it. I suppose this flag would be flown only when the minister is on board. I suppose the acting minister ought to know this flag, and I would be glad if he would give us a description of it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot describe it. Possibly if I could go to the Atlantic and get aboard the 'Canada' I could learn all about it. I do not know whether it would be flown for an acting minister or not.

Mr. FOWLER. It would be put at half mast then.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I will make inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT. If the design has not been finally settled, I would suggest a tree, with a hand placing grafts all over it.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,156,000.

Mr. PATERSON. In a general way there is about $50,000 extra asked for in the coming year, which will be required for the opening of new ports and to give some increases to members of the staff. When the supplementary estimates are brought down I would be pleased, if parliament approves, to augment the amount for increases of salary. This estimate is based upon what we have found necessary to expend last year.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister remember whether the officer at the subport of Sussex, N.B., is to have an increase of salary.

Mr. PATERSON. That is a question we have not yet determined, nor can we until we ascertain the mind of parliament in reference to granting increases generally. I had better not say much about that until I get the sanction of my colleagues to an increase. My own view is that under the circumstances of the country, considering how the officials in the customs are paid in comparison with persons occupying like position, they are entitled to a general increase. There are over 1,700 officers, and if you gave them only a moderate increase it would swell the estimates considerably. In addition we are establishing new ports rapidly in the Northwest. The country is filling up and settlers are pouring in by the hundred thousand, many of them from the United States, and we have to give them customs facilities. After all I think in view of the way the revenue is coming in, the cost of collecting being something like 3·40 per cent, we are justified in granting a moderate increase in the remuneration of the officials.

Mr. FOWLER. The revenue at Sussex has largely increased whereas the salary has remained about stationary. The salary is $550, a very small one in view of the fact that the collector has to give his whole time to his duties and cannot attend to any other business. I will not be charged with trying to favour a political friend in asking that his salary be increased, because the gentleman who fills that position is a violent Grit partisan—was when he was appointed, and I am afraid he still clings to his first love. It is only a matter of common justice that I speak on his behalf, and I hope the minister will take his case into consideration. I think it is perhaps at such points as the town of Sussex where the greatest injustice is done to officials in the matter of salaries. I fancy in large cities the salaries are probably commensurate with the duties performed. The collector at Sussex has to perform responsible duties. He requires to be a man of fair education in order to fill a position of that kind; he must be a man of some substance in order to be able to give bonds and that sort of thing. In these expansive days a salary of $550 is not a very large sum. I dare say that what applies to that officer would apply to many others throughout the country. I would bespeak the hon. gentleman's attention to this case.

Mr. PATERSON. I have made a note of it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am sure the country will not hesitate to grant an additional salary to the customs officials. Take the port of Hamilton for instance. In 1896 the expenses of that port were about $21,000 and the revenue amounted to nearly $600,000. They were collecting a revenue of something less than $600,000. They will collect at least $2,000,000 of revenue and expenses are a little less than $23,000. There is one man less in the department to-day than there was in 1896. I have tried to impress the minister that it is absolutely necessary to increase the help and also the salaries paid at the port of Hamilton. I am sure the House will agree with the minister that $50,000 scattered all over Canada is not too much of an increase in the salaries of the servants in that department.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I wish to lay before the Minister of Customs the claims of the district I represent. I laid before the minister last year and I think the year previously the claims of the district of Muskoka with regard to the establishment of a port of entry. We have a large business transacted through there and we suffer great inconvenience because of the fact that we have not a customs port. I might mention the case of one firm that is using the customs to the extent of about a million dollars per annum. That represents the value of the goods that they have to pass through the customs. They are at a very great disadvantage at the present time. Then we have a great many other people there who use the customs, and especially in the summer season we have a large tourist business. A great many of these people come from the United States. They are there for six weeks or two months and they want to use the customs in getting their goods through. Every one of them

is in a hurry. We have numerous instances of men coming over during the summer season who are trying to get the requisites for their comfort through the customs and they find that they can come and go before they can get their goods through. The difficulty of getting their goods through is such that it is seriously interfering with our summer resort business. I think this is something that demands the attention of the Minister of Customs and I hope he will give it his consideration and give the people relief in regard to this matter.

Mr. PATERSON. What was the town you mentioned ?

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I might mention all the towns in Muskoka district—Gravenhurst, Bracebridge and Huntsville. We have two chains of lakes, one having headquarters at Gravenhurst and Bracebridge and the other with headquarters at Huntsville. There should be provision made for the summer months at least at two of these places and a permanent port of entry should be granted in the district of Muskoka. I do hope the minister will give it his careful consideration. He practically made a promise last year that we would have it this year, but I do not find anything in the estimates in regard to it, and that is my reason for impressing the matter upon the minister at the present time.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a large tourist travel to the beautiful country that is comprised within the territory that my hon. friend (Mr. W. Wright) represents and we try to give all the facilities we can because these tourists bring a great deal of money into the country and are a valuable asset, if I may use that term. In order to provide for that traffic we appoint, during the summer months, a special agent at Gravenhurst to expedite any business that these tourists may have. But the hon. gentleman is quite correct when he says that the ordinary merchandise of some of the towns there is passed through the customs port of Orillia. I am aware that it is not as convenient as it should be to have a customs port in one of your own towns. But we have a difficulty. We have so many applications for ports that we have been unable as far as our finances went, to grant them all and we do not desire to enlarge them any more than we can help. At the same time we feel that we are in this position that many of the points that are asking for customs ports are as large and their business is as large as some of the places that now enjoy that privilege, and people point out to us that the business of their town is greater perhaps than the business of a town which has a port. This, of course, strengthens the application of the town that asks for it, but if we were to multiply them too fast I am afraid that parliament would hardly agree to give us the money to do it. If we are able in the public interest and with the means at our command to meet the wishes of the people in my hon. friend's district I would be only too pleased but I cannot make him a promise because we cannot grant all that are asked for. We will endeavour to give them such facilities as we can and it may be possible —I do not say we cannot—to perhaps have an additional port in his county. But there are so many of these requests and especially from the Northwest which is filling up so rapidly that it is difficult to grant them all. I may say in reference to the trading public in Canada that I believe it is a fact that the 80,000,000 people in the United States have not as many ports of entry as we have in Canada ; so that we cannot be accused of not trying to meet the convenience of the people in so far as we can.

I find I have some details here that were furnished me by the accountant in reference to this vote that we are asking. He points out that the sum we are asking compared with the full year at the same rate is $87,781 more than the amount which would be required for the service of the full twelve months of the previous year. This is a nine months column we have put before us, but if you take the full year basis we are asking in this main estimate $87,781 more. There is a small supplementary estimate that will have to be added for the next year but this is for the current year. Some $30,000 will be required for increases in the salaries of the officers and the balance will be needed for the salary of additional officers if the trade and revenue go on. These proposed increases of salaries have reference only to exceptional cases where persons engaged in the Customs Department in outlying ports are not receiving perhaps what is the fair equivalent of what other officers were receiving. It would not cover anything like a general increase even to a small amount and we had not contemplated that at the time that these original estimates were prepared.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What will the total be for the year?

Mr. PATERSON. In the main estimates it will be $1,445,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Then you have some supplementaries?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, there are supplementaries ; that is for the coming year. The expenditure for last year, if it had been on the twelve months basis instead of the nine months' basis, would be $1,345,000, but as soon as this is passed you will find another item in the supplementary estimates of the current year for $22,500 added to this which will make $1,031,150 that we will take for the current year. Then there is an increase over that of $87,781 for the ensuing year.

To pay gratuity to John Bain for special services as secretary of the Tariff Commission inquiry, $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that in addition to his salary ?

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Bain, who is not in the service now, was the secretary of the commission.

Mr. SPROULE. He was in the service and drawing his pay when he was secretary of the commission.

Mr. PATERSON. Quite so, but if the hon. gentleman had any idea of the work Mr. Bain performed in connection with the tariff he would recognize that this is only a fair recognition of his services. Both Mr. Bain and Mr. McDougald worked many a night long after midnight and no hon. gentleman can understand the amount of work that was performed by Mr. Bain, in fact he was nearly broken down under the work, while Mr. McDougald has been of the greatest help to the commission.

Mr. SPROULE. It would seem that his work was not of extraordinary importance as he was engaged in writing political pamphlets.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Bain has been accused of writing political pamphlets, but I think that charge has been given up. Now that he has left the service I am free to speak and to say that he was one of the most valuable officers it was possible to have, and I think that any gentleman on the opposition side as well as on this side who ever met Mr. Bain found him to be a most painstaking and courteous official.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. And that he was a valuable man is apparent to every one. I regret his loss from the department exceedingly. I view it as a loss not only to myself in administering the department but as a loss to the public service of the Dominion. He was a most valuable public servant.

Mr. SPROULE. What was his salary ?

Mr. PATERSON. $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. And $1,000 more for his secretaryship of the commission ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Which extended over a period, I suppose——

Mr. PATERSON. Over a year. He was with us all through the country and had all the direction of the compiling and the indexing, &c. The House will understand the amount of work in connection with the preparing of references to those nine volumes. As to his value—well, he left us, we have nothing in the public service and there was no hope that we could give him anything that would repay his services. I do not know exactly what the arrangement is, but I presume he is in a position where he will probably get more than any cabinet minister's position would give except that of the Prime Minister before very long. At any rate he felt that in justice to himself he must take one of several offers that were made to him that were more lucrative than the salary that we were able to pay him.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not underestimate his ability or the importance of his work, but it seems to me that a public employee receiving $3,000 a year or more who is supposed to give his whole time to the service of the country, if you give him $1,000 extra, you are paying him pretty high. If he was doing the work of the commission he could not have been doing the work of the department, that is sure. He could only give at the best his whole time. He might work a little harder or do different work but he could only work his whole time, and it does seem to me that for a few months' additional work an increase of salary of $1,000 is a very high jump.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman is right enough that the principle of gratuity is one that is not to be encouraged ; when an official is engaged he is to devote his whole time to his duties and it is undesirable to supplement the payment of officials for special work especially if it be in their line to perform the extra work. This tariff commission work was exceptional and it really appertained more to the Finance Department than to the Customs Department, but Mr. Bain was the best available man for it. As to doing his own work, all I can say is that when we were travelling he had his typewriter along and his work in the office had to be kept up and it was kept up ; I think nothing was neglected and over and above that the work of the tariff commission was being done. It is an exceptional case. He not only gave all his time to the work but he gave time that no reasonable man would ask him to give.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he receive a superannuation allowance ?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh no, he has left the service.

Mr. SPROULE. Then he receives no superannuation ?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh no, he receives no superannuation.

Mr. SPROULE. How long was he in the service ?

Mr. PATERSON. I brought him in ; he would be here 11 years, I think.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is less objectionable if he is not getting any superannuation.

Mr. PATERSON. He was not on the superannuation list. If he was on the superannuation list and a man comparatively young in years as he is, this gratuity would be a serious thing to contemplate.

Mr. SPROULE. He was only a temporary employee ?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh no, he was not ; I do not know how it was, but I suppose we made the change in the Superannuation Act just about the time he came in, at any rate he gets no superannuation. He was my private secretary for a year or two.

Mr. CROCKET. Perhaps I may be allowed to mention here a matter which I have been asked to bring to the attention of the minister. I refer to the vacancy in the customs office at Centreville, in Carleton county, caused by the recent death of the collector at that place, and the urgent necessity which exists for an immediate appointment being made. On account of the price of potatoes being much higher on the Canadian than on the American side, there is a great deal of smuggling now going on in this commodity. The work of the office now is being performed by a young lady, the daughter of the late collector, who is of course unable to cope with the situation. The smuggling is resulting in a serious loss to the farmers in that neighbourhood, and they are especially anxious that the vacancy be filled without delay.

Mr. PATERSON. We must make a special effort under these circumstances to fill the position as rapidly as possible. Generally we would expect the collector at the main port, which would be Woodstock, to send one of his staff to take charge of the office pending an appointment, but I presume he is trusting to the young lady who who has been mentioned.

To pay gratuity to Mr. McDougald in connection with the Tariff Commission, $500.

Mr. PATERSON. The distinction between Mr. Bain and Mr. McDougald is that Mr. Bain was with the commission the whole year, backward and forward, keeping up his office work as well. Mr. McDougald has been a very faithful help to us here, but he has done it in the past few months when the tariff was being wrought out.

Quebec harbour—improvements, $280,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is a vote to close up the contract for building what is called the Pointe à Carcy breakwater at the city of Quebec. It is an extension down the river St. Lawrence from the old Louise embankment, which was undertaken some four years ago, and is expected to be completed this year.

Mr. DANIEL. What has been the cost hitherto, and will this finish it?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, this amount will finish it. The total estimate is $812,500. It is a pier 1,100 feet long, 200 feet wide at the end and 150 feet wide on the top.

Mr. DANIEL. The harbour of Quebec is under a commission, is it not ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but this is outside of the work of the harbour commissioners.

Mr. AMES. This work has come in for a good deal of criticism on a number of different occasions. First is the fact that when the original arrangement for construction was made it was supposed that only a comparatively small sum of money would be expended, yet this contractor, Mr. Dussault, who received the contract, when he had completed what he originally contracted for, was permitted to go on year after year without new tenders being called for, and was allowed large amounts at the same figures. When sums varying from $150,000 to $250,000 are being spent from year to year without new tenders being called for, and the same contractor is allowed year after year to have his contract extended, it leads to the application of a very wrong principle. I hope that the minister is bringing to a close this year a chapter in the history of public works which is not altogether creditable to the department. I hope we can expect to see this contract completed, or at least have the assurance that if it is not completed this year there will be a fresh start made and new tenders called, so that there will be open competition for any additional work to be done in connection with these Quebec harbour improvements.

Mr. FISHER. I may say that in the original contract provision was made for the continuation to a certain extent of the scheme of improvement of the harbour of Quebec, and the rates of continuation have been according to the schedule rates provided for in the contract. There was no sort of intention or desire to conceal anything. The contract was discussed in this House several years ago, soon after it was made, and it provided for all that has been done at the rates provided for in the contract. There has been nothing done outside of the contract at all.

Mr. AMES. When the original advertisements were placed in the newspapers in regard to the work to be done, was it intimated that this was to be practically a self-repeating contract, to be continued year after year, and that the amount of the original appropriation represented only one-third or one-fourth of what might be expected to be spent before the work was fully completed ? Did those who tendered, other than Mr. Dussault, know that in receiving the original contract they were likely to have four times the amount of work originally stipulated ?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that when tenders were originally asked for, the whole plan was prepared, and that all the tenderers knew what the whole amount of the work was going to be, although the original tenders were only for a portion of the work. There was no information given to Mr. Dussault that was not given to everybody else.

Mr. AMES. I would like to call the attention of the minister and of the House to a clipping which appeared some time ago in the Quebec 'Chronicle,' making very severe strictures on the character of this work—a statement which can hardly be allowed to go without at least some defence on the part of the government. The statement is as follows:

Practical contracting experts who have made a survey of the Dominion government contractors work in connection with the breakwater extension, severely criticise the construction of the masonry facing along the river front, and say it does not bear the appearance of good engineering and without a question of doubt will have to be strengthened in the near future to prevent it from giving away and falling into the St. Lawrence. These same experts take exception to the supposed crib work that is being done to support in position the sand filling done by the Canadian Pacific Railway to make new land, and say that the work, notwithstanding the excuse that it is only temporary should not be accepted by the government, and they question if an engineer was in charge to supervise the existing conditions. It is pointed out by the experienced contractors who made the survey that the crib work in course of construction is a very cheap and indifferent article of workmanship, and the material used altogether out of keeping with the demand. The ballast flooring, which should be made of good timber, is made of three-inch deals, and the timber that is used on top is simply fastened with drift bolts or spikes that possibly cannot stand the strain intended, and will allow the sand filling by degrees to exude through the cribwork into the river and thus weaken a portion of the newly made land. The experts are very strong in their strictures on the work performed, and if what they assert is only half true the federal authorities should lose no time in having the proper engineers inspect the work before it is too late.

If that is the character of work that is going on in Quebec and this appeared in the Quebec 'Chronicle' on the 10th of June last—is the government justified from year to year in giving the same contractor permission to continue with work of this character and making a total expenditure of upwards of $750,000 over the original contract? What steps have the government taken to insure this House that these strictures, which are claimed to be made by competent authorities on the spot, are well based? I have also a letter which reads as follows:

This work has been going on for some years. It is under contract to a man by the name of Dussault. It is a contract in connection with the harbour works, and it is made directly with the Department of Public Works. There were no tenders. There is little or no superintendence. Rotten timbers and timbers not in accordance with the specifications are used. The construction is faulty. The work is said to have been moved by the ice last year. It is generally believed that the construction is entirely inadequate for the purposes which is intended to be served.

Mr. FISHER. Did the hon. gentleman say from whom that letter comes?

Mr. AMES. No, I did not, but it is based on this article which I quoted from the 'Quebec Chronicle' of June 10, 1906.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman's correspondent did not have a little better basis than that article for making such strictures. The fact that the article states there was no adequate supervision of the work is sufficient to discredit, in my eyes, the whole article. There is a resident engineer of the department in Quebec, Mr. Valiquette, who has been engineer of the department thirty-five years and who is thoroughly competent, and he has an assistant, Mr. Chapais. The general superintendent, Mr. Valiquette, took particular pains to supervise the whole of that work. Besides Mr. Dussault is a well known, reputable and competent contractor. The work was conducted right under the nose of the people of the 'Chronicle' and the statements in that article are absolutely baseless.

Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour and river improvements, $500,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of improvements are you proposing to make this year which require half a million dollars more?

Mr. FISHER. This is the completion of a large contract, extending over several years, for dredging the channel at Fort William in the Mission and Kaministiquia rivers. It also includes some dredging at Port Arthur and the construction of a breakwater there. This whole work has been going on about a year and is intended to extend over seven years in all, or six years more.

Mr. SPROULE: Under contract?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, awarded after public tender to the lowest tenderer. It was awarded at a rate per yard for dredging and a bulk sum for the breakwater on specifications prepared by the department.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the rate per yard.

Mr. FISHER. On the Mission river nine cents and at Port Arthur nine and a half cents per cubic yard.

Mr. SPROULE. The breakwater is at Port Arthur?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it is 4,800 feet long.

Mr. SPROULE. Who has that contract ?

Mr. FISHER. The contractor is Mr. M. J. Hogan of Port Colborne and the amount of the contract is $363,000. Mr. Weddell has the contract for dredging in Port Arthur, and the Great Lake Dredging Company has it for dredging at Fort William.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the breakwater let by public tender ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there any extension of the work after the original contract was let ?

Mr. FISHER. No, the plans and specifications were prepared before the contract was let. It is an extension of the old breakwater from west to east.

Mr. SPROULE. There has been a great deal of dredging done in the harbour the last few years. Is the river filling up again or why is this new dredging being done every year ?

Mr. FISHER. This dredging is new and is to continue until the whole river is dredged out in order to make a harbour for Fort William. The dredging now being done is chiefly in the Mission river. The dredging that has been done in Kaministiquia does not require to be done over.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been there several times, and it was pointed out to me that the trouble consists in the mouth of the river constantly filling up.

Mr. FISHER. I am told that there has been some little silting in of sand from the lake at the mouth of the river but not in the river itself where the harbour is. In the river itself there has not been any silting down from above or falling of the bank. A good deal of the dredging is in the Mission river, which is the western branch or mouth of the Kaministiquia. That is a much shallower river than the main stream. It has been dredged out to form part of the harbour and another channel to the westward of these islands into the lake.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there elevators there ?

Mr. FISHER. Not yet. But the Grand Trunk Pacific terminals will be on the western bank of the Mission river and down the Kaministiquia towards the lake.

Mr. SPROULE. I was told some time ago that a company held most of the land there and that this land, owing to expected development, would be very valuable. I wondered whether this work was being done not to facilitate the building of terminals but rather for the purpose of increasing the value of private property ?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. FISHER. No. But the demands of Fort William are very great. It is confidently expected that it will be a very great port.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that it will be, in the future.

Mr. FISHER. The Kaministiquia river alone—

Mr. SPROULE. I am not speaking of that.

Mr. FISHER. The Kaministiquia river was pretty well occupied and if that part of the Mission river could not be dredged out there would be no room for new development. As a matter of fact, the Grand Trunk Pacific have got a large portion of the land on the western bank of this river and will establish elevators and other terminal works there to serve their system west of Fort William. Had they not access to the water there they would be blocked completely.

Mr. SPROULE. And it is in anticipation of that that you are doing this dredging ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in believing that the river is well dredged out down to the mouth, and no more dredging is needed there ?

Mr. FISHER. Dredging is going on in the Kaministiquia below the junction of the Mission, which, I think, is four miles from the mouth. There is already a channel there but not the 22 feet channel it is hoped to make. It is now about 19 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. And what width.

Mr. FISHER. It averages 260 feet. The Mission river is expected to be dredged to the same depth and width.

Mr. BLAIN. I was under the impression that the harbour of Fort William and Port Arthur were under the control of a commission, a Bill having been put through some time ago for that purpose.

Mr. FISHER. I think not, I am not aware of it.

Mr. BENNETT. How much dredging is to be done at Fort William and Port Arthur ?

Mr. FISHER. We do not expect the whole work $360,000 to be done this year.

Mr. BENNETT. How much will be spent for dredging this year ?

Mr. FISHER. About $193,000 at Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand that contracts have been entered into, with Weddell at one place and the Great Lakes Com-

pany for another, that will run for six years at about $190,000 a year for the two ?

Mr. FISHER. The contract is terminable at any time at the wish of the government. The plan was made for the whole work, and contracts were let for the whole expecting to occupy about seven years.

Mr. SPROULE. The contract was let on estimated quantities ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How can the government let a contract covering work for six or seven years when the money has not been voted ?

Mr. FISHER. The contract can be terminated at any time.

Mr. SPROULE. But if a contract is let and the money is not voted, I take it, the contractor would have reasonable grounds for claiming damages.

Mr. FISHER. The contract is let subject to the voting of the money by parliament.

Mr. BLAIN. In the session of 1904, a Bill was introduced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that time, the late Mr. Préfontaine, relating to these two harbours. I desire information on that subject. The minister at that time is reported in 'Hansard' as follows :

> The purport of the Bill, as I have explained, is to put the affairs of the port in the hands of a commission composed of men of the locality instead of leaving their administration in the hands of the Department of Marine and Fisheries as it is at present. The Department of Marine and Fisheries now sees about the collection of dues, &c., and the Public Works Department sees about the construction of whatever works may be necessary. These two ports are becoming very important ; trade is increasing considerably and it has been represented by the people interested that by putting it into the hands of a commission in this manner the public interest will be better served.

I would like to ask the minister the explanation of this.

Mr. FISHER. The Bill was not passed into law, I cannot explain why.

Mr. BLAIN. Evidently the minister at that time had decided, in consultation with the residents, that it was in the best interest of the public that the expenditure should be made thereafter under a commission rather than by the Public Works Department or the Marine and Fisheries Department. The minister was so well convinced that he introduced a Bill. Now I would like to know why the Bill was not pressed and why a change was made, also why these expenditures are now being made by the department rather than by a commission.

Mr. FISHER. I am unable to give the reasons.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand the position of affairs nearly $200,000 will be spent the coming year for dredging at these two ports, I think the minister said $190,000, but we may be sure the expenditure will exceed that amount. That work, it is contemplated, shall extend over seven years. So there will be an aggregate of a million and a half, in round figures, worth of dredging done at these two points. I am sure nobody will complain of the prices, because the Weddell Company are doing the dredging at Port Arthur for nine and a half cents a yard, and the Great Lakes Dredging Company are doing the work at Fort William for nine cents. Now I want to refer to the history of the dredging operations that have been carried on at these two points because I think the country, and the government too, are under a lasting obligation to the opposition for the course they have taken in regard to this dredging. If the minister will refer to the 'Hansard' of 1905, volume 2, he will find these facts to be admitted by the Minister of Public Works (Hon. C. S. Hyman) ; First we find, page 4459, that the first advertisement published calling for tenders to close on the 14th of April, appeared on 11th of April. Now what opportunity have contractors to tender between these dates ? This work was to commence within ten days after the acceptance of the contract; in other words, the work was to commence on the 21st of April. Another term of the contract was this, that the dredge should of necessity be up there on the date of the acceptance of the tender, namely the 21st April. Now that practically meant that no person could bring a dredge into Port Arthur by the 21st of April from the outside, because it would be frozen up at that time of the year. But the opposition hammered away at the minister, with the result that a change was brought about and open tendering was permitted. The result was that companies came to the front, and this Weddell Company brought down the price at Port Arthur to 9½ cents, and the Great Lakes Dredging Company were forced, in order to get part of the contract, to tender at 9 cents for the Fort William work. Now how was that brought about ? It was brought about by the opposition compelling the minister to throw open the field to tenderers. As the Great Lakes Dredging Company had their plant on the ground, they would naturally have had the contract at their own figures, but they were forced to come down in open competition against these other parties, and to-day the country is getting a million and a half dollars worth of dredging done at these two points at the figures I have named.

What had been the policy of the government prior to that? Referring to the 'Hansard' of the same year, page 4462, we find the minister admitting that last year $108-000 was spent for dredging, and that this favoured company, the Great Lakes Dredging Company, were paid 25 cents a yard for exactly similar work that is to-day being done at 9 cents and 9½ cents per yard. In the same debate the minister admitted that for two years work had been done there without tender, and that in one of those years it had amounted to the sum of $108,000. Look at the princely fortunes that were made by the Great Lakes Dredging Company in doing the work at 25 cents a yard, which it is now compelled to do at 9 cents a yard. Nobody can commend the government or the Minister of Public Works for having brought about that state of affairs, because he hedged around this dredging contract with conditions and barriers that made it impossible for anybody else but the Great Lakes Dredging Company to secure the contract. But by adopting that course in the House the opposition forced the government to make this desirable change, with the result of saving a great deal of money to this country. But there was a great deal worse than paying 25 cents a yard. In many other cases they were allowed for special work as high as 40 cents a yard, some of it at 90 cents a yard, other cases at 45 cents, and in some cases as high as $1.25 a yard. Now I will be fair, and I will admit that the work might not have been of a uniform nature, and that consequently higher prices should have been paid. But according to this return, and the statement of the minister which tallies with the return brought down last year in answer to a question asked by myself, these two companies, the Weddell Company at Fort William and the Great Lakes Dredging Company at Port Arthur, no matter what difficulties they may meet with, no matter what the formation may be, are doing the work at those prices, and the country is thereby being benefited.

Common report says that the Acting Minister of Public Works is to be the future Minister of Public Works and if the hon. gentleman is to occupy that office I want to throw out a word of warning to him as to the dredging operations that are conducted to-day. I am going to refer to Ontario only. I do not say a word about the other provinces because I am not conversant with them. I hope the committee will bear with me while I point out a case that perhaps is not within the minister's knowledge unless he has read to-day's papers, because he was not present at yesterday's meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. What transpired there? We had before the committee a man who was appointed inspector of dredging ata $3 a day. He frankly told the committee that there was another dredge working near at hand and that he went to the other dredge inspector and paid him $1.25 a day to look after the two dredges. Mark you this dredging work is done in this way: scows are brought there and they are reputed to carry so many yards of material. If you carry away ten scows in a day only half filled it follows that if they were completely filled you could not carry away so many, so that in other words the owner of the dredge is the beneficiary if there is an incompetent or dishonest man there on behalf of the government. I would not say that this man Eastwood, who was before the committee yesterday giving evidence, was dishonest. I think he simply imagined that he could do as he pleased. He gave frank and straightforward evidence. He did not seek in any way to conceal the facts. He told the story frankly. I have made inquiry about this matter at different points where dredging operations are carried on, and I tell the minister now that a strong opinion prevails that because this work is under water you can do exactly as you please. The man you have to calculate on is the inspector on the dredge. What is the position of a lot of these dredges? I will take the very case I cited a moment ago; that is the dredging on Matchedash bay. One of these two dredges is a dredge owned by some persons who call themselves the Penetanguishene Dredging Company, although they are not an incorporated company. The head of that company in Penetanguishene is Dr. Spohn, superintendent of the provincial asylum at that point. One of the largest owners of the dredge is Mr. Gendron, a boot and shoe merchant in Penetanguishene. A brother of this Mr. Gendron is in charge of the dredge. I am not going to say that he is a dishonest man because I cannot say it. I have not stood there day after day and watched to see whether that scow was filled to the top or not.

Mr. W. ROCHE. What sort of material is being taken out—mud or sand?

Mr. BENNETT. This would be a sandy formation—not rock. This government inspector, Gendron, apparently had a stunted sense of what was right and he did not think it was improper on his part to take $1.25 per day from the inspector on the other dredge and profess to do the work on both. What was the result? He got not only the $3 a day which was being allowed by the department but he was in addition being paid $1.25 by Eastwood, while Eastwood pocketed $1.75 a day for doing nothing. I have followed up these dredging operations by correspondence with different parties at different points and the whole of the dredging operations in Ontario are, I believe, quite on a par with the dredging operations at Matchedash bay.

I am not going to assert that every scow there was not filled to the top because I never saw one of them go out but apparently the opinion prevails that they can do exactly what they please and I am going to throw out a suggestion to the minister that I believe will save this country thousands upon thousands of dollars and it is that the department here should send officers out to supervise these operations. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) threw out the suggestion by his question that if it is rock you can exactly measure in situ,—I think that is the phrase that the engineers use—you can go out to the bluff of the rock and measure it and see exactly what has been removed, but you cannot do that as well with a sandy condition because the formation will change and it will not be of a uniform depth. The result is that you are relying entirely on the local inspector's account of how many scows went out each day and relying on each of these scows being completely filled. That is exactly the position of the matter. I am going to ask the minister, if in face of the Eastwood case yesterday —and I hope the minister will read over the evidence in that case—he does not think that the time has arrived when inspectors should be men sent out from the department. I know of other cases, but I am not going to refer to them here, with regard to which I have had correspondence from people entirely unknown to me who, owing to the fact that I have paid some little attention to this dredging question at different points have written to me in regard to the matter. Gentlemen whose reputations are beyond cavil and beyond doubt have written to me and suggested that these very evils were prevailing at different points. I am going to ask the minister what he is going to do about them. The public record is against the department. I am not referring to the acting minister; I am referring to the incumbent of the office. Take this very case of the Great Lakes Dredging Company. I refer to the tenders for dredging at Port Arthur and Fort William. At Port Arthur the Great Lakes Dredging Company put in a tender of ten cents per cubic yard. Mr. A. F. Bowman put in a tender of 22½ cents a yard. Mr. A. F. Bowman is the owner of a quarter interest in the plant of the Great Lakes Dredging Company, and I say that because I cannot be contradicted on that point. A government return shows that. He puts in a tender at 22½ cents and the very concern of which he is a member puts in a tender of ten cents a yard. What does that mean?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. On the same work?

Mr. BENNETT. On the same work. The Great Lakes Dredging Company is composed of Mr. Whelan, a son-in-law of the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Commee), Mr. C. A. Bowman, a member of the local legislature of Ontario, and his brother, Mr. A. F. Bowman, who are the sole owners. The stock in it is divided equally between the Bowmans and Mr. Whelan. What are the public going to say when that return is presented to them? They are going to say that Mr. A. F. Bowman must have a strange opinion, and that is putting it mildly, of the Minister of Public Works, because while he is the owner of a quarter interest in the plant of the Great Lakes Dredging Company, he puts in a tender at ten cents a yard and in his individual name he puts in a tender at 22½ cents a yard for the very same work. One deduction and only one can be drawn and that deduction is that Mr. Bowman and the Great Lakes Dredging Company figured in this way that if no tender intervened they would find the Minister of Public Works putty in their hands and that he would allow them to draw out their low tender at ten cents and substitute their higher tender of 22½ cents. There could be no mistake about this, it was not a matter of an accident or of chance because I will take the next dredging contract, that of Fort William. The Great Lakes Dredging Company tendered at 9 cents and A. F. Bowman at 18 cents a yard, and here the same inference can be drawn that had it not been for the three or four intervening tenders the Great Lakes Company expected that Mr. Hyman would allow them to draw out the low tender at 9 cents and substitute the high tender at 18 cents. Fortunately for the country there were these intervening tenders and the Great Lakes Company had to take the work at 9 cents instead of as they anticipated at 18 cents.

I refer now to page V—26 of the Auditor General's Report and find that A. F. Bowman performed certain services with the dredge 'Dominion' which aggregated something over $10,000. At V—27 you will find that the Great Lakes Dredging Company, for services performed by the dredge 'Dominion,' got about $7,000. This was for different work altogether. But what does it show? That the very same dredge 'Dominion,' because there are not two dredges registered under the name of 'Dominion,' is the dredge working under the name of A. F. Bowman in one case and under that of the Great Lakes Dredging Company in another. For fear it might be considered that this is a typographical mistake, I point out that at page 26 A. F. Bowman performed services with a dredge called 'No. 1' amounting to over $25,000, and at page V—27 the same dredge 'No. 1' under the ownership of the Great Lakes Dredging Company does work that is detailed there. There is no doubt about it. I know from the most accurate information received from gentle-

men residing there that these two dredges are the property of the Great Lakes Dredging Company. Who superintends the work at this point? I understand it is Mr. Temple, the resident engineer. I do not assume that Mr. Temple could possibly visit all the scows up there and see the filling of each scow, and consequently there are upwards of half a dozen men employed as inspectors of dredging. I have nothing to say against the integrity of these gentlemen; I know none of them. I do not know whether each of them is insistent and assiduous in his duties; that he stays on the dredge and watches the filling of the scows or whether, like Mr. Eastwood, he is half a mile or a mile away from the work. The opposition did their duty by the government and by the country and by themselves when they forced the department to have open tenders called for this work, and I think the opposition may be congratulated that they hammered the price of dredging at these two ports down from more than 25 cents a yard to 9 and 9½ cents a yard, and the country to-day on that $1,500,000 of dredging will be saving upwards of $500,000. I am not going to say anything about dredging in the other provinces. I believe the time has arrived when the department in the defence of the country's interest should see that men are appointed as inspectors direct from headquarters here, because the country is spending millions of dollars in dredging. These figures are becoming enormous. There are large dredging operations at different points and I think the time has come when some steps should be taken to safeguard the public interest in that respect.

Mr. FISHER. I think it would be a pity if I should say anything that would interfere with the hon. gentleman's self-gratulation and complacency. I am sure he will be happy after what he and the opposition have accomplished. I am glad they feel that way and I am willing to give them all credit, but I think there is a little credit to the people who do the things as well as to the people who criticise. As far as concerns the dredging inspector at Matchadash bay I knew nothing about it until it was brought to my attention the other day, and it seems that the agent acted in a way that was improper and as his returns came to the department the department had no means of knowing that they were inaccurate. I think it would be well for the department to see that there would be some check upon superintendents of that class, and that these returns are more accurate, but I confess also that I cannot quite understand that it would be very difficult indeed to force a man under all circumstances and at all times to do his duty if he wants to shirk it. We have to depend on subordinate officers all over the country for the public service. It is unfortunately the case that

occasionally—very rarely I am glad to say for the reputation of the people of Canada—but still occasionally a man does what he should not do and in this instance he seems to have made returns that were not justified by his services. I shall be very glad to recommend to the permanent Minister of Public Works that some change should be made which would as far as possible check the action of superintendents and secure that such an incident as this should not occur. It is but little satisfaction to say that the actual loss is small, but still it is a principle and a thing which might have occurred more frequently and might have occurred on occasions of which we know nothing.

With regard to the general question of dredging I am glad to say that the country is getting the dredging done there at a cheaper rate than it was before. The different Ministers of Public Works have been trying different plans and have found a plan which appears to work satisfactorily. I trust it will. My hon. friend himself says it is working satisfactorily.

Mr. BENNETT. I say that as to the price it is satisfactory; as to the other conditions I know not.

Mr. FISHER. As to the price, that is what we are talking about now; it is working satisfactorily, and we hope it will go on satisfactorily in that regard and in other respects to as great an extent as possible.

Mr. BENNETT. I omitted to mention another matter. I know nothing about Mr. Temple, politically or in any other way, but I want to call the attention of the minister to the fact that at page V—392 there is some correspondence in reference to a bill of some $1,400 that was presented for breaking ice at the harbour of Port Arthur in 1902 by the Great Lakes Dredging Company. The papers were moved for and they disclosed that the services were performed in 1902. When the bill reached the department is was cheerfully certified to as being correct, although the service had been performed in 1902. I found out that the original papers were certified to by Mr. Temple. What was the result? The Auditor General's Department called attention, as may be seen by the letter on page V—392, to the extraordinary fact that a bill was presented some four or five years after the service was performed, and the Auditor General refused to pay the bill amounting to some $1,402. After the Auditor General had called the attention of the department to the fact that they must get an order in council if it were to be paid, was the order in council got? Although it is certified to by Mr. Temple as being correct, that bill is unpaid to-day, or at least it was unpaid at that date. Has the account been paid since?

Mr. FISHER. I am told that the account has not been paid, but the matter has been settled in the line that it should be paid. The work was done about three years ago. When the bill came in, it was looked upon as being too high for the work, and the work had not been authorized. In the discussion which occurred, the bill was reduced materially to a basis which was justifiable as pay for the work performed. To the department, on investigation, the work seemed to be in the public interest, although the department at headquarters had not authorized it. The bill as eventually passed was at rates which were considered fair and just for the work actually performed, and on these grounds the department decided to pay it.

Mr. BENNETT. About what was the amount that was paid ?

Mr. FISHER. It is not paid yet ; but the amount agreed upon was $1,402.50.

Mr. BENNETT. That was the amount originally claimed ?

Mr. FISHER. No, the amount originally claimed was about one-third more, that is to say, nearly $2,000.

Mr. BENNETT. And so far the account has not been paid ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I find in this same report that this Great Lakes Dredging Company, which seems to have what in common parlance is called a pull with the department, was paid for the use of a yacht called the 'Nahma' at the rate of $100 a day for two days and at the rate of $75 a day for six months. May I ask who settled that amount of pay for that boat ? I have endeavoured to find out what style of boat she was by reference to the Canadian Register, but I find that she is not registered at all.

Mr. FISHER. That is evidently a misprint; so much per day must mean so much per month, because the total payment is $976, and if she had been employed for the time and at the rates mentioned, it would have been ten times that. I do not myself know anything about the matter, but it is evident on the face of the account that that is not correct.

Mr. SPROULE. What was she doing ?

Mr. FISHER. She was used by the inspector going about on inspection.

Mr. BENNETT. What class of boat is she at $75 a month ?

Mr. FISHER. She must have been a gasoline launch. The officers of the department do not know the boat, but at the rate she could not have been a very large one.

Mr. BENNETT. If she was a gasoline launch, the minister would have done better to have bought one.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the icebreaker, the minister said that the work had to be done and that good value had been given for the money. How did he reach that conclusion four years after the work was done, and without it being under the supervision of any one?

Mr. BENNETT. Has an application been made by the town of Midland to be reimbursed for breaking ice there last fall, and has the minister considered the application favourably ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know it myself, and the officers of the department are not aware of it.

Mr. BENNETT. Last fall the town went to the expense, and some citizens also contributed, to cut the ice in order to allow three or five grain vessels to come in. If the application has not been made, I shall advise the authorities to make it to the department.

Mr. FISHER. We will consider it.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me say another word with regard to this Bowman firm, because they seem to be followed by suspicion wherever they go. Some dredging was done by that firm at Southampton, and I was told by a reputable citizen of that town that it was not done in a creditable way, and that a large claim was made upon the government which Mr. Hyman, when he visited the place, declared to be scandalous. A considerable portion of the account was not paid. Has it been adjusted or is it still pending ?

Mr. FISHER. There is an outstanding account for dredging at Southampton, the difficulty being to determine the character of the soil removed.

Mr. SPROULE. Or whether it was removed at all or not ?

Mr. FISHER. No, not as to whether or not it was removed, but as to the character of the soil. The contractor claimed that it was hard material, while the engineers reported that it was not, and that consequently it should be paid for at a lower rate.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there was more than that. I think the contention was set up that, where the soil was soft the contractor took it out, but that when hard pan was struck he went over that, so that the bottom was very uneven and the dredging was not done.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that that is not the case.

Mr. SPROULE. I was told by a very reputable citizen there that it is the case.

I think there is a good deal more about it than that although I am not in possession of the absolute facts to warrant my repeating all I heard about it. But it left this impression on my mind that the contractor in connection with that and other transactions is well worth watching. The minister laughs. It may be a matter of levity to him but the country is spending the money and expects to get value in return. And the people will not regard it as a laughing matter that thousands of dollars have been taken out of the public treasury and nothing given in return by Mr. Bowman or his associates.

Mr. FISHER. It is the duty of all public employees to see that the work is done.

Mr. SPROULE. Sometimes that duty is not carried out. Let me give another illustration which I cited a few years ago. Dredging was going on in Owen Sound, and a man was appointed to remain on the dredge and see that the scows were properly filled. The company were allowed so many yards per scow, and a government official was put there to prevent their going out with the scow half loaded and charging the whole number of yards. Well, this man spent a large portion of his time around the hotels smoking cigars.

Mr. FISHER. He was derelict in his duty.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but although the matter was brought to the attention of the government, the same man was put on again. He was receiving $3 a day for watching what was being done, and I was told that he was absent three-quarters of the time.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to call attention to this fact that these dredging companies are composed of men not at all connected with that class of work. Take the Penetanguishene Dredging Company, what has a physician and superintendent of a provincial institution in common with dredging? He receives a high salary, upwards of $4,000, and yet he blossoms out into a contractor and has associated with him this Mr. Gendron, and Gendron's brother is in charge of the work. Naturally we suspect that everything is not altogether right. The contractors may perhaps be a little light on the price but they make good on the quantity. Take the company known as the Owen Sound Dredging Company. Who compose that company? The minister must know or his officers as there is a record in the department and a return brought down. We have a record showing a telegram from one of the owners of the dredge, Mr. McKay, a practising barrister in Ontario and a member of the late Ross government, asking who has the contract for certain dredging. Everybody knows that Mr. McKay owns that dredge or a half interest in it and that a certain member of parliament owned the other half interest. That member of parliament is no more, but the public records show that his interest in the company stood in the name of a poor school teacher in western Ontario. After the member of parliament died, his stock went in his wife's name and it is there to-day. Let me take another of these companies, the Dominion Dredge and Construction Company. They have a contract at Port Stanley or Port Colborne. Who is that company?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know and do not care.

Mr. BENNETT. But the country does. When you go down the streets of Ottawa and are told that a son of the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) is the owner of a dredge, you ask in astonishment where did that boy get it? The hon. Minister has put himself on record as saying that he does not care who owns the dredge.

Mr. FISHER. Practically.

Mr. BENNETT. The public care, the public are interested in knowing whether it is members of parliament or their sons and relatives who are interested in these companies, and who no one would suspect of owning a dredge. It has been the whole policy in Ontario to associate politicians with these dredges. Take the dredges that were owned at Owen Sound by different parties—right after the change of government these parties were practically taken by the throat and sold out their dredges for mere songs to politicians, and these politicians have the contracts ever since. I have made the statement, both in and outside the House that one of the dredges composing the fleet of the Great Lakes Dredging Company was imported by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee). He denied the statement but I dared the Minister of Customs to say that the customs returns do not show that it was imported by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) and the customs duty paid by him.

Mr. FISHER. You have to accept the statement of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee).

Mr. BENNETT. I accept his statement and accept the customs return which show that a dredge was imported by Mr. James Conmee, of Rainy River. The minister says he does not know who owns the dredges, whether members of parliament or joint stock companies. But the public care and they can readily understand why dredging was given at Port Arthur at twenty-five cents a yard without tender when now that the government have been driven to it, the work is being done at nine cents a cubic

yard. The public will draw their own conclusions when they see the Great Lakes Dredging Company put in two tenders, and then expecting to be allowed by the Minister of Public Works to withdraw the low tender and substitute a high one. As regards the appointment of inspectors at Port Arthur and Fort William, is it the member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) who recommends them ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not the slightest idea. Mr. Temple, an old engineer, has been working there and is in charge. I am lost in admiration at the hon. gentleman's ingenuity in devising ways to cheat the government. I do not know where he has learnt so well how to do that or what the result may be if the government contractors should be tempted to do the things my hon. friend has been working out so carefully and ingenuously in his fertile mind. I do not believe that the contractors would tender for government work and spend their time in inventing methods to defraud the government. I think they spend their time in their business and that they are generally honourable men who can be trusted. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that there are Conservative as well as Liberal contractors. Some of the largest contractors in the employ of this government were Conservative members of parliament. This government gives contracts to the lowest tenderers, whether Liberal or Conservative.

An hon. MEMBER. Have these men's politics changed ?

Mr. FISHER. No, they are about the same as they were. I believe that they got contracts before in the way suggested by my hon. friend. from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) as members of joint stock companies. I am not going to ask who the members of a joint stock company are. A son or nephew or aunt of a member of parliament has—yes, and even the member himself—has a right to be a member of a joint stock company having a contract with this government. I can remember when the Conservatives were in power that there were on the very government benches men who were members of companies having contracts with the government. The late Hon. Thomas White, for instance, was a member of the Montreal 'Gazette' Company which, for years had large payments from the government.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the 'Herald.'

Mr. FISHER. I do not know what about the 'Herald.' Hon. members opposite can give dozens of instances of members of this House holding stock in joint stock companies that had contracts with the government. It is not a new thing; that has been allowed under the law of the land for many years. But, of course, those who choose can cast suspicions and give out innuendoes to cause the public to believe that it is wrong for members to hold stock in such companies. But, when a contract is open to public tender there is nothing to be said even though members of this House are members of the joint stock company which gets the contract.

Mr. BENNETT. I take it that the reference made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) is to Mr. W. J. Poupore as a member of the Weddell Company.

Mr. FISHER. I did not know he was a member of that company.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Weddell and his associates in that company showed a higher estimate of the Minister of Public Works than did Mr. Bowman and his associates. They put in one honest tender and were ready to stand before or fall by it. Does the hon. minister (Mr. Fisher) want a more damning insinuation than that ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not see anything damning about it.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I have heard of people whose sense of right was stunted. The minister does not see anything wrong in a company putting in one tender in a corporate name and a member of that firm putting a tender for the same work under another name. Why, it so attracted the attention of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. J. T. Schell) that, when I spoke about the case he asked if this tender was for the same work. He, a contractor, was astounded to think that these gentlemen of the Great Lakes Dredging Company had so low an estimate of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman). The hon. gentleman has referred to Hon. Thomas White. Well, Mr. White is dead and gone. But he left a pretty good reputation behind him—I think as good as that held by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman). The statement is on record in 'Hansard' that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) was a large stock holder in the Montreal 'Herald.'

Mr. FISHER. Years ago.

Mr. BENNETT. Not many years ago—not 'when we were twenty-one,' but much later than that. And when he became a member of this government, he transferred his stock to his brother.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. All in the family. And the Montreal 'Herald' is fattening pretty well at the public crib. Here we see the difference between the two men. Hon. Thomas White said; 'No entry by back doors for me; it is my right to be a member of a joint stock company, even if that company does business with the government, and I will hold my stock.' But the

acting Minister of Public Works transferred his stock to his brother. I would like to know if any consideration was given for it and who draws the dividends.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry to say it was never worth anything.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. These references bring up the question of contracts for many years back. For many years we have had discussions on dredging and dredging contracts. We have had dredging for mud and sand at all prices from 35 cents to 9 cents, and we have had all sorts of conditions in the contracts. One point is noticeable, and that is that when this government came into power they largely inherited the methods that were in vogue under their predecessors, doing dredging by the hour or by the day, or giving closed contracts not asking for public tender. I am pleased to find the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is willing to congratulate the government for having developed the idea—and are getting better value for the country by it—of letting these works by open public tender. So far as I am concerned, I believe that is the proper way to do with all government contracts, or any other.

Mr. SPROULE. If they give a reasonable time to prepare tenders and not only three days.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I shall not go into the conditions, but I think that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) did not go into all the conditions with regard to that limited time. Speaking of the Rainy River dredging as compared with other dredging there is one point to be remembered and that is that on the Rainy River you are dredging into a heavy bank of sand, which is quite different from taking three or four feet, cutting off, as it were, the the tops of the little hillocks at the bottom of the water. In the latter case you bring up dipper after dipper with practically nothing, but in such work as the Rainy River work you are taking it out of a bank where every dipper comes up full. Two years ago the contract was let by public tender and the lowest tender price was 42 cents a foot. It was let to a Conservative because he was the lowest tenderer on that work. But it would not be fair at all to compare that 42 cents or 44 cents, the next lowest tender, with the nine cents. I am quite willing to give all the credit to the hon. member for East Simcoe. I have listened to him criticising and finding fault, and of course making all the political capital he could for his side out of these dredging contracts. That is perfectly legitimate. But there are dredging contracts and there are dredging contracts; there are conditions wherein a price of 42 cents would be the lowest price, and other conditions where a price of 9 cents, 9½, 13, 15 and 18 would be the lowest price, according to the character of the work done, and the conditions surrounding it.

Another point I wish to make is that all these contracts, if the government can at all do so, and if the contract is large enough, should be let by public competition. I consider that is the only proper way to let government contracts. As to the ownership of dredges, time and again in the last few weeks parties have come to me who wished me to join in dredging contracts, and I have invariably told them that I did not understand that business. You need a man who understands the business to run a dredge. When you take the Weddell concern and a good many of these dredging concerns who furnish the money, if they get a good dredge runner they will succeed. It all depends on the man who is running that dredge, and if the owner of the dredge, or the man who furnishes the money, gets a good dredge runner, a man of character and ability to handle the dredge, he will make a success of it. I can name you numbers of men who would be willing to go behind me if I had the money, I have had a number of offers of that kind myself, and I daresay others have too; but I do not care to go into anything relating to government contracts as long as I sit in this House, and I do not intend to.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to ask my hon. friend one question, as I believe he is a fair man and will give an honest answer. To use a mild term, does he not think that the two tenders of A. F. Bowman and the Great Lakes Dredging Company, are rather foxy?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I would not give an opinion on a matter of that kind until I understood all about the conditions. I would want to understand thoroughly all these matters before giving an opinion as to prices. There is one point the hon. gentleman has overlooked, that is that when a contract is let it is let at 9 cents; it makes no difference if all the individual members of that concern put in their tenders at 18 or 80 cents, it is the 9 cent price that prevails. But the point I wish to make is that in public tendering, in public contract letting, it makes no difference whether each one of the individual members of that firm puts in a different price so long as the tender is public and the contract is public, it has to go at the lowest price. If there is any departure from that rule the minister is amenable; and I am not prepared to say that the oath of office of a minister of a government in this country is to be lightly called in question. But I would be calling it in question if I took these figures and these alleged facts as being absolutely true.

Red river—improvements at St. Andrew's rapids, $200,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Would the minister explain the position of the work at the present time ?

Mr. FISHER. The work is under contract, and it is progressing. It is expected that this $200,000 will be expended during the coming year.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. How much has been spent during the past year ?

Mr. FISHER. This is a new contract which was only let last fall. The old contractor failed and the contract was cancelled.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The character of the work was changed too, was it not ?

Mr. FISHER. Not materially. The contractor was not making proper progress with the work and the contract was taken out of his hands. When the work was taken out of his hands a radical change was made in the plans.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who has the present contract ?

Mr. FISHER. Quinlan & Robertson

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Owing to the lateness of the hour I will not discuss this question further. But had the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) been in his place I would like to have asked that gentleman for a little information. In 1904 he promised his electors that if certain progress was not made in connection with that work by a certain time, he would resign his seat. But the progress has not been made and he still keeps his seat.

Transportation facilities—Georgian bay to Montreal—survey for waterway via French and Ottawa rivers, including payments authorized notwithstanding the Civil Service Act, $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will there be anything in the supplementary estimates ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, there will be a small item in the supplementaries and you can then discuss this question.

Montreal harbour (lower division)—improvements below St. Mary's current, $75,000.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would like to say a few words with respect to the building of wharfage facilities at St. Helen's island. As every one knows St. Helen's island is situated just opposite the city of Montreal on the south eastern side of the deepest channel of the river. By virtue of several Acts of the provincial legislature this island has been annexed to the territory of the city of Montreal. The island, which should form part of the county of Chambly, has been declared to be part of the city of Montreal. The whole administration of the island has been given to the corporation of the city of Montreal.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not Montreal own it now ?

Mr. GERVAIS. Later on, as far as I can see, the corporation of the city of Montreal will become the owner in fee simple of St. Helen's island. For the last thirty years the city of Montreal has been in possession of the island under a leasehold granted by the government to the corporation. There is some talk of a sale in fee simple of the island to the corporation by the government of Canada ; but at this date that sale is not completed. In the meantime, whether it is completed or not, under any circumstances, wharfage facilities should be given to the people of Montreal who have to go over to that island. During the hot season of the summer on many days over 30,000 people have to land on St. Helen's island.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Where do they land if there is no wharf ?

Mr. GERVAIS. There are some temporary but inadéquate wharf facilities.

Mr. DANIEL. Do they land from ferries ?

Mr. GERVAIS. Ferries, row boats and steamers plying between Montreal and St. Helen's island. As a matter of fact, for the last twenty years St. Helen's island has been used by the city of Montreal as a public park. It is now proposed that the city of Montreal should buy the island from the government of Canada; but in the meantime, for the benefit of the people of Montreal, proper and permanent wharfage facilities should be established on St. Helen's island.

Mr. DANIEL. Why do they not build the wharf ?

Mr. GERVAIS. They are no more bound to do it than quite a number of fishing villages which have been granted any kind of wharf accommodation. That is why I am bringing this matter to the notice of parliament.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes, it is for the general advantage of Canada. If you have good healthy people in the city of Montreal it will redound to the benefit of the people of Canada. If you have good healthy citizens in the city of Montreal the Dominion of Canada will be all right. I may say also that most of the people who have to cross over to the island are people without any great means, are mostly women and children and something should be done to accommodate the 30,000 people who land on that island. Sometimes during the hot season many more thousands of people land on the island of St. Helen than are coming on the Montreal island by water. I may add also that the request for the building of a permanent wharf at St. Helen's island was presented to the Hon. Mr. Hyman last

summer. This request was made on behalf of the city of Montreal through its committee on parks and ferries. The Hon. Mr. Hyman ordered his district engineer, Mr. Michaud, to make a report upon the proposed work. The total expenditure was estimated by Mr. Michaud at the sum of $7,000, I am informed. I do not know why there is no amount in the estimates for the construction of a work of such great utility. I would like to be informed by the minister why he has thought fit to disregard the request of the council of the city of Montreal, as well as the request of all the citizens of Montreal? I may add also that I do not understand why such a small expenditure should be refused to the city of Montreal when thousands and thousands of dollars are spent freely right and left from one end of the province of Quebec to the other and also in some other provinces. The people of Montreal need a wharf at St. Helen's island and anybody who is aware of their needs will say that I am right.

Mr. FISHER. This vote does not contemplate the erection of such a wharf as that. This vote is only for the commercial wharf down below St. Mary's current.

Mr. GERVAIS. I know, but I may say, as has been the case for several years past, we never know when an item is coming up. One item is called to-night and another tomorrow morning, and it is quite a task at the end of the session to know how we can ventilate the grievances of the people we represent. I have a chance to-night and I do wish to put before this House the wish, the request, the demand of the people of Montreal.

Port Colborne—harbour improvements, $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will there be an item in the supplementaries ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, for next year.

Mr. GERVAIS. Before the House adjourns I would like the minister to say if there will be an item put in for the construction of a wharf on St. Helen's island ?

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid I cannot gratify my hon. friend's curiosity as to items in the supplementary estimates which are not yet before the House.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue in supply with the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. SPROULE. Until they are disposed of ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and after that we would like to be free to take up general business, chiefly in supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. Saturday.

INDEX

THIRD SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1906-7.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Conside ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques. Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adamson, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4754 (iii).

Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3491 (ii).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Bay of Quinte Lights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 1303, 1624 (i).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 670 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4749 (iii).

Election Frauds and Corruption, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6866 (iv).

Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. of Sup., 7645 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2802 (ii).

Interior (timber inspector) 7294 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5872 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Fernie) 4042 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Belleville) 4018; (Guelph Armoury) 4020; (Hamilton post office) 4022; (London P.O.) 4022; (North Bay) 4023; (St. Mary's) 4026 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Que. (St. John's military) 4015 (iii).

Supreme Court Judges (salaries) in Sask. and Alberta B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7443 (iv).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

Tariff—Dumping Clause (cream separators) 1196 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5700 (iii).

Ames, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Athabaska Fish Co., Reps. Cor. Leases, Rentals, &c., with Dom. Govt. (M. for copies*) 1066 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3844 (ii), 5864 (iii), 6259 (iv).

Aylmer, Mr. F. W., Apptmt. as Engineer, and Resignation, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 580 (i). *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.

Brick, T. A., Employment by Govt. *re* Census in Alberta (Ques.) 1135 (i).

Brown, Bedingfield, et al., Grazing Leases, O.Cs., Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 1149

Calcium Carbide, Purchase from Ottawa Carbide Co., Rates, Freight, &c., (Ques.) 720

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. 4557 (iii).

Coal Supplies for Sorel, Form of Tenders, Procedure, &c. (Ques.) 721 (i).

Deep Sea Missions, Dr. Grenfell's Stations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5882 (iii).

Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6034 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4678 (iii).

Doukhobor Colonies, Rep. of Mr. C. W. Speers *re* inspection of (M. for copy*) 2146 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Fishing Privileges, North Saskatchewan Lakes, Concessions granted (Ques.) 1394 (i).
Galena Oil Co., Contracts *re* Oil Supplies to Govt. Rys. (M. for cor.*) 1149 (i).
Galway Horse and Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by H. P. Brown, &c., O.Cs., Leases and Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).
See 'Brown,' 'Grazing.'
Grand Forks Cattle Co., Lands withdrawn for Watering of Stock, O.C. &c. (Ques.) 949 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Guarantee Bonds, Total Amount (Ques.) 3635 (ii).
——— Investigations *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com. 5094 (iii).
——— Surveys, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1394 (i).
——— Western Division, Amounts expended, Verification of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— Western Div., Cost of Construction, Guarantee Bonds, Reps. *re* (Ques.) 3634 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Clause *re* 15 per cent overdue Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1557 (i).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3476 (ii).
Grazing Lease granted to J. R. Craig, Date of, Transference, &c., (Ques.) 1806 (i).
Grazing Leases granted to J. D. McGregor and A. E. Hitchcock, Transfer to the Grand Forks Cattle Co., O.C.'s, Agreements, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).
Grazing Leases granted by Govt. of Twps. 32, 33, &c. (Ques.) 484 (i).
Grazing Leases, Sask., Original Applicants, Transfers, &c. (Ques.) 1061 (i).
Homestead Entry of Township 51, Alberta, Action *re* Application for (Ques.) 1137 (i).
Homesteads unpatented in Alameda, Battleford, &c., Inspection *re* (M. for ret.*) 2146 (ii).
I.C.R., Cars used in U.S., Return of, &c. (Ques.) 7007, 7248 (iv).
——— Freight Rates, Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Levis, &c. (M. for ret.) 728 (i).
——— Moncton Lands acquired by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3885 (ii).
——— *See* 'Moncton.'
——— Passenger Tariffs, Standard, from Truro, Moncton and Levis (M. for ret.) 729 (i).
——— Passenger Tariff in 1904, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1118 (i).
——— Rolling Stock, Number in use in U.S. (Ques.) 7007, 7248 (iv).
——— Scrap Iron sold to H. J. Garson, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Scrap Metal at Moncton Fire, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).
Irrigation Applications, Assignments, &c. (Ques.) 1806 (i).
Lord's Day Act, Prohibition of Cut Flowers, &c. (Ques.) 4611 (iii).
Manitoba Public Works, Dredging, &c., Resignation of Hon. Mr. Aylmer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iv).
Marconi Establishment at Clarke City (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5875 (iii).
Marine Medical Inspector at Canso, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 482 (i).
Milk River Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by C. E. Hall, &c., O.Cs., Leases and Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).
Moncton Car Shops, Location, Equipment, &c. (M. for reps.*) 1148 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry., Tracks on Mill St., Montreal (Ques.) 7984 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7086 (iv).
Montreal Military School Site, Location, &c. (Ques.) 1799 (i).
National Art Gallery, Committee of Artists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iv).
New Brunswick Supply Co., Purchase from by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 1052 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Application of C.P.R. for same Lands (Ques.) 1061, 1138 (i).
——— Application for Lands, &c., Documents, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).
——— Application of E. H. Cuthbertson, and Guy T. Robbins, Action taken by Govt. (Ques.) 482 (i).
——— Application *re* Water Rights, Plans filed (Ques.) 1060 (i).
——— Constitution and Incorporation of (Ques.) 1060, 1139 (i).
——— Date of Authorization (Ques.) 1060 (i).
——— J. Stewart's Rep. *re* Character of Land, &c. (Ques.) 2143 (ii).
——— Plans, Open for Examination, &c. (Ques.) 1137 (i).
——— *See* 'Southern Alberta,' &c.
Rougemont, Senatorial District, Cor. *re* Appmnt. (M. for copies*) 6010 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor., 7011, 7518 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co. and Section 2, of Twp. 25, Entry, &c. (Ques.) 485 (i).
Saunders, Mr. B. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 482 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co.'s and Robbins Irrigation Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2539 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Fisheries (hatcheries) 5903 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 5871; (Marconi stations), 5875; (salaries) 5866; (submarine signals 5873 (iii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Marine Hospitals (distressed seaman) 5882 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson Lake) 6996; (Columbia River) 6996; (Coquitlam) 6996; (Fraser River) 6997; (Victoria harbour) 6997; (Williams Head quarantine station) 6999 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (dredge 'Eastman') 6995; (dredging) 6992 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6017; (Baddeck wharf) 6019; (Bay St. Lawrence) 6020; (Big Lorraine) 6020; (Church's Point) 6021; (Cow Bay) 6022; (Eskasoni wharf) 6029; (Glace Bay 6034; (Grand Etang) 6038; (Jersey cove) 6048; (Moose breakwater) 6052; (Phinney's Cove) 6057; (Porter's Lake) 6057; (Scotch Cove) 6066; (Tatamagouche wharf) 6066; (Yarmouth) 6069 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Little Current) 6958 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse du Cap) 6092; (Barachois de Malbaie) 6093; (Bic) 6094; (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Father Point) 6099; (Grosse Isle wharf) 6109; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6111; (Percé wharf) 6115 (iv); (Quebec harbour) 5980 (iii); (Rimouski) 6120; (Rivière aux Renards) 6121; (Rivière Batiscan) 6121; (St. Fulgence) 6132; (St. Anne des Monts) 6128 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Ste. Rosalie) 7522 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 5878 (iii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (cotton fabrics) 2365 (ii); (intermediate Tariff) 556 (i); (military stores, &c.) 2408 (ii); (pickles, &c.) 1887 (i); (settlers' effects) 2407 (ii); (sugar) 4157 (iii); (trunks, &c.) 2405 (ii).
Timber Lands, sold or leased, subsequent to 1906, Description, Area, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4458 (iii).
Townships 10, 11, 12 and 13, Topographical Surveys, &c., Reps. (M. for copies*) 1066 (i).
Transportation Commission's Recommendations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Walberg, E. A. Contracts *re* Govt. Rys. (Ques.) 1051 (i).

Archambault, Mr. J. E., *Berthier.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (post office) 2802 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6267 (iv).
Canada-United States Boundary Surveys, Extent, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1610 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 809; in Com., 1617 (i), 2011 (ii).
Census Forms for Manufacturing, Distribution and Completion, of (Ques.) 4217 (iii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Cheese hauling to Curing Rooms, Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 4211 (iii).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7140 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses Bill, on M. for Com. on Res. (remarks) 522 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2433; in Com., 2465 (ii).
Cold Storage and Cool Curing Plants, Disposal of by Govt. (Ques.) 710 (i).
Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5138 (iii).
Curry, Mr S. G. Payments to as Architect (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Cutlery and Foreign Goods, Surtax and British Preference, Par. in 'Citizen,' 4842 (iii).
Dayley, Dr. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Rep., &c. (Ques.) 1988 (ii).
Eastern Townships Counties, Public Works, Expenditures *re* (M. for ret.*) 2838 (ii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7033 (iv).
Exports from Canadian Ports, Total Value for 1906 (Ques.) 3883 (ii).
German and Canadian Tariffs, Cor. between Govt. of Can. and German or British Govts. (M. for cor.) 1149 (i).
——— Cor. with J. B. Jackson, Inquiry for, 5863 (iii).
German Maximum Tariff, Fiscal Relations, &c. (Ques.) 1128 (i).
Govt. Deposits in Banks in each month of 1906 (M. for ret.*) 4458 (iii).
——— Total Amount, Interest *re*, &c. (Ques.) 4211 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7401 (iv).
Immigration Agents in Germany, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1988 (ii).
Indian Agents, and Teachers, Average Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3629 (ii).
Indian Lands, Sales or Leases, Number of Acres, &c. (M. for ret.) 492 (i).
Indian Dept., Inquiry for Rets., 1699 (i), 2415 (ii).
Indian Lands, Total Acres sold, &c. (Ques.) 2835, 2980 (ii).
Indian Schools at Fort Alexander, &c., Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4209 (iii).
Indian Schools, Qualifications of Teachers, &c. (Ques.) 2582 (ii).
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6781 (iv).
Mines Dept. Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7190, 7214 (iv).
Montreal Port, Inspectors of Perishable Products, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1989 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3892 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Postal Express, Legislation, Ref. to in Speech on Address, &c. (Ques.) 613 (i).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) 7026 (iv).
Poultry Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Discontinuation of Stations (Ques.) 1139 (i).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. for Sup., 6640 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Bill.'
Public Buildings in Ont., Total Cost, and Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 1387 (i).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7234 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4119 (iii).
Revised Statutes (Schedule 'A') Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 6766, 6769 (iv).
Rubenstein Bros., Contracts *re* Furnishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3588 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery between Can and U.S., Cor. Reps, &c. (M. for copies*) 2840 (ii).
St. Clair River Dredging, Amounts expended (Ques.) 1927 (i).
Seeds Branch of Dept of Agriculture, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1139 (i).
Seedsmen, Reports from Govt., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1140 (i).
Stockton, Mr. A. A., Decease of (remarks) 4758 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3302, 3326, 3367, 3861 (ii). on M. for 3°, (amt.) 5010; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 105) 5011 (iii).
Sugar imported, Names of Countries, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 568 (i).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands—(surveys) 7257 (iv).
Excise—(tobacco stamps) 7297 (iv).
Geological Survey (gas borings, &c.) 3159; (maps, &c.) 3163; (Nicolas, F., salary) 3163; (salaries) 3159; (specimens) 3166 (ii).
Indians—N.S. (superintendent) 7294 (iv).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 7281 (iv).
Interior—Miscellaneous (maps, &c.) 7276 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 3149 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Vancouver) 4042 (iii).
Public Works— Buildings—Generally (salaries, &c.) 4043 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville) 4018; (Brockville) 4020; (Hamilton drill hall) 4021; (London P.O.) 4022; (Toronto customs) 4028; (Toronto drill hall) 4034 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (alterations, &c.) 3608; (furniture, &c.) 3588; (Museum) 3616; (Royal mint) 3603 (ii); (steel shelves) 4024 (iii); (Sussex St. property) 3952, 3617 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration) 4009 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Medicine Hat) 4039; (Regina P.O.) 4040; (Saskatoon) 4041 (iii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6940; (Goderich) 6953; (Point Edward) 6964; (Port Stanley) 6978; (Thames river) 6983 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means—(animals) in Com., 1258; (berries) 1900; dumping clause) 1009 (i); (florist stock) 4148 (iii); intermediate and German treaties) 861 (i); (seeds, &c.) 4146 (iii); (tomatoes) 1876; (vegetables) 1883 (i).

Avery, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2777 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia River) 6966; Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 6094 (iv).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice), *North York, Ont.*
Allegash River, Diversion of Water (Ans.) 6635 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounty B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 7986 (iv).
Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6603 (iv).
B.C. Appellate Court, Representations from Provincial Govt. (remarks) 4946 (iii).
B.C. County Court Judges (salaries) prop. res. withdwn. 3841 (ii).
B.C. Judgeships, Alleged Sale of, Reps. in Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 718 (i).
——— (remarks) 580 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 108) 1°*, 4209 2°* and in Com., 4656 (iii).
——— (B. 175) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
C.P.R. Lands Taxation, Appeals to Privy Council (Ans.) 3368 (ii), 4666 (iii).
Carroll, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4859 (iii).
Charbonneau, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4859 (iii).
Clements, Judge, Promotion to Supreme Court, B.C. (Ans.) 1057 (i).
Cooke, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re* (Ans.) 4859 (iii).
Criminal Code (public works) Amt. (B. 136) 1°*, 5023 (iii); 2°* and in Com., 7187 (iv).
Criminal Code (unorganized ters.) Amt. (B. 145) 1° m., 5777 (iii); (M.) to ref. back to Com., 7014; in Com., 7015 (iv).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 1119 (i).
Dullman, Nolan and Walsh, Convicts in Kingston Penitentiary, Clemency to (Ans.) 2578 (ii).
Election Act Amts., on Inquiry for (Mr. Borden) 2638 (ii).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Electric Power Export (B. 60) 1° m., 1293 (i); in Com., 2229, 2237 (ii); 4616; Mr. Whitney's letter (read) 4654; on M. for 3°, 4669, 4946; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4949; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 4954; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 4961 (iii); on Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).
Exchequer Court, Apptmnt. of French Judge (Ans.) 3185 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (registrar's salary) Amt. (B. 170) prop. res., 6257; in Com. on Res., 7255; 1°*, 7257 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. (wages) Amt. (B. 86) 1° m., 2137; in Com., 2479 (ii).
G.T.P. Land Grant in B.C. Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2102 (ii).
G.T.R. Car Ferry: *See* 'Port Hope,' &c.
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7325 (iv).
Henderson, Judge, Resignation of (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Pension Claims, Ref. to Justice Dept (Ans.) 1141 (i).
——— Claims *re* Compensation (Ans.) 6012 (iv).
Hutchinson, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4860 (iii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Rep. of Com. on Privs., &c., (remarks) on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4762 (iii).
I.C.Ry., Accidents, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3417 (ii).
I.C.R. and G.T.R., Agreement Act Amt. (B. 50) 1° m., 1120 (i); in Com., 2476 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Rep. *re*, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6311 (iv).
——— on Charges (Mr. M. Martin) Ques. of Order *re* Statement (Mr. Fowler) 6400 (iv).
——— (personal explanation) in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Cor. between Min. of Justice and Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
——— Inquiry for further Cor. not in Ret., on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2346 (ii).
——— Evidence *re*, Printing and Distribution of (remarks) 2906 (ii).
——— French Translation (remarks) 7985 (iv).
——— Mr. Shepley's Retainer (Ans.) 3632, 3639 (ii).
——— Total Amounts paid, Information furnished to Min. of Jus., &c. (Ans.) 4215 (iii).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 4664; 2° m. and in Com., 5016 (iii).
Judges' Salaries, Man. and B.C. (B. 177) in Com. on Res., 7781 (iv).
Judges, acting as Directors on Boards of Stock Cos. (Ans.) 2144 (ii).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Judges, Provincial, on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 3461 (ii).
Judges, Retired, Practising, Govtl. Action *re* (Ans.) 3370 (ii).
Judges in Review, Selection of, &c. (Ans.) 4853 (iii).
Judges, superannuated and retired, in Quebec Prov., &c. (Ans.) 3640 (ii).
Judges of Superior Court, Quebec, Number on Leave of Absence (Ans.) 2978 (ii).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 2209 (ii).
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4128 (iii).
Lemieux, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4860 (iii).
Lloyd, T. H., Imprisonment of, &c. (Ans.) 2983 (ii).
London Election Investigation, Govtl. Assistance (Ans.) 225 (i).
Lord's Day Act, Prohibition of Cut Flowers, &c. (Ans.) 4611 (iii).
——— Prohibition of Sunday School Papers (Ans.) 5024 (iii).
MacIlreith, R. T., Payments to for Legal Services (Ans.) 2144, 2292 (ii).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments (remarks) in Com. on Judges B., 7784 (iv).
——— (Ans.) 885, 1927 (i).
Man. and B.C. Judges Salaries (B. 177) prop. res., 5781 (iii); 1°*, 7792; on Amt. (Mr. Taylor) 7792 (iv).
Manitoba King's Bench, Apptmt. of Mr. Henderson (Ans.) 4858 (iii).
Marriages (minors) Invalid (B. 176) 1° m., 7696; in Com., 7841 (iv).
Northwest Territories Act (commissioner's powers) Amt. (B. 76) 1° m., 1796 (i); in Com., 2478 (ii).
N.S. Bench, Apptmnts, to (remarks) 7009 (iv).
——— Chief Justiceship, Resignation of (remarks) 5509 (iii).
——— Vacancy, Apptmnt. of D. C. Fraser as Lt. Governor, &c. (Ans.) 235 (i).
See 'Supreme.'
Orders-in-Council, Consolidation of (remarks) 4946 (iii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Superannuation of, Health of, &c. (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
Paradis, Judge, Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 4858 (iii).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2829 (ii).
Penitentiaries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1292 (i).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Port Hope and Charlotte Car Ferry, on M. for Sup., 7601 (iv).
Probationary System and Indeterminate Sentences, Observations of Mr. Justice MacMahon (remarks) 3842 (ii).
Provincial Rights : *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act, from Senate, on prop. res (Mr. Fielding) 7714; in Com. on Res., 7754 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Deptl. Documents (explanation) 2999 (ii).
Quebec County Election and Speech of Mr. Aylesworth at Wiarton (Ans.) 471 (i).
Quibell, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 2832 (ii).
Ry. Act (mortgages) Amt. (B. 75) 1° m., 1794 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 7410 (iv).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale B., Change in Rev. Statutes (remarks) 7309 (iv).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2161 (ii).
Revised Statutes of Canada (B. 19) 1°*, 945; 2° m. and in Com., 1502; 3° m., 1543; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to M. for 3°, 1544 (i).
Revised Statutes, Copy laid on Table, 1470 (i).
——— Copies sent to Firms, Corporations, &c., in advance (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
——— Distribution to Libraries, &c. in P.E.I. (Ans.) 2138 (ii).
——— Distribution to Members (Ans.) 481 (i).
——— Distribution of, &c. (remarks) 1614 (i).
——— List of those to whom distribution is made (Ans.) 1801 (i).
——— French Edition, Delay in Distribution (Ans.) 2577 (ii).
——— Translation into French, Delay, &c. (Ans.) 3183 (ii).
——— Typographical Errors, &c. (Ans.) 5288 (iii).
Rochon, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re* (Ans.) 4860 (iii).
Routhier, Mr. Justice, Retirement of, &c. (Ans.) 4856 (iii).
St. John River Sewerage, Pollution at Fredericton (Ans.) 6017 (iv).
St. Louis, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3639 (ii).
Simcoe County Judge, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 3638 (ii).
Statutes, Revised (Schedule A) Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 5883; 2°*, and in Com., 5884 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 7689 (iv).
Dom. Police (salaries) 6762 (iv).
Justice, Administration of—Supreme Court (Library) 7693; Yukon (judges' living allowance) 7968 (iv).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6311; (litigated matters, Dom. and Provs.) 7972; (Revised Statutes) 7972; (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
Penitentiaries—Generally (maintenance, &c.) 7971 (iv).
Saskatchewan Supreme Court Judges, Salaries (prop. res.) 6377 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Statute Law Amt. (B. 146) 1°*, 5778 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7440; in Com. on Bill, 7442, 7578; 3° m. 7578 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.B., Apptmnt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 6766 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy *re* (Ans.) 2982 (ii).
——— Rep. from Chief Justice *re* (remarks) 2998 (ii).
——— Cor. read on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3922 (ii).
See 'N.S.'
Supreme Court, Apptmnt. of Judge from Quebec (Ans.) 2978 (ii).
Tariff—Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1233 (i).
Tellier, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 4861 (iii), 6636 (iv).
Winding Up Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 5778 (iii); in Com., 7019 (iv).

Barker, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
Address, The, 161 (i).
Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6609 (iv).
Boots and Shoes' and Tanners' Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4563 4586 (iii).
Cigarettes, Sale and Manufacture, Prohibition, on Amt. (Mr. Johnston) to prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4086, (amt.) 4087 (iii).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Election Oaths, Form, &c., London Election Trial, on M. for Sup., 7872 (iv).
——— Form of, Further Issue of, &c. (remarks) 7933 (iv).
Govt. Railways, Chief Accountant, Apptmt., Duties, &c. (Ques.) 722 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Commissioners Rep., Delay in Presenting (Ques.) 1045 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Payments on Construction (amt.) to 6th Rep. of Public Accounts Com., 5027 (iii).
——— Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret., &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3136 (ii).
I.C.R., Galena Oil Co., Purchase of Oil by Govt. (Ques.) 712 (i).
——— McDougall, Mr. Bruce, Emplymt. by Govt., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 711 (i).

Barker, Mr. S.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Officials, Alleged Misconduct, Rep. *re* Investigation, &c. (M. for copies) 725 (i).
——— Pass issued to Sir Wm. Mulock, Use of by Strangers (Ques.) 712 (i).
——— Payments to Geo. Cochrane *re* Supplies (Ques.) 725 (i).
——— Purchase of Property in Halifax, O.C. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
——— Reps. and Complaints *re* Coal Supply (Ques.) 1810 (i).
——— Round House and Machine Shops at Halifax, Purchase of Property, &c., O.C. Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
London Elections and East Elgin and N. Bruce Elections, Form of Writs, &c., issued (M. for copies*) 803 (i).
London Election Trial, Form of Oaths, &c., on M. for Sup., 7872 (iv).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7217 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims and Amounts paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 1071 (i).
——— Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5849 (iii).
N.B. Petroleum Co. and Memramcoook and Dover Oil Cos., Quantities purchased and prices paid by Govt. (M. for rets.*) 802 (i).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7205 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Addresss to His Maj., *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act, from Senate, in Com. on Res., 7763 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., 6th Rep., G.T.P. Payments (M.) to consider, 4771; on M. to conc., 5027 (iii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7414 (iv).
Record Foundry Co. Scrap Iron, &c., purchased from I.C.R., Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3337, 3857 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Geological Survey (Nicolas, F., salary) 3165 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Broad Cove Mines) 6043; (Glace Bay) 6033; (Inverness Mines) 6043; (Middle Country) 6051; (Petite Rivière) 6056 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich) 6953; (Hamilton) 6954 (iv).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4360 (iii).
Winnipeg Terminals, C.N. and G.T.P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5519 (iii).

Barr, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr Templeman) in Com., 6266 (iv).
Canned Food Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 838; in Com., 1318, 1629 (i), 2011 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, &c., Prohibition, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4079; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4084 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2432 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4805, 4869 (iii).
Dom. Lands Bill, Legislation this Session (remarks) 5864 (iii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7032 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2252 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 157 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7352 (iv).
Immigration, Employment of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 4861 (iii).
Immigration from Ont., Statement of Mr. Southworth, 4662 (iii).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2950 (ii).
McCracken and McCann, Messrs., Application for Lands in Sask., Papers, &c. *re* (M. for copies) 578 (i).
Meaford Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5895 (iii).
Mines Dept., Esablishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7196 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims, Amounts paid, &c., by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) 1071 (i).
Orangeville P.O., Vacancy *re* (Ques.) 7249 (iv).
Patrick, J. A. M., Emplymt. by Govt (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— (remarks) 576 (i).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase in Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3207 (ii).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3692 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3981 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt (Post office) 2788 (ii); (contingencies) 6622 (iv).
Fisheries (fish breeding) 5892 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6711; (agents, Ont.) 6716 (iv).
Labour Dept. (printing, &c.) 6618 (iv).

Barr, Mr. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Post Office (mail service) 3156 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 4021 (iii); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 3597 (ii).
Tariff—in Com. of Ways and Means (biscuits) 1865; (cheese) 1351; (condensed milk) 1361 (i); (drugs) 2116 (ii); (dumping clause, cream separators) 1195; (dumping clause) 1001; (farm products) 1276; (hay) 1867; (indian corn) 1364 (i); (marble) 2125 (ii); (sago, &c.) 1865 (i); (settlers' effects) 2408; (wire fencing) 2133; (wool) 2380 (ii).
Ventilation in Chamber of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3606 (ii).

Beauparlant, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Cheese Arbitrations, Apptmnt. of Officials at Montreal, &c. (Ques.) 1612.
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2416 (ii).
Debates of the House, Delay in French Edition (remarks) 3543 (ii).
I.C. Ry., Midnight Train between Montreal and Levis (Ques.) 3180 (ii).
Judges in Review, Selection of, &c. (Ques.) 4853 (iii).
St. Charles Post Office, Compensation to Postmistress *re* Fire Loss (Ques.) 1612 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3057 (ii).
Tariff—Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2364 (ii).
Tellier, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4853, 4860 (iii), 6635 (iv).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3083 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of, Apptmnt. of Successor (remarks) 6009 (iv).
Baxter Island No. 136, Sale to L. E. Embrace (Ques.) 2833 (ii).
Bone Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 2983 (ii).
Coboconk and Gull River Waterway, Construction of a canal, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 497 (i).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 2143 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Production of Papers at Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 3000 (ii).
——— Ref. to in debate on North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5843 (iii).
Dom. Lands Amt. B. 21 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 4788, 4809 (iii).
Draper, P. M., Emplymt by Govt. (Ques.) 7247 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Dugas Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7282 (iv).
Eclipse Furniture Co., Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7033 (iv).
Erie, Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto 'News' *re* Committee, 6910 (iv).
Fishery Commission, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 723 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to W. S. Pratt of Little Beausoleil Island (Ques.) 2833 (ii).
——— Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
See 'Baxter,' &c.
Gowan, Sir James, Resignation at Senator (remarks) 3626 (ii).
Grain received at Montreal from Lake Ports, Qnantity, &c. (Ques.) 570, 1946 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5077, 5086 (iii).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 3° (amt.) 4801, (amt.) agreed to, 4844 (iii).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Claims *re* &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3591 (ii).
——— Expenditure at Port Arthur and Fort William (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7404 (iv).
Henderson, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3640 (ii).
Henderson, Mr. J. B., Apptmnt. as Immigration Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
Hope Island Lighthouse Reserve, Sale of Timber, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 490 (i).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter of Resignation, &c. (remarks) 3108 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Members, on M. (Mr. Bourassa) to Ways and Means, 4382 (iii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5499 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7446 (iv).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse, 2212 (ii).
Library Bureau Headquarters, &c. (Ques.) 3837 (ii).
Little Beausoleil Island, Georgian Bay, Application *re* Transfer to D. S. Pratt (Ques.) 2984 (ii).
Marieville Post Office Building, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Expenditures *re* Govt. Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5961 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 111 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7067 (iv).

Nipissing Indian Reserve, Application for Water Power, &c. (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

——— Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 2832 (ii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5839 (iii).

Northwest Land Deals, Charges *re*, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 3430 (ii).

Office Specialty Company, Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).

Otonabee River Water Power, Leasing of, &c. (Ques.) 4612 (iii).

Penetanguishene Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5995 (iii).

Pig Iron imported from U.S., Names of Ports of Entry (Ques.) 708 (i).

Porch in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4604 (iii).

Port Colborne Grain Elevator, Contract, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 483 (i).

Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Post Office Bill, 7023 (iv).

Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7102 (iv).

Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Bill.'

Senators, New, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 1473 (i).

Sparks Estate, Settlement *re* Ry. Terminals (Ques.) 710 (i).

Spohn. Dr., Apptmnt. to Senate, Promise *re* (remarks) 4659 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2959 (ii).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 7534; (surveys, &c.) 7531; (tow boat) 7534 (iv).

Canals—Quebec (cement) 5551 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 7531; (Port Maitland wall) 7533 (iv).

Civil Govt—Labour Dept., 2958 (ii); (Acland, F. A.) 6619; (McNiven, J. A.) 6619 (iv); (Post Office) 2781 (ii).

Excise (wood alcohol) 6626 (iv).

Fisheries (fishery commissions) 5941, 5971; (fish transportation) 5932; (legal expenses) 5970; (protection service) 5961 (iii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 6711 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (Babines) 7293 (iv).

Indians—N.S. (superintendent) 7293 (iv).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (agents) 7284; (Giant's Tomb) 7288; (medical attendance) 7279; (Treaty No. 9, gratuities) 7290; (Oka settlement) 7292 (iv).

Interior—Miscellaneous (Banff sewerage) 7279; (timber inspector) 7294 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept (Gazette) 3580 (ii); (Pere Marquette Ry. litigation) 6620 (iv).

Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6366 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 4599; (Neepawa) 4599; (Selkirk) 4600; (Winnipeg P.O.) 4601 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 3973; (Inverness) 3974; (Shelburne) 3974; (Westville) 3974 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 4609 (iii); (furniture, &c.) 3590; H. of C. addition) 3614 (ii); (maintenance) 4603 (iii); (Museum) 3616; (Obesrvatory) 3581; (Rideau Hall improvements) 3615; (Supreme Court) 3625; (Sussex St. property) 3617, 3954 (ii); (telephones) 4609 (iii); (tower investigation) 3616 (ii).

Pubic Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, &c., 4605 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck wharf) 6019; (Digby) 6027; (Parrsboro) 6054; (Port Hastings) 6058; (West Head wharf) 6067; (Yarmouth) 6067

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 6932; (Blanche River) 6933; (Collingwood) 6933; (Goderich) 6951 (iv); (ice breakers) 5994 (iii); (Little Current) 6955; (Midland) 6963; (Point Edward) 6964 (iv); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5984 (iii); (Port Burwell) 6966 (iv); (Port Colborne) 6004 (iii); (Port Stanley) 6968 (iv).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay) 6001 (iii).

Railways, I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 7523; (drawbars) 7307; (facilities) 7521; (Mulgrave) 7297; (Newcastle) 7300; (Truro) 7300 (iv).

Yukon (council grant) 7278 (iv).

Supreme Court Judges (salaries) in Sask. and Alberta B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7442 (iv).

Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S., Cor. *re*, &c. read on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3945 (ii).

Sussex St. Buildings, Architect's Plans, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (animals, &c., 1254; (dumping clause) 1020; (farm products) in Com., 1271 (i); (vessels, &c.) 2389 (ii).

Timber or Lumber Importations free of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 570 (i).

Transportation Commission's Rep., Consdn. of, &c. (prop. res.) 1564 (i); Debate resumed, 3698 (ii), 4092 (iii).

Trent Canal, Lake Simcoe Section, Ref. to, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Waterways, 497 (i).

——— Rice Lake, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies of Reps., 1930 (i).

——— Severn Route, &c. (remarks) 4840 (iii).

Victoria Harbour and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

Wabaushene Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5968 (iii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Address, The, Ques. of Order, Reading from Documents (Mr. Johnston) 153 (i).
Address, The, 1670 (i).
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation *re* Charges in 1906, &c. (Ques.) 1389 (i).
Beauharnois Canal Water Power Lease, Guarantee *re* Navigation (Ques.) 2999 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Rental or Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).
Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4156 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) on Sen. Amts., 6772 (iv).
Carroll, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4859 (iii).
Charbonneau, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4859 (iii).
Civil Servants, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7686 (iv).
Clergy from France, &c., Par. in 'Le Canada' *re* Orangemen, &c. (personal explanation) 7092 (iv).
Contractors, Tendering at Ottawa (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
Cooke, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4858 (iii).
Criminal Code (exclusive contract clause) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 3726 (ii).
Criminal Code (Public Works) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7188 (iv).
Criminal Code (unorganized ters.) Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 5778 (iii); in Com., 7017 (iv).
Cross Point Wharf, Purchase of Lumber, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6782 (iv).
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1759; Amt. (Mr. Pringle) wthdrwn., 1798 (i).
Debates Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7008 (iv).
Debates, Official, Salaries of Staff (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Desks bought for House of Commons, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4841 (iii).
——— *See* 'Members.'
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7031 (iv).
French Clergy exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6669 (iv).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3664

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Ry. Contracts for Construction, Rumours *re*, 3727 (ii).
——— Contract for Ties, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 1396, 1559 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc., in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5054 (iii).
——— Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1945 (i).
Hansard, French Edition, Delay, &c. (remarks) 582 (i), 3544 (ii).
Hansard: *See* 'Legislative Union,' &c.
House of Commons Employees, Salaries, Duties, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2584 (ii).
Hutchinson, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4859 (iii).
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6777 (iv).
Insurance Commission, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) 6402 (iv).
——— Printing in French of Rep., &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com. on Printing, 7004 (iv).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement of Min. of Rys., 5256 (iii).
——— Chaudiere Junction Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 1133 (i).
——— Drummondville Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 1133 (i).
——— Employes Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1486 (i).
——— Riviere du Loup Branch, Total Expenditure for 1906, &c. (Ques.) 1132 (i).
——— Ste. Flavie Improvements (Ques.) 1132 (i).
——— Ste. Rosalie Improvements (Ques.) 1134 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Distribution of (remarks) 1331 (i).
Legislative Union, &c. Correction in Hansard (personal explanation) 5509 (iii).
Lemieux, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 4860 (iii).
Marriages (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 7699; in Com., 7841 (iv).
Members Desks in H. of C., Papers taken from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 144 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5644 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7253 (iv).
'Montcalm,' Str., Failure as an Ice-breaker (remarks) 1087 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7056; in Com., 7569 (iv).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commission, Nominations and Apptmnts, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Erection of Sheds, Contract *re*, Change of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf Extension, Damage to, &c. (Ques.) 1395 (i).
Nicolet and St. Gregoire Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1386 (i).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Contract *re* Construction, Supervisor, &c. (Ques.) 1386 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse. on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5808 (iii).
Nouvelle Wharf, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).
Paradis, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re* (Ques.) 4858 (iii).
Pasbebiac Wharf, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 1396 (i).
Patent Medicine Bill, Legislation this Session (remarks) 5863 (iii).
Patent Medicine B. 99 (Mr. Templeman) Postponement of, &c. (remarks) 4441 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to wthdr., 7439 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7021 (iv).
Private Bills (remarks) *re* Translation, 708 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5296, 5331 (iii); on M. (Mr. Fielding) to make corrections, 7053 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7706 (iv).
——— on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7743; in Com. on Res., 7762 (iv).
Pulp Wood, cut and made in Canada, Export Duty *re* (Ques.) 888 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7546 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2455 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 4412 (iii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7417; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 7437 (iv).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3691 (ii).
Red Island, N.S., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 1927 (i).
——— Dredging Sand Bar, Coal Supply, &c. (Ques.) 1987 (ii).
Residential Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7014 (iv).
Richmond County Wharf, Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 1928 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Rochon, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re* (Ques.) 4860 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Abandonment by N.W. Mounted Police, &c. (Ques.) 614 (i).
——— (explanation) 572 (i).
Ross Rifles, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Sup., 3789 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1413 (i).
——— Number delivered, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 222, 1126 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Judgeship, Apptmnt. *re* (remarks) 1300 (i), 1991, 2229 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Improvements, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
St. Timothée and Grand Isle Road, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).
St. Timothée Post Office, Investigation *re* Mismanagement (Ques.) 2828 (ii).
Strikes and Lock-outs Prevention B. 86 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1036 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dublin exhibition) 6901 (iv).
Canals—Beauharnois (staff) 7534; (south bank) 7668 (Valleyfield banks) 7539; (Valleyfield repairs) 7668 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7536 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5552 (iii).
Canals—Quebec (cement) 5552 (iii).
Canals—Soulanges (Cascades wharf) 7535; (electrical staff) 7666; (lockmen, &c.) 7535 (iv); (maintenance) 5551 (iii).
Civil Govt—Finance (increases) 7690; Justice (salaries) 7690; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 7678; Militia (salaries) 7686; Post Office (asst dep. P.M.G.) 7691 (iv).
Dom. Lands (timber protection) 7268 (iv).
Fisheries (dogfish extermination) 5921; (fish breeding) 5892; (hatcheries) 5900; (inspectors' salaries) 5890; (jurisdiction of provs.) 5913 (iii).
High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 7692 (iv).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c.) 6707; (agents, Que.) 6717; (bonuses, &c.) 7277; (deportations) 7278; (fuel, &c.) 7278 (iv).
Interior—Hydrographic Surveys (astronomical surveys) 7269; Miscellaneous (Banff sewerage) 7279; (maps, &c.) 7275 (iv).
Legislation H. of C. (debates, salaries) 7972 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (accountants, experts, &c.) 7682 (iv); (salaries) 5865 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspe Basin) 7120 (iv).
Militia (properties, &c.) 7981 (iv).
Miscellaneous—(Connaught, Prince Arthur of, visit) 6901; (Insurance commission, printing, &c.) 7972 (iv); (Jamaica Disaster, aid to) 2727 (ii); (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
N.W. Ter. Govt—(commissioner's salary) 7272; (litigation) 7275; (roads and bridges) 7273; (Yoho Park) 7274 (iv).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Edmonton) 7823 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (alterations) 3608; (furniture, &c.) 3590 (ii); (H. of C. rooms) 7821 (iv); (Rideau Hall improvements) 3615; (Royal Mint) 3605 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal P.O. enlargement) 7820 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Big Lorraine) 6020; (Eskasoni wharf) 6030 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse du Cap) 6093; (Anse a L'Ilot) 6090; (Chateuaguay) 6096; (Chicoutimi) 6096; (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Father Point) 6100; (Grand Mechins) 6101; (Lake St. Francis) 6111; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6111; (Peribonka) 6121; (Petites Bergeronnes) 6115; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6116; (Riviere aux Renards) 6121; (Rivière du Loup) 6122; (Saguenay) 6125; (St. Anne des Monts) 6129; (St. Francois) 6131; (St. Jean) 6132; (Sorel deepwater) 6133; (Yamaska) 6134 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Indiantown branch) 7663; (rolling stock) 7664; Railway Commission (staff) 7670 (iv).
Scientific Institutions—Meteorological Service allowances) 7684 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration) 7095 (iv).
Yukon—(council grant) 7278 (iv).
Supreme Court Judges Salaries in Sask. and Alberta B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7440 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means, (animals) 1259 (i); (binders) 4427; (boots and shoes) 4558 (iii); (cotton fabrics) 2347 (ii); (dumping clause Amts., binder twine) 1215; (dumping clause Amts.) 1189; (intermediate tariff and German treaties) 856 (i); (iron or steel beams) 4207 (iii); (proceedings *re* combinations, &c.) 1252 (i); (pulp wood) 2063 (ii); (steel billets) 4207; (structural steel) 4208; (sugar) 4156 (iii); (U.S. Duties, comparisons, &c.) 1199 (i).
Transportation Commission's Rep., Suggestions *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Ventilation in Chamber of House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3605 (ii).
Winding Up Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7020 (iv).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Chicago Drainage Canal, Diversion of Water from St. Lawrence Route, &c. (Ques.) 2577 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7507 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7072 (iv).

Bickerdike, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 1119 (i); in Com. and 3° m., 2769 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4330 (iii).

Black, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Probition, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4071 (iii).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c. (prop. res.) 1445 (i).
I.C.R., Windsor Branch of the Dom. Atlantic Ry., Expiration of Lease, &c. (Ques.) 615, 1141 (i).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1309 (i), 2015 (ii).
Charlesville, Breakwater, Reps. and Papers *re* Building (M. for copies*) 2840 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Prohibition, &c. (prop. res) 4053 (iii).
——— Legislation *re* Prohibition (Ques.) 1801 (i).
Clam Point Canal, Sable Island, Report *re* (Ques.) 2836 (ii).
——— Access to, &c. (Ques.) 3188 (ii).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7167 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 668 (i).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7030 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7339 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2919 (ii).
Inverness Public Building, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 6011 (iv).
Laurier Tower Collapse, Cost of Investigation (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 941 (i).
London Election Investigation, Govtl. Assistance (Ques.) 225 (i).
Ottawa Post Office, Date of Erection, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 1799 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Damage by Fire (Ques.) 1557 (i).
Ottawa Properties purchased by Govt., Amounts of Commission and Legal Expenses (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 3839 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to Com. of Sup., 7905, 7927 (iv).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Port Credit Life Saving Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5770 (iii).
Port Hood Breakwater, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3181 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Bill, 7024 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7104 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Stoves imported into Western Canada, Value of, &c. (Ques.) 2293 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (customs) 2767 (ii).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 5891 (iii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 6711; (agents, Ont.) 6715 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (bookkeeping reorganization) 5950 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt. (commissioner) 7273 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (life-saving stations) 5770 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 7822 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 3973 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Parkhill) 7822; (Renfrew) 7822 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (maintenance) 4604 (iii); (picture frames) 3972; (Sussex St. property) 3619, 3951; (Laurier Tower investigation) 3972 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6018; (Charlo's Cove) 6021; (Glace Bay) 6032; (Inverness Mines) 6045; (New Campbellton wharf) 6053; (Round Hill wharf) 6065 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 6933; (Collingwood) 6936; (Kincardine) 6954; (Owen Sound) 6964 (iv); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5984 (iii); (Port Burwell) 6965 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a l'Ilot) 6092; (Disraeli wharf) 7827; (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Lake Aylmer Wharf) 7825; (L'Isle d'Alma) 6113; (Lake Megantic piers) 7826; (Lake St. Francis) 7828; (Rivière Ouelle) 6124 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (steamer, B.C.) 5880 (iii).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6249 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (barley, &c.) 1362; (berries) 1896 (i); (brass instruments) 2400; (brushes, &c.) 2406 (ii); (dumping clause) 1023; (farm products) 1260 (i); (chains) 4270 (iii); (cheese) 1335; (chicory) 1360 (i); items standing, 2405 (ii); (malleable chains) 4390 (iii); (oils, &c.) 2121 (ii); (pease) 1361; (rice) 1859; (tomatoes) 1871; (trees) 1870; (vegetables) 1882 (i); (vessels, &c) 2395; (whips) 2402 (ii); (white lead) 4186 (iii); (wool) 2374 (ii).
Yukon Concessions, Bronson and Ray, &c., Transfer to Guggenheims, &c. (Ques.) 3425 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Yukon Officials, Absence from Duty, Aggregate Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 887, 1062 (i).
Yukon Winter Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 889 (i).

Bole, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*
Annuity Co. of Canada (B. 65) 1°*, 1472 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., Shortage of Fuel, &c. (M.) to adjn. House, Cor. &c. (read) 7131 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5614 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4751 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7475 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, Agreement with Mr. Brown (Ques.) 3839 (ii).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 1120 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4976, 5205 (iii), 6204 (iv).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 4231 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 2963 (ii).
Militia (clothing) 5743; (pay and allowance) 5654 (iii).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1012 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Militia and Defence), *King's, N.S.*
Annual Drill, Restrictions *re* Leave of Absence (Ans.) 4051 (iii).
Armstrong, Trooper, Compensation *re* Injuries at Laprairie Camp (Ans.) 1050 (i).
Belleville Drill Hall, Progress *re* Construction (Ans.) 1397 (i).
Boer War Trophies, Distribution of, &c. (Ans.) 474 (i).
Burford Armoury, Contract *re* Coal Supply (Ans.) 1395 (i).
Criminal Code (militia stores) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 2068; 2°* and in Com., 3092 (ii).
Copper purchased for the Militia, Total Value (Ans.) 3883 (ii).
Dufferin Rifles, Payment to Men, &c. (Ans.) 4045 (iii).
Dunnville Drill Hall, Erection of (Ans.) 474 (i).
Esquimalt Station, Esablishment of School of Instruction (Ans.) 3370 (ii).
Halifax Barracks, Coal furnished, Quantity and Rate per Ton (Ans.) 714 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Docks, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1057 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 894 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Immigrants entering Canadian Militia, &c. (Ans.) 2633 (ii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Number of Acres purchased, Cost, Amount of Award, &c. (Ans.) 1385 (i).
Lee-Enfield and Ross Rifles, Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia (Ans.) 4452 (iii).
Lindsay Drill Shed, Erection of, &c. (Ans.) 223 (i).
Medals for Nile Voyageurs, Issue of (Ans.) 224 (i).
Military Forts at Levis, Clearing of Land, &c. (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Military Forts, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
Military Schools of Instruction, Number and Location, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).
Military School at Montreal, Location and Site, &c. (Ans.) 1799 (i).
Military Stores Inspection, Names of Officers, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 720 (i).
Militia Estimates (annual statement) in Com. of Sup., 5647 (iii).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5084 (iii).
Militia Arms, 13th Haldimand, Amounts paid for Storage (Ans.) 2828 (ii).
Militia Drill Sheds Ret., on Inquiry for, 4615 (iii).
Militia, Expenditure *re* aiding Civil Powers, Collections, &c. (Ans.) 895 (i).
Militia Officers, Provisional Courses Allowance, on M. (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 1073 (i).
Militia Pension Act Amt. (B. 144) M. for Com. on Res., 4612; in Com. on Res., 5643; 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 5645; 3°*, 5646 (iii).
Mulloy, Mr., Relief to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
Permanent Force, Qualifications of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 1051 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Compensation *re* Timber Licenses (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Quebec Garrison, Permanent Force, Recruits from English soldiers (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2206 (ii), 4119 (iii).
Riflemen, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt., on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 741 (i).
Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Contract *re* (Ans.) 485 (i).
Rifles Ranges in Victoria County, Site *re* (Ans.) 224 (i).
Ross Rifle, Accidents, &c. Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4050 (iii).
——— Accidents in N.W.M. Police, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4051 (iii).
——— Amounts paid for Extras, &c. (Ans.) 4214 (iii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, Amounts paid to Sir Charles Ross or Ross Rifle Co. (Ans.) 5025 (iii).
——— Bayonet for, Pattern, &c. (Ans.) 2580 (ii).
——— Contract with Messrs. Billings & Spencer, &c. (Ans.) 1395 (i).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Sup., 3778 (ii).
——— Inspection, Commissions, &c., Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1403 (i).
——— Imported Parts from U.S. (Ans.) 2834 (ii).
——— Number delivered, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1126 (i).
——— Number purchased, Price paid, &c. (Ans.) 222 (i).
——— Pattern *re*, Rep. of Commissioner for 1901 (Ans.) 4216 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— Reps from Officers *re* Defects (Ans.) 4273 (iii).
——— Ret., on Inquiry for (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3546 (ii).
See 'Lee-Enfield.'
St. Johns, Que., Sale of Barracks, &c. (Ans.) 4215 (iii).
St. Joseph de Levis Military Cabins, Burning of, &c. (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Proposed Erection of (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
S.A. Veterans, Land Grants, Terms and Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
——— on Prop. Res., (Mr. Hughes) 735 (i).
Sub-Target Gun Co., O.C.'s, Cor. with Dept. of Militia, on M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 726 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to ref. papers to Pub. Accounts Com., 3887 (ii); 3977 (iii).
——— Purchase and Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 226 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia, 2822 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5735; (clothing) 5740; (customs duties) 5765; (Dom. arsenal) 5764; (pay and allowance) 5647; (properties) 5736; (rifle ranges) 5764; (Royal Scots armoury) 5765; (supplies) 5763; (surveys) 5723 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (barracks) 4035 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston barracks) 4022; (London militia stores) 4022; (Toronto drill hall) 4031 (iii).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Purchase of by Govt., Quantity, &c., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 719 (i).
Vaux, Major F. L., Application *re* Leave of Absence (Ans.) 4046 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, Ont.*
Address, The, 19 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6275 (iv).
Athabaska Fishing Co., on Inquiry for Ret., (Mr. Ames) 6259 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Inquiry for, 703, 992, 658 1470 (i), 2069, 2344 (ii).
Australian and Canadian Tariff Preferences, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Bain, J. L., and Campbell, J. O., Apptmt, as Scrutineers in Elections, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4153 (iii).
Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6579, 6587 (iv).
Boots and Shoes, and Tanners' Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4589 (iii).
B.C. Judgeship Vacancy, Statement *re* Sale of, Ques. of Order, 580 (i).
Budget Debate and Tariff Discussions (remarks) 238 (i).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1114 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 108 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 4656 (iii).
——— B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
Canada and U. S., Negotiations by Mr. Bryce, &c. (remarks) 5508 (iii).
C.P.Ry. Land Belt, B.C., B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4655 (iii).
Canadian Sealers imprisoned at Montevideo, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 1381 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 804; in Com., 1306 (i), 2018, 2029 (ii); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6774; on Sen. Amts., 6771 (iv).
Cattle, Tuberculosis, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7990 (iv).
Charges against Conservative Members by Mr. Emmerson, Ques. of Privilege, 5666 (iii).
Charing Cross Station, Closing of, &c. (remarks) 1109 (i).
Cigarettes, Sale, &c., Prohibition of, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4085 (iii).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7794 (iv).
Coal Lands in Northwest, Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes on prop. res. (Mr. Herron) 778 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, on Cor. from Taber Mines (remarks) 6145 (iv).
——— Information *re* Settlement (remarks) 276 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes in the West, Further Information *re* (remarks) 6909, 7309, 7518, 7543, 7985 (iv).
——— Jurisdiction *re* Control of Mines (remarks) 221 (i).
——— Location of Dep. Min. of Labour (remarks) 423 (i).
——— Rep. in 'Evening Journal,' Further Information, Inquiry for, 219 (i).
——— Shortage of Fuel, &c., in the N.W., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn Hse., 7140 (iv).
Coasting Trade Treaties *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 1051 (i).
——— Abrogation of, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Black) 1453 (i).
Cochrane, Mr. Edward, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4368 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 702 (i); on M. for 2°, 2450; in Com., 2464 (ii).
——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* discussion, 520 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5847 (iii).
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, Rumours *re*, M. to adjn., 5260, 5280
——— Cor. with Mr. Deakin or Sir Jos. Ward, eliminated from Ret. (remarks) 5525 (iii).
——— Establishment of Imperial Council, on M. for Sup., 5526 (iii).
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 4543 (iii).
Committees, Sel. Standing, 4th Rep. of Com. (remarks) 2287 (ii).
——— on M. to adopt 5th Rep., 2415 (ii).
——— on M. to sit concurrently with Hse, 6836 (iv).
Criminal Code (militia stores) Amt. B. 85, (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 3092 (ii).
Criminal Code (Public Works) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7188 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7015 (iv).
Customs Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. res., 4864; in Com., 5510; on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5608; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 5627, Neg. (Y. 36; N. 84) 5641 (iii).
Distribution (N.W.) Bill and Public Lands Bill, Information asked for, 1471 (i).
Dominion Lands Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 703 (i); on M. for 2°, 4732; in Com., 4740, 4787, 4806, 4865 (iii).
Dom. Lands (surveys and surveyors) B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, and in Com., 3093, 3462 (ii).
Dom. Lands Survey B. 172 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7308 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Election Act, Amt. *re* Corruption and Frauds (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6791; Amt. Neg. (Y. 44; N. 88) 6898 (iv).
Election Act Amts., Inquiry for, 2637 (ii).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2267 (ii), 4635, 4655; on M. for 3°, 4669, (amt.) 4947 (iii).
Exchequer Court (Registrar) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7257 (iv).
Fidelity Life Insurance Co.'s of Canada's incorp. B. 164 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 7313 (iv).
Financial Situation (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7851, Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 7870 (iv).
French Clergymen exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6661 (iv).
Fuel Famine in N.W., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Burrows) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2826 (ii).
German Treaties and Intermediate Tariff: in Com. on Ways and Means, 851 (i).
Gold and Silver Marking Act B. 137 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7014 (iv).
Goods, Dutiable, Imported Free, Rebates, &c., on M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 727 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 4274 (iii).
——— on M. to take in Wednesdays, 2729 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations (remarks) 6378 (iv).
Govt. Officials and Political Interference (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6677 (iv).
——— (remarks) on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6663 (iv).
G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) to M. for 3°, 4803 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., District 'F,' Construction, &c., O.C.'s, Specifications, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 1118 (i).
——— Land Grants in B.C., Indian Reserve, on M. for Ways and Means, 2069 (ii).
——— Land Grants in B.C., Inquiries for Papers, &c., 1792 (i).
——— La Tuque Branch, Construction Contract, &c. (M. for copy*) 1068 (i).
——— Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1947 (i).
——— Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret., on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3140 (ii).
G.T.P. Act (wages) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2479 (ii).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3537 (ii).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2897 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Grenfell, Lady Victoria, Decease of (remarks) 2481 (ii).
Hall, Zaccheus, Penalties *re* N.S. Election Act, &c. (Ques.) 1062 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6257 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7314 (iv).
Henderson, Judge Alex., Resignation, O.C. Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2147 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Huron (West) Election, Corruption, Ref. to in Debate on Election Act Frauds, 6794 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation, Further Information *re*, 581, 1184, 1472 (i), 5086, 5560 (iii).
——— Cor. read, &c. (remarks) 2736 (ii).
——— Legality of (remarks) 7 (i).
——— (M.) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 3170 (ii).
——— Original Letter and Witnesses (remarks) 3104 (ii).
——— Resignation *re* Portfolio of Public Works (remarks) 92, 839 (i).
——— Second Resignation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6790 (iv).
Immigration Policy of Govt *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6205 (iv).
Indian Timber Reserve Lands, Disposal of, &c.: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5464 (iii).
——— Charges against Members, on M. (Mr. Bourassa) to Ways and Means, 4385 (iii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers, &c., 5666; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5658 (iii).
——— Cor. *re* not in Ret. (remarks) 2346 (ii).
——— Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 3844 (ii).
——— Evidence, Inquiry for, 4118 (iii).
——— Evidence and Rep., on M. (Mr. Fielding) to print, 3722 (ii).
——— Printing in French (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7005 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) 6402 (iv).
——— Rep. on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6930 (iv).
——— Rep. *re*, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6349 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1492 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4865 (iii).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Rental Betterments (remarks) 7009 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Purchase of Land at Truro, N.S., from H. W. Yuill, O.C.'s, Valuation, Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
Interior Deptl. Rep., on Inquiry for, 992 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4664 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7475; in Com., 7515 (iv).
——— on M. for Consideration of Res., 4613 (iii).
Jamaica Disaster, Govt. Grant (remarks) 1698 (i).
Judges' Salaries in Man. and B.C., B. 177 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7788; on Amt. (Mr. Taylor) 7793 (iv).
Judges in Sask. and Alberta Salaries B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for, 3°, 7578 (iv).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S. (M.) to adjn., 2206, 2225 (ii).
Justice, Administration of by Dom. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4135 (iii).
Kaien Island Land Grant, O.C., Inquiry for, 1699 (i), 3977 (ii).
Labour Disputes Prevention, (M.) for Special Com., 1150 (i), 3696, Neg. (Y. 40; N. 78) 3696 (ii).
——— Settlement of, Ref. to in Debate on Address, 32 (i).
See 'Coal Strike.'
Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 925 (i).
London Election, Ref. to in debate on Address, 26 (i).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 4976 (iii).
Manitoba Schools Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5702 (iii).
Marconi Tel. Co., Contract with Govt., &c. (remarks) 1299 (i).
Marriages (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 7698; in Com., 7844 (iv).
Martin, T., late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4518 (iii).
Members occupying Seats on Govt Side (remarks) 5890 (iii).
Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Agreement with B.C., &c. (M. for copy*) 2295 (ii).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 144 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5644 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7191, 7253; on Sen. Amts., 7840 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7574 (iv).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5554 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 22 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 1095 (i).
New Ottawa, Settlers not complying with Settlement Duties (Ques.) 236, 1046 (i).
Niagara—International Waterways Commission, Reps., O.C.'s. &c., on M. (Mr. Lancaster) for copies, 1441 (i).
Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5589 (iii).
Northwest Territories Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2479 (ii).
N.S. Bench, Apptmnts. to (remarks) 7009 (iv).
N.S. Supreme Court Judgeship, Vacancy *re* (remarks) 1300 (i), 5508 (iii).
——— Apptmnt. of D. C. Fraser as Lt. Governor, &c. (Ques.) 235 (i)
Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto 'News' (remarks) 6911 (iv).
Orders in Council, Consolidation of (remarks) 4946 (iii).
Peace River District, B.C., Selection and Locations of Lands (Ques.) 2633 (ii).
——— Rep., Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 3189 (ii).
Petawawa Military Camp, and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7610 (iv).
Petitions, 5th Rep., of Private Bills, 2480 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3894 (ii).
Postal Act (dead letter branches) Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) on Sen. Amts., 7839 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Post Office B. 7022 (iv).
Post Office Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7022 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa, on M. for Sup., 3731 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service (remarks) 1088 (i).
P.E.I. Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, Repairs, &c. (remarks) 3547 (ii).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1992 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3265 (ii).
Private Bills, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1921 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 1983 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Talbot) to place on Order Paper, 4928 (iii).
Private Bills Com., on M. (Mr. D. Ross) to sit concurrently with Hse, 7246 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa), Charges of Graft against Ministers, &c., 3443 (ii).
Probationary System, and Indeterminate Sentences, Observations of Mr. Justice McMahon, &c. (remarks) 3841 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Provincial Premiers Conference, Inquiry for Papers, 703 (i).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158,' 'Petawawa,' &c.
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate, on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7738 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) to Reconsideration of, 7703 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, &c. from Senate, in Com. on Res., 7755; on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7777 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Collingwood Dock (M.) *re* Sittings, 3840 (ii).
——— Delay in bringing down Papers (remarks) 3459 (ii).
——— Documents produced at next Session's Meetings, (M.) 7125 (iv).
——— Sittings, &c. (remarks) 5561 (iii).
Public Accounts Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 9 (i).
Public Expenditures, Criticism of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7851, Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 7870 (iv).
Public Lands or Public Domains, Sale or Grant of to others than Settlers, O.C.'s, Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Public Works, Minister of, Resignation of Mr. Hyman, Status as Member of the Hse, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 839 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) to M. for 3°, 3175 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co., Discussion *re* (remarks) 7008 (iv).
Quebec County Election, Speech of Mr. Aylesworth, Ref. to in debate on Address, 27 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7554 (iv).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4969 (iii).
Queens-Shelburne Election, Apptmnt. of Lighthouse Keepers as Scrutineers, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Queens and Shelburne Election Protest, Interference of Govt Officials, on M. for Sup., 6677, (amt.) Neg. (Y.40; N. 70) 6705 (iv).
——— Ref. to in Debate on Election Act Amt., 6800 (iv).
——— Ref. to in Debate on Address, 23 (i).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2456 (ii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 652 (i); on M. for Com., 3688 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 981 (i).
Railway Act (canal penalties) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7810 (iv).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7418, 7428; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7437 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7800; (Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry.) 7806; (Nicolet) 7808 (iv).
Reports, Inquiry for, 1091, 1184 (i).
Representation in H. of C., from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2200 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 582, 1856 (i), 2479, 3625 (ii), 5890 (iii), 7519, 7985 (iv).
——— Preparation of (remarks) 1091 (i).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1502 (i).
Revised Statutes, Copy placed in Library (remarks) 1470 (i).
——— Copy to be placed on Table (remarks) 1382 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Grants of Land, &c. to in Alberta, O.C.'s. Agreements, &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Rougemont Senatorship, Inquiry for Ret., 7011 (iv).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Tenders, Specifications, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 1067 (i).
Settlement Duties in New Ottawa, Sask., &c. (Ques.) 236, 1046 (i).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, &c., Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4245 (iii).
Sol. Gen., Delay in Apptmnt. (remarks) 841 (i).
——— Inconvenience *re* Vacancy (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
Songhees Indian Reserve, Negotiations for, O.C. Instructions, &c. *re* Mr. Pedley's Investigation (M. for copies*) 1118 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2663 (ii).
——— Ref. to in debate on Address, 29 (i).
Statutes (Schedule 'A') Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5884 (iii).
Stockton, Mr. A. A., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4758 (iii).
Strikes in Industrial Concerns in the West (remarks) 5862 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3032; in Com., 3802, 3846 (ii), 4458, 4774; on M. for 3°, 4978; (amt.) 4980; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 106) 5008 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts, Enforcement of Statute (remarks) 6007 (iv).
See 'Coal Strike.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Supply B. 141 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 5396; in Com., 5561 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt (Privy Council) 2764 (ii).
Geological Survey (clerical assistance) 3166; (oil borings) 3162; (specimens) 3165 (ii).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6349 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Stanley) 6972 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy *re* (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
——— Cor. &c. *re* Vacancy, &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
——— Complaint from Chief Justice *re* (remarks) 2998 (ii).
——— Cor. &c. (read) 3916; (amt.) 3922; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 83) 3949 (ii).
——— Delay in Apptmnt. (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 840 (i).
See 'N.S.' &c.
Supreme Court Judges in Sask. and Alberta B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7442 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) 4402 (iii); (animals, &c.) 1254; (biscuits) 1866 (i); (boots and shoes) 4568; (brass, &c.) 4197; (britannia metal) 4204; (chains) 4265; (coil chains) 4265 (iii); (corks) 2136; (cotton fabrics) 2348 (ii); (crucibles) 4190; (Customs Act Repeal) 4548 (iii); (dumping clause) 1006; (amts.) 1193; amts. (binder twine) 1226 (i); (electric bulbs) 4193 (iii); (excise duty, &c.) 1252 (i); (fire brick) 4190; (glass ware) 4193; (glucose, &c.) 4181; (malt flour) 4182; (marble) 4191; (molasses) 4180; (monotypes) 4401 (iii); (mould boards) 2134 (ii); (proceedings *re* combinations, &c.) 1249; (rice, &c.) 1858 (i); (rice, sago, &c.) 4143; (roofing slate) 4192 (iii); (sago, &c.) 1860 (i); (structural steel) 4208; (sugar 16 Dutch standard) 4150 (iii); (U.S. duties, comparisons, &c.) 1198 (i); (wool) 2373 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4327 (iii).
Tariff Changes, Ref. to Debate on Address, 21 (i).
Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence (remarks) 423 (i).
——— Customs Acts, in Com. on Ways and Means, 525 (i).
Tariff Index, Distribution of (remarks) 424 (i).
Tariff—Intermediate Tariff *re* G. B. and Foreign Countries, in Com. on Ways and Means, 998 (i).
——— Intermediate Tariff and Treaties in Com. on Ways and Means, 851 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Tariff, Intermediate and Treaty, Relation to, Ref. to in Budget Speech, 297 (i).
——— Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Treaties (commercial) Canadian B. 17 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 1552 (i).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commissioners (prop. res.) 2295; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2328 (ii); agreed to (Y. 96; N. 36) 7576 (iv).
Vancouver Post Office Building, Terms of Contract, Changes *re* (Ques.) 894 (i).
——— Specifications, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1066 (i).
Warships of U.S. on Great Lakes, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 6279 (iv).
——— Information *re*, 6378, 6618, 6910 (iv).
Water Powers of Soulange Canal, Leases by Govt. on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 258 (i).
Winding-up Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7020 (iv).
Winnipeg Immigration Buildings, O.C.'s, Specifications, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 1067 (i).
Winnipeg Post Office, O.C.s' Tenders, Specifications, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 1119
Winnipeg Terminals, C.N. and G.T.P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5517 (iii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5016, 5686 (iii).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5704 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7544 (iv).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*
Address, The, 94 (i).
Buckingham Strike Riots (M. for cor. &c.*) 240 (i).
Church Army Immigrants: *See* 'Immigration, Encouragement.'
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse, 5269 (iii).
French Clergy, exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6658 (iv).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3657 (ii).
German Surtax: *See* 'Preferential.'
G.T.R. 2-cent a Mile Rate, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Ways and Means, 4376 (iii).
Hay Permits in Prince Albert District Conditions *re* (Ques.) 7541 (iv).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Original Colony Register 'A,' Disappearance of (Ques.) 5287 (iii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Rep. of Committee *re* (remarks) on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4767 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Immigrants, Contracts *re* Bonuses (remarks) 4615 (iii).
Immigration, Encouragement of Eastern Settlers to go to N.W. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6725 (iv).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).
Imperial Council in G.B. for Colonies, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' *re* Cor. between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Australian Premier, 4667 (iii).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Members (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 4378 (iii).
——— Notice of Motion, 4771, 5259 (iii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers (Amt.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5397; Amt. Neg. (Y. 55; N. 109) 5500 (iii).
——— Charges by Mr. Fowler, Notice of Ques. of Privilege, 5509; Question of Privilege, 5657 (iii).
See 'Privilege.'
Insurance Rep., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to consider 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 5176 (iii).
——— Translation and Printing, on M. to conc. in Amended Rep., of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlements, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1177 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an English Minister (remarks) 5860 (iii).
Minister of the Crown, Charges *re*: *See* 'Insurance Commission.'
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5813 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. res. (Mr. Pringle) 3393 (ii).
Personal Explanation, Par. *re* Relationship to Mr. Sifton, 7131 (iv).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).
Prince Albert District, Hay Permits, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 7541 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of *re* Charges against Ministers and Members (Mr. Fowler) 3428 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act, from Senate, on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7725 (iv).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1502; on M. for 3° (amt.) 1543, Neg. (Y. 31; N. 84) 1545 (i).
Salvation Army Immigrants: *See* 'Immigration Encouragement.'

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers of Estate, &c. (Ques.) 5287 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2722 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3809, 3852 (ii), 4773; on M. for 3°, 4984 (iii).
Supply B. 141 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 5396 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, Que.) 6719 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration) 4010 (iii).
Tariff—Dumping Clause Amts., in Com. on Res., 1186 (i).
——— French Treaty, &c. (remarks) in Com., 1252 (i).
——— Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1231 (i).
'Women, Wine and Graft, Charges by Mr. Fowler, against Members and Ministers, Ques. of Privilege, 3428 (ii).
See 'Insurance Commission.

Bourbonnais, Mr. A., *Soulanges.*
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2453 (ii).

Boyce, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*
Address, The, 123 (i).
Algoma District, Indian Land Sales, Special Terms, &c. (Ques.) 6015 (iv).
Algoma Timber Limits, Sales to Messrs. Wilson, Reesor and Philp, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 3641 (ii).
Blind River Inspector of Weights and Measures, Apptmnt. of Asst. (Ques.) 2292 (ii).
Boots and Shoes, Tanners Combine, Memorial to Tariff Commission (read) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4559 (iii).
Caustic Soda (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4552 (iii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Govt. Officials, 6697 (iv).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Instructions to P.O. Inspector, Reps. &c. (M. for copies*) 4458 (iii).
——— Charges against Postmaster (Ques.) 4049 (iii).
Election Frauds, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6848 (iv).
Farm and Garden Products, Quantity entered at Sault Ste. Marie (Ques.) 483 (i).
Garden River Indian Reserve, Representations *re* Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 2830 (ii).
'Golspie', Str., Wreck of, Investigation *re* (remarks) 1097 (i).
——— Name of Port of Import (Ques.) 1384 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
'Golspie,' Str., Rep. of Commissioner, Inquiry for, 2346, 2590 (ii).
——— Total Amounts paid for, &c. (Ques.) 4048 (iii).
Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6693 (iv).
Grand Falls, Mineral Lands, Water Powers, &c., Applications for, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3373 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7377 (iv).
Homestead Entries, in Quarter Section 20, &c. Issue of Patent, &c. (Ques.) 4851 (iii).
Indian Lands in Algoma District, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7283 (iv).
——— (Ques.) 3371 (ii).
——— (M. for ret*) 3373 (ii).
Indian Lands, Nipissing District, Open for Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Daily Retainer of Mr. Shepley, &c. (Ques.) 3639 (ii).
——— Report, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).
Lake Superior Fishing Grounds, Depletion by American Fishermen, &c. (Ques.) 4049 (iii).
Life-Saving Stations maintained in Canada, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2295 (ii).
Life-saving Stations on Great Lakes, Establishment of (Ques.) 1384 (i).
Loggie, W. S. & Co., Payments to (Ques.) 4048 (iii).
Michipicoten Mail Service, Irregularity, &c. (Ques.) 2831 (ii).
Mines Dept. Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7215 (iv).
'Monarch,' SS., Rep. *re* Investigation by Govt. (Ques.) 1384 (i).
N.S. Judiciary, Vacancy (remarks) 6765 (iv). *See* 'Supreme,' &c.
Ophir Postmaster, Reduction of Salary and Increased Mail Service (Ques.) 4219 (iii).
Patterson, Rev. G. C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
Petawawa Military Camp, Compensation *re* Timber Licenses, &c. (Ques.) 5656 (iii).
Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7633 (iv).
Poaching on Lake Superior, Patrol System *re* (Ques.) 3372 (ii).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B.' 'Petawawa.'
Quibell, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 2832 (ii).
Railway Committee, Shirking a Vote, Par. in Toronto 'World,' (personal explanation) 4388 (iii).

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Rainy River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6979 (iv).
——— Obstructions *re* (Ques.) 1142 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4119 (iii).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3371 (ii).
Salmon River and Hectanooga Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4611 (iii).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, on M. for Ways and Means, 4234; (amt.) 4240; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 94) 4262 (iii).
'Strathmore,' Str., Investigation *re* Wreck (Ques.) 1383 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3281, 3829 (ii), 3980, 4463 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Indians—B.C. (Babine investigation) 7286 (iv).
Indians—N.S. (superintendent) 7293 (iv).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 7279; (Mississaguas' claims) 7292; (roads, &c.) 7288 (iv).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6437 (iv).
N.W.T. Govt. (litigation) 7274 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie) 6986 (iv).
Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S. *re* Cor., &c. read, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3934 (ii). *See* 'N.S.'
Tariff (boots and shoes) 4558; (coal for smelting) 4434 (iii); (vessels, &c.) 2393 (ii).
Thessalon Postmaster, Dismissal of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Govt. Officials, 6696 (iv).
Timber Berths, Nos. 824, 1062, 1107, &c., Bonuses, &c., Applications and Regulations *re* (M. for ret.*) 6010 (iv).
Vaux, Major F. L., Application *re* Leave of Absence (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
Wrecks on Great Lakes, Number and Causes, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2295 (ii).

Boyer, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Judges, acting as Directors of Stock Cos., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2144 (ii).
Maple Syrup, Adulteration of, &c. (Ques.) 2634 (ii).
Year Book, French Edition, Publication of (Ques.) 1987 (ii).

Brabazon, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Interim Report, Approximate Cost, &c. (Ques.) 230 (i).

Bristol, Mr. E., *Centre Toronto.*
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7798 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2245 (ii), 4629 (iii).

Bristol, Mr. E.—*Con.*
G.T. Ry., Accounts furnished to Inspector General, &c. (Ques.) 5027 (iii).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5055 (iii).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3498 (ii).
Justice, Adminstration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4142 (iii).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlement, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1182 (i).
Petawawa Military Camp, and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7415, 7425 (iv).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 981 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co.'s Transactions, &c., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2554 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. that Com. rise, 3303; in Com., 3811, 3867 (ii).
——— Seconding M. that Com. rise, wthdrwn. 3319 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4365 (iii).
Tariff—Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1208 (i); (sugar) 4174 (iii).
Toronto, Postal Branch in Centre Toronto (Ques.) 4861 (iii).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Address, The, 194 (i).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Prohibition, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4073 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4904 (iii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7049 (iv).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 4629 (iii).
Hudson Bay, Colony Register 'A,' Recovery of (Ques.) 7540 (iv).
I.C.R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1485 (i).
Long Sault Rapids, and International Waterways (remarks) 7544 (iv).
Marriages (minor) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7849 (iv).
Tariff—(tinplate) in Com., 4426 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Rouville.*
Aids to Navigation on Pacific Coast, Rep. of Capt. Anderson (Ans.) 480 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Bain, J. L. and Campbell, J. O., Apptmnt. as Scrutineers in Elections, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Receipts and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 2288 (ii).
——— Revetment Wall, Govt. Aid in Construction (Ans.) 2633 (ii).
Brooks, E. L. & Co., Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 472 (i).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1117 (i).
Calcium Carbide, Purchase from Ottawa Carbide Co., Rates, Freight, &c. (Ans.) 720 (i).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1765 (i).
Canadian Fog Signal Co., Amounts purchased, &c. (Ans.) 472 (i).
Canadian Sealers, imprisoned at Montevideo, Investigation, &c (remarks) 1382 (i).
——— Release, &c. (Ans.) 229 (i).
Clam Canal, Cape Sable Island, Access to, &c. (Ans.) 3189 (ii).
Coal Supplies for Sorel, Form of Tenders, Procedure, &c. (Ans.) 721 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing, Rep. (remarks) 2288 (ii).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Construction and Cost of of Maintenance (Ans.) 3187 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure at Pictou Harbour (Ans.) 1799 (i).
Fish Breeding and Protection, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1929 (i).
Fishery Commission, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 723 (i).
Fishing Privileges, North Saskatchewan Lakes, Concessions granted, &c. (Ans.) 1394 (i).
Fishing Seasons in Ont., Special Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 1928 (i).
'Golspie,' or 'Osceola,' Str., Name of Port of Entry (Ans.) 1384 (i).
——— Total Amounts paid for, &c. (Ans.) 4049 (iii.)
——— Wreck of, Investigation *re* (remarks) 1105 (i).
——— Wreck of, Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 2590 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 3°, 4795 (iii).
Greece's Point Wharf, Number of Steamers landing, &c. (Ans.) 2574 (ii).
Hay Shipments, Claims of P. E. I. for Refunds, &c. (Ans.) 4854 (iii).
Hudson Bay Deep Water Wharf, Govt. Action *re* Transportation, &c. (Ans.) 2574 (ii).
Lake Superior Fishing Grounds, Depletion by American Fishermen (Ans.) 4050 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Laurier Tower Collapse, Cost of Investigation (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
Life Saving Stations on Great Lakes, Establishment of (Ans.) 1384 (i).
Life Saving Stations on Pacific Coast, Establishment of, &c., (Ans.) 479 (i).
Life Savings Stations on P. E. I. Coast, Number, &c. (Ans.) 231 (i).
——— Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 904 (i).
See 'Sovinto.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Total Expenditure from 1892 to 1896 and from 1902 to 1906 (Ans.) 471 (i).
Lion's Head Life Saving Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii).
Lobster Hatchery at Egmont Bay, Application for (Ans.) 724 (i).
'McKeen, G. A.,' Loss of on Cascumpec Bar, &c. (Ans.) 1146 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Purchasing of Supplies, Auditing of Accounts, &c. (Ans.) 709 (i).
Marine Medical Inspector at Canso, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).
Marine Road on Vancouver Island, Cor. with Premier McBride, &c. (Ans.) 481 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 602; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 610 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T., Amount of Goods purchased for Lighthouse Service, &c. (Ans.) 471 (i).
Modus Vivendi Licenses and Fines of U. S. Vessels, Amount collected, &c. (Ans.) 1049
'Monarch' SS., Investigation by Govt., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1384 (i).
'Montague,' Dredge, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3189 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmnt. of Chairman as per Statute 6, Edward VII., &c. (Ans.) 234 (i).
——— Nominations and Apptmnts, &c. (Ans.) 236, 237 (i).
Montreal Pilots, Tour de Role System (Ans.) 4857 (iii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt., Amounts collected, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 511 (i).
'Neptune' Str., Repairs and Supplies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 3638 (ii).
Ottawa Post Office Building, Date of Erection, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 1799 (i).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4656 (iii).
Pictou Harbour Dues, Collections, &c. (Ans.) 1809 (i).
Poaching on St. Mary's River, Patrol System *re* (Ans.) 3372 (ii).
Port Bruce Harbour. Cor. *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 4666 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Port Hood Breakwater, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 3181 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Freight Service, &c. (remarks) 1085 (i).
P. E. I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels. &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3222 (ii).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Condition of Boats, &c. (remarks) 4667 (iii).
——— Discussion *re* Laying off of Strs. (remarks) 704, 706 (i).
——— Ice-bound steamers, &c. (remarks) 4841 (iii).
——— Inefficient Service (remarks) 4926 (iii).
——— Location of Govt. Steamers (Ans.) 3186 (ii).
——— Res. of Board of Trade, Tunnel, &c. (Ans.) 717 (i).
——— with N. S., Tests *re* Open Route, &c. (Ans.) 1049 (i).
P. E. I. Winter Service, Closing up of Channel by Ice (remarks) 513 (i).
——— Names of Steamers, Through Freight Rates, &c. (Ans.) 613 (i).
——— Total Cost and Subsidies (Ans.) 1986 (ii).
Quahaug Fishing Regulation, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1143 (i).
Quinte Bass Pond, Expenditure for 1904-6, Amount paid to J. Hurley (Ques.) 3427 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3185 (ii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2453 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1515 (i).
Riley, James, Supt. of Pilots, Certificate and Qualifications (Ans.) 3641 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Widening at Cap Charles, Pet. from Pilots, Grounding of SS. Victorian (Ans.) 574 (i).
St. Lawrence Pilots, Number in Ocean SS. Service (Ans.) 4456 (iii).
St. Lawrence River Improvements, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
——— Dredging at Cap a la Roche, &c. (Ans.) 575 (i).
Sea-weed Industry at Isle Verte, Tax collected *re* (Ans.) 5655 (iii).
Senatorship for Rougemont, Rep. *re* Stmnt. by Mr. Girard (remarks) 4658 (iii).
'Sovinto' Wreck on P.E.I., Request to Govt. for Life-saving Boats, (Ans.) 711 (i).
'Stanley' and 'Minto,' Strs., Instructions *re* P.E.I. Route (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
'Strathmore' Str., Investigation *re* Wreck (Ans.) 1383 (i).
Strubb, Chas., Amounts purchased by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 473 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 5765 (iii).
Marine—Public Works (Cap a la Roche) 5776; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 5773; (signal service) 5776 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766; (life-saving stations) 5767; (naval militia) 5773; (patrol vessels) 5772; (wrecking plant) 5771 (iii).
Tariff—Cheese, in Com., 1342 (i).
Tariff, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to increase Taxation, 1349 (i).
——— Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1232 (i).
Toronto Harbour Life Saving Stations, &c. (Ans.) 487 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5768 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Wrecks, Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) 8 (i).
Wharfingers in Muskoka, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 1064 (i).

Brown, Mr. James P., *Chateauguay.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay) 6096 (iv).

Bureau, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*
Grand Trunk Ry. (B. 82) 1°*, 1986 (ii).
Indian River Railway Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 1119 (i).
La Compagnie du chemin de fer Colonization du Nord (B. 13) in Com., and 3° m., 2768 (ii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2454 (ii).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 2482 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Machins) 6103; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6112; (Rivière du Loup) 6123; (Rivière Maskinonge) 6124; (St. Maurice River) 6126; (Three Rivers) 6134 (iv).

Burrows, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*
Fuel Famine in N.W. (personal explanation) *re* Rep. in 'Telegram,' 2824 (ii).
Lumber Combine in N.W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1831 (i).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6246 (iv).
Timber Regulations, Number of Permits, &c. (Ques.) 7007 (iv).

Caldwell, Mr. T. B., *North Lanark.*
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7507 (iv).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) in Com., 7203, 7311, 7483 (iv).

Caldwell, Mr. T. B.—*Con.*
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3991 (iii).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1008 (i).
——— Wool, in Com., 2371 (ii).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *W. Middlesex.*
Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co. incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1923 (i); in Com., 4409, 4557 (iii).
Eastern Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 2482 (ii).
London and St. Clair Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 1120 (i).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3892 (ii).
Private Bills, Pets. *re*, M. to receive, 1920 (i).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Centre York, Ont.*
Address, The 175 (i).
Ansley, Selina Kingan, Relief (B. 117) 1°*, 4771 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 5204 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 154) 1°*, 6376 (iv).
Committees, Sel. Standing, (M.) to sit concurrently with Hse, 6833 (iv).
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief (B. 8) 1°*, 515; in Com., 1750, 1754 (i).
Jordan, Light, Heat and Power, and Erie and Ontario Development Co.'s Amalgamation (B. 115) 1*, 4664 (iii); in Com., 7909 (iv).
Hadley, Geo. Wm., Relief (B. 118) 1°*, 4771 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 158) in Com., 7315, 7912 (iv).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 133 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 6586 (iv).
Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Co's B. 132 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 6585 (iv).
Orders of the Day, Printing in English (remarks) 7838 (iv).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7207, 7311 (iv).
Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Co.'s incorp. (B. 66) 1°*, 1472 (i); (M.) to wthdrw, 3720 (ii).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s B. 167 (Mr. Conmee) 2° m., 7212 (iv).
——— on Protest (Mr. Conmee) *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2455, 2459 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4972 (iii).
Spain, O. G. V., Relief (B. 104) 1°*, 4117 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Rondeau) 6985 (iv).
Tariff—Tomatoes, in Com., 1875 (i).
——— Vegetables, in Com., 1885 (i).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. res. (Mr. Bennett) Amt. 4115 (iii).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 129 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 6585 (iv).

Carrier, Mr. L. A., *Lévis.*
Levis Military Forts, Clearing of Land, &c. (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
St. Joseph de Levis, Military Cabins, Burning of, &c. (Ques.) 5656 (iii).

Carvell, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2251 (ii), 4623 (iii), 7050 (iv).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payment on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5118 (iii).
I.C.R. Accidents, Deaths, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3409 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Com. of Sup., 5434 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5824 (iii).
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. Tels, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3260 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges of Graft against Ministers and Members, 3435 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Woodstock, N.B.) in Com. on Res., 7802 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2653 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3833 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John River) 6078 (iv).

Cash, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Doukhobor Colonies in Sask., Cor. Papers, Reps. &c. (M. for copies*) 4458 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. res. (Mr. Knowles) 3568 (ii).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 1119 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. T., *East Huron.*
Address, The, 69 (i).
British Periodicals, Postage, &c. (Ques.) 1134 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo, Cor. with G.B., &c. (Ques.) 1055 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 698 (i); on M. for 2°, 2429 (ii).
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5166 (iii).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2860 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7467 (iv).
Iron, Steel and Lead Manufactories, Quantity of Production (Ques.) 4047 (iii).
McGee, Thomas D'Arcy, Monument, Erection of (Ques.) 7700 (iv).
'Montague,' Dredge, Total Cost of repairing (Ques.) 2980 (ii).
Moore, Mr. W. W., Report *re* Packing Houses, &c. (Ques.) 229 (i).
Petroleum, Bounties *re*, Total Amount (Ques.) 4052 (iii).
Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected and Due (Ques.) 1134 (i).
'Tagish' Charlie, Rep. *re* Recompense for Mining Property (Ques.) 890 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3246 (ii).
——— N.S., Tests *re* Open Route, &c. (Ques.) 1048 (i).
Tariff—Printing Paper, in Com., 2061 (ii).

Christie, Mr. P., *South Ontario.*
Immigration Agents in Ont., Number and Names, &c. (Ques.) 713 (i).
Immigrants, Number of Arrivals, 1906, Location, &c., (Ques.) 571 (i).
Pictou, N.S., Roundhouse, Dimensions, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4854 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7818; (exhibitions) 7818; (experimental farms) 7813 (iv).
Tariff—(chains) 4265; (malleable chains) 4390 (iii).
Trent Valley Canal, Total Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 713 (i).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*
Railway Strikes, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3188 (ii).
Welland Canal and Cataract Power Co., Application *re* Water Power (Ques.) 3187 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*
Hamilton Radial Electric Co. (B. 158) in Com., 7314, 7340, 7484 (iv).

Clarke, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*

G. T. P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5070 (iii).

Life Saving Stations, P. E. I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 931 (i).

Lime Kiln, Lake Erie, Regulations *re* Boats, &c. (Ques.) 4045 (iii).

Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 119) in Com., 5589 (iii).

Nipissing Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 94) 1°*, 2482 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3891 (ii).

Point Pelee Life Saving Crew (remarks) in debate on P. E. I. Life Saving Stations, 931 (i).

Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Thames river wharf) 6982 (iv).

Clements, Mr. H. S., *West Kent.*

Address, The, 116 (i).

Agricultural Products, Imports and Exports from Can. to U. S., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1149 (i).

Charing Cross Station, Closing of by Michigan Central Ry. (remarks) 1107 (i).

Chatham Armoury, Moneys due Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 4048 (iii).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2418 (ii).

Cordage Co., Amounts of Fines, &c. (Ques.) 4047 (iii).

Detroit River Tunnel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).

Dolsen's Burying Ground, Protection of Banks, &c. (Ques.) 4456 (iii).

Fish-breedin, Amounts expended *re* Propagation (Ques.) 1929 (i).

Fishing Seasons in Ont., Special Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1928 (i).

Floor Oil used in Govt. Buildings, Price, &c. (Ques.) 5024 (iii).

G. T. P. Ry., Cars, Number in Operation, &c. (Ques.) 5024 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Steam Shovels (Ques.) 3182 (ii).

——— Number of Miles constructed (Ques.) 5505 (iii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7510 (iv).

Iron or Steel Tubing, in Com., 2132 (ii), 4265 (iii).

Jeannette's Creek Wharf, Cost of Completion, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).
See 'Thames.'

Clements, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Letter Carrier System, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).

Petroleum Bounty Act Amt B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3894 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4666 (iii).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 641 (i).

Railway Committee Meetings, Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Shirking Vote (personal explanation) 4387 (iii).

St. Ann's Island Lease, Date and Terms *re* (Ques.) 6016 (iv).

St. Antoine's Island, Lake St. Clair District, Lease, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).

San José Scale, Suppression of, &c. (remarks) 2759 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt. (post offices) 2807 (ii); (contingencies) 6626 (iv).

Excise (tobacco stamps) 7294 (iv).

Fisheries (dogfish extermination) 5923; (hatcheries) 5898 (iii).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 7280 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5867 (iii).

Post Office (mail service) 3155 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham) 4020 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6950; (Port Stanley) 6973; (Rondeau) 6984; (Thames river wharf) 6980 (iv).

Weights and Measures (gas inspection) 6627 (iv).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (brass coils) 2129 (ii), 4198 (iii); Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1220 (i); (malleable chains) 4391; (marble) 4191 (iii); (tomatoes) 1877 (i); (wool) 2369 (ii).

Thames River, Deepening Channel, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i). *See* 'Jeannette's Creek Wharf.'

Tobacco Duties, Change in Excise Regulations (remarks) 5861 (iii), 6142 (iv).

Tobacco Interests in Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7294 iv).

Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Amount imported from U. S., 1906 (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

Wire Fencing on Boundary Line between U.S. and N.W.T., Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*

Address, The, 111 (i).

Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6263 (iv).

Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4158 (iii).

Binder Twine, Drawbacks *re* Duty up to 1906 (Ques.) 1612 (i).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Brantford Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4599 (iii).
Budget, The, 441 (i).
Burford Armoury, Contract *re* Supply of Coal, &c. (Ques.) 1394 (i).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7798 (iv).
Dufferin Rifles, Delay in Payments of Men (Ques.) 4045 (iii).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2241 (ii), 4624, 4650; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4964 (iii).
Jamaica Disaster, &c. (remarks) 1613 (i).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 22 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 1096 (i).
Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cancellation of, &c. (Ques.) 473 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Bill, 7028 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlements B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3347, 3813 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 2966; (Yearbook) 2971 (ii).
Public Works Buildings — Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg immigration) 4601 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal mint) 3603 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich) 6950 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (binder twine) 2368 (ii); (brass, &c.) 4199 (iii); (cements) 2121 (ii); (chains) 4268; (clover seeds, &c.) 4144 (iii); (corks) 2136; (cotton fabrics) 2347 (ii); (dumping clause amts., binder twine) 1209 (i); (electric bulbs) 4193 (iii); (farm products) 1281 (i); (garden seeds, &c.) 4145; (glucose, &c.) 4181 (iii); (glue, &c.) 2118; (machinery for binder twine) 2135 (ii); (oils) 4187; (sugar 16 Dutch standard) 4149 (iii).
——— Discussion of Items standing (remarks) 1868 (i).

Conmee, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2263 (ii), 4626; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4965 (ii).
Electric Light Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7050 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7319, 7489 (iv).
I.C.R. Employes Pension Bund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2955 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7480, 7492 (iv).
Mines Dept. Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7218 (iv).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s incorp. (B. 167) 1° m., 7123 (iv).

Conmee, Mr. J.—*Con.*
——— Protest *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges *re*, on M. for Sup., 7898, 7919 (iv).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. German) for Precedence, 7482 (iv).
——— Pets *re*, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1923 (i).
Railway Act (fencing) Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 3723 (ii).
Simcoe County Judge, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 3638 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3290, 3802, 3850 (ii), 3980, 4460, 4780 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7537 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 7833; Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7827 (iv).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 1731, 1762 (i).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Protection and Preservation, Expenditure of Moneys, Ques. of Privilege *re* Press Reports, 277 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 6025 (iv).

Crawford, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*
Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 124) 1°*, 4839 (iii).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., Shortage of Fuel, on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7134 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4750, 4791, 4829 (iii).
Election Oaths, Form of, and Protests, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) to Com. of Sup., 7893 (iv).
Midway and Vernon Ry Co.'s (B. 123) 1°*, 4839 (iii).
Tariff (agricultural implements) 1375; (oatmeal) 1374 (i); (wagons) 2397 (ii).

Crocket, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Centreville, N.B., Customs Collectorship, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
G.T. Ry. Co., Payments to by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1470 (i).
——— Lands purchased at Moncton (Ques.) 1130 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., N.B. Section, Proposed Routes, Resurveys, &c. (Ques.) 469 (i).
——— Reps., &c. Inquiry for, 4118 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7010 (iv).

Crocket, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Ry., Quebec-Moncton Section Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 263 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3117 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7670 (iv).
G.T.P., Route from Chipman to Grand Falls, N.B. (Ques.) 2837 (ii).
——— Decision *re* Selection (Ques.) 2980 (ii).
I.C.R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1479 (i); in Com., 2910 (ii).
I.C.R., Bridge Strengthening, Amounts expended, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1469 (i).
——— Moncton Shops, Land Purchase (M. for ret.) Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2586 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 1131 (i).
——— Number of new Apptmnts, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1054 (i).
——— O'Rourke, Mr. John, Charges *re* Stolen Postage Stamps (Ques.) 3181, 3425 (ii).
MacIlreith, R. T., Payment to *re* Legal Services (Ques.) 2144, 2292 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.) 2585; Amt. (Mr. A. Johnston) 2587 (ii).
Moncton Park, N.B., Expropriation by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2985 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) to M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5346 (iii).
Reardon, Mr. F., Wages paid to Painters in Halifax (Ques.) 4218 (iii).
Representation in H. of C., from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2178 (ii).
Senators, Apptmnt. of in N.B., Residential Qualification, &c. (remarks) 1645 (i).
Senators, New, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 1381, 1473 (i).
Senate Vacancies from N.B., Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 708 (i).
Stanley, N.B., Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Rogers (Ques.) 7542 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2810 (ii).
Customs (collectors' salaries) 5979 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (bookkeeping reorganization) 5951 (iii); (Marconi stations) 5877 (iii).
Militia (clothing) 5740 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 4044 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton) 6074; (Dalhousie) 6076; (North Head) 6076; (St. John tributaries) 6077 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Marble Mountain wharf) 6050; (Parker's Cove) 6054 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 7670 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 7523; (Halifax) 7301; (Moncton shops) 7301; (Newcastle) 7300; (Sackville) 7298 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 5960 (iii).

Crocket, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
Supreme Court, N.B., Reorganization, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 3641 (ii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (cant dogs) 4430; (casket trimmings) 4433 (iii); (cheese) 1351 (i); (cutlery) 4430 (iii); intermediate tariff *re* G.B. and Foreign Countries, 993 (i); (malleable chains) 4393; (matrices) 4398 (iii); (wire fencing) 2133 (ii).

Daniel, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6270 (iv).
Cabinet Vacancy for N.B. (remarks) 6135 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2023 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2475 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4740 (iii).
'Empress of Ireland,' Delays in Canadian Fast Mails *re* Halifax Route (Ques.) 1059 (i).
Grain exported from Canada and U.S. Ports, &c. (Ques.) 475 (i).
G.T.R. and I.C.R. Running Rights, Terms, &c. (Ques.) 2835 (ii).
Importations from United Kingdom, Names of Ports, for 1904-5-6, &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement of Min. of Rys., 5249 (iii).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1482 (i); in Com., 2926 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Date of Issue to Militia, &c. (Ques.) 4452 (iii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 934 (i).
Lurcher Lightship, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).
Marine Hospitals, Mar. Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5882 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 606 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 111 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7068 (iv).
P. E. I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for copies, 3256 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5375, (amt.) 5378 (iii).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2157 (ii).
Ross Rifles, Date of Issue to Canadian Militia (Ques.) 4452 (iii).
Ross Rifle Inspection, &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1424 (i).

Daniel, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

St. John Harbour Improvements, Recommendation of Transportation Commission, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

St. John Harbour Life Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5769 (iii).

Senators, N.B., Apptmnt. of, Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1650 (i).

Stockton, Mr. A. A., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4758 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dublin exhibition) 6900 (iv); (Year-book) 2971 (ii), 7810 (iv).
Civil Govt. (post office) 2797 (ii).
Dom. Police (retiring allowances) 6900; (salaries, &c.) 6762 (iv).
Excise (B. C. officers) 6626 (iv).
Fisheries ('Canada's' ensign) 5972; (dogfish extermination) 5923; (fish curing) 5926; (legal expenses) 5970 (iii)
Geological Survey (gas borings) 3162 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys (steamer) 7685 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6760; (agents, G.B., &c.) 6708 (iv).
Indians—N. B. (seed grain) 7291 (iv).
Interior—Miscellaneous (Banff sewerage) 7279; (maps, &c.) 7275 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (bookkeeping) reorganization) 5949 (iii), 7678; (lighthouses) 7678 (iv); (repairs, maintenance, &c.) 5868 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Canada) 7108; (St. John and Digby) 7116; (St. John and Yarmouth) 7118 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5880 (iii).
Marine—Public Works (signal service) 5776 (iii.)
Militia (annual drill) 5736; (clothing) 5742; (pay and allowance) 5733; (properties) 5737; (rifle ranges) 5764 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (life saving stations) 5768 (iii); (life saving stations) 7678 (iv); (naval militia) 5773; (wrecking plants) 5772 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 3142 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Edmonton) 4037 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 4042 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 4021; (North Bay) 4023 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 4608; (Major's Hill park) 4609; (Rideau Hall conservatory) 4607; (ventilation, H. of C.) 4602 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration) 4009; (Nicolet) 4011; (Three Rivers drill hall) 4015; (trachoma hospital) 4012 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Cockfish) 6076; (Mispec) 6076. (Quaco pier) 6077; (St. John harbour) 6081 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Glace Bay) 6037; (Yarmouth) 6070 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Quebec harbour) 5979; (St. Mary's current) 6001 (iii).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 7677 (iv).

Daniel, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 7523; (Halifax) 7300; (Moncton shops) 7301; (Truro) 7300 (iv).
Railways—Railway Commission (counsel) 7669 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration) 6903, 7106 (iv).
Weights and Measures (gas inspection) 6627 (iv).

Tariff—British Preferential, on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) to Com. on Ways and Means, 4302, 4354 (iii).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means—(axes, scythes, &c.) 4418; (cutlery) 4430; (drawbacks) 4424 (iii); (drugs) 2116 (ii); (Indian corn) 1368 (i); (manila rope, &c.) 2407; (opium) in Com., 2117 (ii).

Tariff Res.—Preferential Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 527 (i).

Trade and Nav. Rets., Misprint as to Years (remarks) 278 (i).

Delisle, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Exchequer Court, Appmnt. of French Judge (Ques.) 3185 (ii).

Judges, Retired, Practising, Action of Govt. *re* (Ques.) 3370 (ii).

Judges Retirement and Superannuation in Quebec Prov. (Ques.) 3640 (ii).

Judges of Superior Court, Quebec, Number on Leave of Absence (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Superannuation of, Health, &c. (Ques.) 4046 (iii).

Pilots of Montreal, Tour de Role, System (Ques.) 4857 (iii).

Riley, James, Supt. of Pilots, Certificate and Qualifications (Ques.) 3641 (ii).

Routhier, Mr. Justice, Retirement of, &c. (Ques.) 4856 (iii).

Supreme Court, Appmnt. of Judge from Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 15 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7536 (iv).

Derbyshire, Mr. D., *Brockville.*

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 1119 (i).

Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5134 (iii).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 677 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co., 2-cent a mile Rate, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Ways and Means, 4378 (iii).

Derbyshire, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829 (iv).

Transportation Committee's Rep., &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Bennett) 1594 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Apples, Hay, Maple Sugar, &c, Exports for 1905-6, &c. (Ques.) 2581 (ii).

Butter Production and Exportation, Total Cost, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1145 (i).

Cheese for Exportation or Consumption in Can., Total Product, &c. (Ques.) 1143 (i).

Doncaster Indian Reserve, Completion of Survey (Ques.) 5024 (iii).

Devlin, Mr. C., *Nicolet.*

Berne Convention, Answer *re* Proclamation (Ques.) 7700 (iv).

Cigarettes, Manufacture, &c., Prohibition, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4081 (iii).

Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7796 (iv).

Dullman, Nolan and Walsh, Convicts in Kingston Pentitentiary, Clemency to (Ques.) 2577 (ii).

Election Act Amt., *re* Corruption and Frauds, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6812 (iv).

French Clergy exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6670 (iv).

French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3651 (ii).

G.B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2875 (ii).

I.C.R., Cars, &c., exchanged with U.S. Rys., Number, &c. (Ques.) 2578 (ii).

——— Fire Damage Claims at Manseau and Lemieux (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

——— Passenger Service from Nicolet (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

——— Station at St. Perpetue, Duties of Agent, &c. (Ques.) 2344 (ii)

Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7842 (iv).

Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Nicolet) in Com. on Res., 7808 (iv).

Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1539 (i).

——— French Edition, Delay in Distribution (Ques.) 2577 (ii).

Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 3°, 4991 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Grand Mechins) 6104 (iv).

Devlin, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

Address, The 108 (i).

Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5486 (iii).

Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7843 (iv).

Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).

Provincial Subsidies, Adress to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate, on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7747 (iv).

Senators, N.B., Apptmnt. of, Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1669 (i).

Dubeau, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

'Le Nationaliste,' Rep. *re* Speech, Ques. of Privilege, 3843 (ii).

Dugas, Mr. O., *Montcalm.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 1120 (i).

Tobacco Manufactures in Canada, Duties *re* Foreign Products (Ques.) 1924 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *East Algoma.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 130) 1°*, 5084 (iii).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 132) 1°*, 5084 (iii); in Com., 6585 (iv).

Ontario Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 133) 1°*, 5084 (iii).

St. Mary River Bridge Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 5084 (iii).

Elson, Mr. P., *East Middlesex.*

Boston, Robt., Apptmnt. as Inspector of Immigration (Ques.) 2143 (ii).

Horses imported into Canada, Minimum Value (Ques.) 1055 (i).

London Post Office Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7251 (iv).

New Zealand Flax, Experiment, &c., for Binder Twine (Ques.) 5286 (iii).

St. Louis, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3639 (ii).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means—(agricultural implements) 1352; (agricultural products) 1352 (i); (animals for breeding purposes) 4597 (iii); (butter) 1352; (hay, &c.) 1867 (i); (Paris green) 2120; (wire fencing) 2133; (wool) 2381 (ii).

Wellburn Post Office, Pet. *re* Daily Mail Service (Ques.) 896 (i)

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Westmoreland.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 5205 (iii).

Beauharnois Canal, Charges *re*, Investigation in 1906, &c. (Ans.) 1389 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Beauharnois Canal, Water Power, Disposal of by Govt. (Ans.) 1388 (i).
Campbell, Mr. Narcisse, Application *re* Farm Crossing, Delay, &c. (Ans.) 565 (i).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).
C.P.R. and Crow's Nest Line, Agreement *re* Carriage of Coal (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
C. P. R. Subways at Calgary, Order from Ry. Board, &c. (Ans.) 2290 (ii).
Canals Expenditure for 1907-8, Total Revenues &c. (Ans.) 567 (i).
Charing Cross Station, Closing of, &c. (remarks) 1109 (i).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. res. (Mr. Black) 1463 (i).
Gibson Creek, P. E. I., Privileges *re* Laying of Water Pipes, &c. (Ans.) 2575 (ii).
Govt. Railways, Chief Accountant, Apptmnt., Duties, &c. (Ans.) 722 (i).
G. T. P. Ry., Advertisements for Tenders in Quebec (Ans.) 3183 (ii).
——— and C. N. Ry. Cos., Winnipeg Terminals (B. 128) 1° m., 4929 (iii).
See 'Winnipeg Terminals.'
——— Cars, Number in Operation (Ans.) 5024 (iii).
——— Chipman to Grand Falls Route, &c. (Ans.) 2837 (ii).
——— Chipman-Grand Falls Route, Decision *re* Selection (Ans.) 2981 (ii).
——— Commissioners' Annual Rep., Delay in Presenting (Ans.) 1045 (i).
——— Commission, Employees at Ottawa, Numbers and Salaries (Ans.) 715, 885 (i).
——— Contracts for Construction, Signing of (denial) 3727 (ii).
——— Contracts *re* Steam Shovels (Ans.) 3182 (ii).
——— Contract for Ties, &c., Prices, &c. (Ans.) 1396, 1559 (i).
——— Lands purchased at Moncton (Ans.) 1131 (i).
——— Medical Health Officers, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 2633 (ii).
——— Moncton Route, Surveys, Incomplete Ret., on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3125 (ii).
——— N. B. Section, Proposed Route, Resurveys, &c. (Ans.) 469 (i).
——— Number of Miles constructed, &c. (Ans.) 5506 (iii).
——— Payette, Mr. Philias, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2985 (ii).
——— Progress of Work, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 469 (i).
——— Ry. from Quebec to Lake Pohenegamook, Total Length and Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3886 (ii).
——— Surveys, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1394 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Tax Exemption in N. W. Provs., Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1611 (i).
——— Total Yardage, Winnipeg Div., Govt. Policy *re* Labour, &c. (Ans.) 1800 (i).
——— Western Div., Cost of Construction, Guarantee Bonds, Reps. *re* (Ans.) 3635 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4443; on M. for 3°, 4846 (iii).
G. T. Ry., Madoc-Eldorado Extension, Pet. to Govt. (Ans.) 614 (i).
I.C.R. Employees' Pension Fund (B. 68) prop. Res., 1297; in Com. on Res., 1473; 1°*, 1501 (i); 2°* and in Com., 2907; in Com., 2907; 3°*, 3002 (ii); on Senate Amts., 4865 (iii).
I.C.R., Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 5177, 5205 (iii).
——— Accidents, Compensation to Injured, &c. (remarks)) *re* Question, 1056 (i).
——— Automobile Cars on Rivière Ouelle Branch (Ans.) 3837 (ii).
——— Carpets purchased, Canadian-made or Foreign (Ans.) 3637 (ii).
——— Carpets purchased, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3634 (ii).
——— Cars, &c., Exchanged with U.S. Rys. (Ans.) 2578 (ii).
——— Chaudière Junction Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 1133 (i).
——— Drummond Branch, Outlay in Mitchell and St. Leonard (Ans.) 5086 (iii).
——— Drummondville Improvements (Ans.) 1133 (i).
——— Elgin Road Station, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 718 (i).
——— Fire Damage Claims at Manseau and Lemieux Station (Ans.) 3633 (ii).
——— Fish Transportation, Quantity and Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 4850 (iii).
——— Freight Rates, Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Levis, on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 728 (i).
——— Galena Oil Co., Purchases from, &c. (Ans.) 712 (i).
——— Gibson, N.B., Water Tank, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 2983 (ii).
——— G.T.R. Running Rights, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 2836 (ii).
——— McDougall, Mr. Bruce, Emplymt. by Govt., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 711 (i).
——— McPhee Automatic Signalling Co., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 2835 (ii).
——— Mail Service from Halifax and St. John (remarks) on M. to adjn., 2205 (ii).
——— Midnight Train from Montreal to Levis (Ans.) 3181 (ii).
——— Moncton Lands acquired by Govt. (Ans.) 1131 (i), 3885 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Motor Cars, Investigation and Rep. by Mr. Joughins (Ans.) 723 (i).
——— Number of new Apptmnts., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1054 (i).
——— Officials, Alleged Misconduct, Investigation *re* Rep., on M. for Copy (Mr. Barker) 725 (i).
——— O'Rourke, Mr. John, Charges *re* Sale of Postage Stamps (Ans.) 1130 (i), 3181 (ii).
——— Pass issued to Sir Wm. Mulock (Ans.) 712 (i).
——— Passenger Service from Nicolet (Ans.) 3632 (ii).
——— Passenger Tariff, Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Levis, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 729 (i).
——— Payments to Geo. Cochrane *re* Supplies, on M. (Mr. Barker) for Ret., 725 (i).
——— Pictou Station, Amount of Contract (Ans.) 4857 (iii).
——— Reps. and Complaints *re* Coal supplied (Ans.) 1810 (i).
——— Roundhouse at Halifax, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 486 (i).
——— Rivière du Loup, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1133 (i).
——— Ste. Flavie Improvements (Ans.) 1132 (i).
——— Ste. Rosalie Improvements (Ans.) 1134 (i).
——— Safety Valve Co., Adoption of Patent (Ans.) 2834 (ii).
——— Scrap Iron, Sale to H. J. Garson, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 3839 (ii).
——— Scrap Metal at Moncton Fire, Sale of (Ans.) 3838 (ii).
——— Servis Tie Plate Co., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 2835 (ii).
——— Train Service at Rimouski, Complaints *re* Delays in Mails, &c. (Ans.) 615 (i).
——— Windsor Branch Lease to Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co., &c. (Ans.) 1141 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 915 (i).
McCallum, Duncan, Claims *re* Drowning in Trent Canal (Ans.) 5023 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3884 (iii).
McLaren's Creek Roadway, Completion of (Ans.) 468 (i).
Madoc-Eldorado Ry. Extension, Enforcement of Provisions *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 1064 (i).
Madoc-Eldorado Ry. Subsidy, Payments to G.T.R. (Ans.) 950, 1130 (i).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 4976, 5205 (iii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Moncton Park, N.B., Expropriation by Govt. (Ans.) 2985 (ii).
New Brunswick Supply Co., Purchase by Govt. *re* Rys. (Ans.) 152 (i).
O'Rourke, John, Arrest by Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 1130 (i), 3181 (ii).
Otonabee River Water Power, Lease of, &c. 4612 (iii).
Pictou Roundhouse, Dimensions, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4855 (iii).
Port Colborne, Grain Elevator, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 483 (i).
——— Improvement, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 484 (i).
Praught, Ed., Claims for Compensation *re* Injuries on P.E.I. Ry. (Ans) 4456 (iii)
P.E.I. Life-saving Stations *re* Wrecking (explanation) 993 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service (remarks) 1087 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Charges *re* Protests *re* Winter time table, &c. (Ans.) 1807 (i).
——— Claims *re* Fire Damages, &c. (Ans.) 1808 (i).
——— Coal Supply, Inferior Quality, &c. (Ans). 1144 (i).
——— Freight Rates, Res. of Board of Trade (Ans.) 717 (i).
——— Motor Cars, Experiments *re* (Ans.) 1383 (i).
——— Murray Harbour and Montague Branch, Expropriation of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 470 (i).
——— Officials, Investigation *re* Charges (Ans.) 1146 (i).
——— O'Leary and West Cape Branch, Reps. Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr Lefurgey) for Copies, 1811 (i).
——— Summerside Freight Shed, Rebuilding, of (Ans.) 1136 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Deptl. Documents (explanation) 3000 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) to M. for 3°, 3175 (ii).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4969 (iii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2453; on M. to ref. back to Com., 2526 (ii); on Sen. Amts. 4412 (iii).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 957 (i).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3679 (ii).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°. 980 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Printing and Advertising, &c.. Amounts paid, (Ans.) 1563 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1119 (i).

——— Minister's Portfolio (resignation) 5555 (iii).

Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1857 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 2206 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for *re* Pub. Accounts Com., 3889 (ii).

Ste. Perpetue, Station on I.C.R., Duties of Agent, (Ans.) 2344 (ii).

St. Timothée and Grand Isle Road, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).

Senators, Apptmnt. of in N.B., Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1659 (i).

"Sovinto", Wreck of, Rep. *re* Special Train for Life-saving Boats (Ans.) 1064 (i).

Sparks Estate, Claims *re* Ry. Terminals (Ans.) 710 (i).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (St. John Harbour improvements) 5548 (iii).
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5552 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (slope wall), 5548 (iii).
Canals—Quebec (cement) 5551 (iii).
Canals—Soulanges (Clement's Gully Bridge) 5548; (improvements) 5548; (maintenance) 5551; (Manny's gate bars) 5548 (iii).

Transportation Committee's Rep. (J. H. Ashdown) Consdn. of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1595 (i).

Trent Canal, Outlet at Trenton, on M. (Mr. Ward) to adjn. 3628 (ii).

——— Rice Lake, Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1935 (i).

——— Severn Route, &c. (remarks) 4840 (iii).

——— Survey by E. J. Walsh, Cost of, &c. (Ans.) 4635 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 713 (i).

Trent Canal Waters Powers, Leased or Owned by the Govt. (Ans.) 565 (i).

Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2315, (amt.) 2324 (ii).

Wallberg, A. E., Contracts *re* Govt. Rys. (Ans.) 1052 (i).

Wallace Quarries, Branch Ry., Govt. Aid *re* (Ans.) 2583 (ii).

Welland Canal, Water Power, amount contracted for, &c. (Ans.) 1924 (i).

Welland Canal and Cataract Power Co., Application *re* Water Power, &c. (Ans.) 3187 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector and Customs Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 5550 (iii).

Winnipeg Terminals, C. N. and G. T. P. Rys. (B. 128) 1° m., 4929; 2° m., 5512; in Com., 5515 (iii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*

SUPPLY—
Legislation—H. of C. (debates, salaries) 7974.

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*

American Bank Note Co., Payments to since 1897 (Ans.) 885 (i).

American Silver exported by Banks, Commissions paid, &c. (Ans.) 233 (i).

Assets of Canada, Interest and non-interest-bearing, Total Amount (Ans.) 3882 (ii).

Associated Press Subsidy, Reps. in English Newspaper *re* Canadians (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Athabaska Fish Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 5864 (iii), 6259 (iv).

Atlantic Mail Service, (remarks) 7186 (iv).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 2480, 2727 (ii).

——— (Vol. II.)—(presented) 4008 (iii).

——— (Vol. III.)—(presented) 1119 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 703, 1044, 1091, 1471 (i), 1991, 2344 (ii).

Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of (remarks) 5859 (iii), 6009 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).

Barges Inspection B. 35 (Mr. Laurence) on M. for 1°, 1036 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties (B. 174) prop. Res. 5887 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7515; 1° m., 7517; on Senate Amts., 7986 (iv).

Binder Twine Item, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).

Boots and Shoes, and Tanners Combine, in Com. on Way and Means, 4576 (iii).

Budget Speech, Discussion *re* Tariff Changes (remarks) 238 (i).

Budget Speech and distribution of Public Accounts and Nav. Rets. (remarks) 93 (i).

Budget, The, (financial statement) 278 (i).

——— *See* "Ways and Means."

Cabinet Vacancy for N.B. (remarks) 6135 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4411 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 175) 1° m., 7694 (iv).

Canada and U. S. Treaty Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 6258 (iv).

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 4558 (iii).

Chartered Bank Rep. (presented) 7780 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 156) 1°*, 6256; (M.) to dschg, Order, 7793 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7794 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7686 (iv).

Civil Service Employees, Ottawa, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2289 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Question, 2140 (ii).

Coal Strikes in the West, Further Information *re* (remarks) 7985 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. House, 7176 (iv).

——— location of Dep. Min. of Labour (remarks) 423 (i).

Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c. on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1461 (i).

Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. House, 5273 (iii).

Colonial Securities *re* Investment of Trust Funds (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 4546 (iii).

Collingwood Dry Dock, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) Reference to Proceedings before Pub. Accounts Com., 5846 (iii).

Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. to sit concurrently with Hse, 6835 (iv).

Contractors Deposits for Security, &c. (remarks) 1386 (i).

Crow's Nest Coal, Assurances of Govt. *re* (remarks) *re* Question, 6905 (iv).

Customs Act Amt. (B. 134) 1° m., 5015 ; 2° and in Com. 5510 ; (M.) to report from Com. 5562 ; on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5617 ; 3° m., 5627; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5630 (iii).

Debates, Official, Staff Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7976 (iv).

Denatured Spirits, Ref. to in debate on Budget, 304 (i).

See 'Spirits.'

Dillinger, Mr., Investigation *re* Shortage of Cars in N. W. (remarks) 7252, 7311 (iv).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 72 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7438 (iv).

Dom. Notes, Printing in French (Ans.) 6015 (iv).

Draper, Mr. P. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6635, 7247 (iv).

Elections Act, Amt. *re* Corruption and Frauds on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6815 (iv).

Election Oaths, Form of, &c. (remarks) 7944 (iv).

Estimates (1907-8) Presented, 278 (i).

——— Suppl. (1908) presented, 7213 (iv).

———Further Suppl. (1908) presented, 7837 (iv).

Express Co.'s Rates, Revision of (remarks) 5861 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

"Favoured Nation" Treaties, with Foreign Countries, Commercial Arrangements with Italy, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).

Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 164 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 7313 (iv).

Financial Situation—Public Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7856 (iv).

French Language, action by Min. of Railways *re* extending (Ans.) 6014 (iv).

German and Canadian Tariff, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1149 (i).

German Maximum Tariff, and Fiscal Relations, &c. (Ans.) 1129 (i).

German Tariff Treaties, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 ; Memorial from House of Commons and Senate (read) 856 (i).

See 'Tariff,' 'Preferential.'

Gold and Silver Coins, in Com., 2130 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Macpherson) 2° m. and (M.) to refer to Banking and Commerce Com., 6008 ; in Com., 7012 (iv).

'Golspie,' SS. Wreck of, Rep. of Commissioner, on Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2346 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2732 (ii).

Govt. Deposits in Banks, Total Amount, Interest *re* (Ans.) 4211 (iii).

Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c. (remarks) 6378, 7410 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6684 (iv).

——— (remarks) on Notice (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6664 (iv).

Govt. Rys., Running Rights, Proposals *re* (Ans.) 5780 (iii).

G. T. Ry. Accounts furnished to Inspector General &c. (Ans.) 5027 (iii).

——— Use of Rolling Stock of G. T. P. &c., Terms and Conditions (Ans.) 5657 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Guarantee Bonds, Total Amount (Ans.) 3635 (ii).

——— Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) to Conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5039 (iii).

——— Quebec Bridge Route, Contract &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7832 (iv).

——— Quebec Station Site, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1952 (i).

——— Route in N.B., Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7010 (iv).

——— Route through N. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7675 (iv).

——— Steel Rails, Tenders for, &c. (Ans.) 7006 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7186 (iv).
——— Telegram (read) 6790 (iv).
Industrial and Co-operative Societies B. No. 2 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 592 (i).
Immigration Legislation in B. C., Assent to by Lt. Gov. (remarks) 7985 (iv).
Inspection and Sales Act Amt. (B. 162) 1°*, 6630 (iv).
I.C.R., Cars in U.S., Return of, &c., (Ans.) 7248 (iv).
——— Moncton Shops, Land purchased, on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) to M. for Ret., 2587 (ii).
——— Passenger Agent, Emplymt. of John Matthews (Ans.) 6905 (iv).
——— Rolling Stock, Number of Cars in U.S. (Ans.) 7007 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties (B. 173) prop. Res., 5888; (M.) *re* Com. on Res., 4612 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7444, 7505; 1° m., 7514; in Com., 7515 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Item (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
Iron or Steel Railway Bars, in Com., 2131 (ii).
Insurance Commission, in Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).
Insurance Commission Bill, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7251 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Ministers of Cabinet, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5470 (iii).
——— Evidence laid on Table (M.) to print, &c., 3722, 3723 (ii).
——— Evidence, Exhibits, &c., Printing of (remarks) 3844 (ii), 4118 (iii).
——— Evidence *re* Printing and Distribution to Members (remarks) 93 (i).
——— Evidence, Printing (explanation) *re* Delay, 3881 (ii).
——— Evidence, Printing in French (remarks) on M. to Conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7003 (iv).
——— Exhibits, on Inquiry for, 4441, 4616 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep., 2769 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 4442 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to consider 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 5176 (iii).
——— M. from Senate for Papers (M.) 5258 (iii).
——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Foster) 5859 (iii).
——— Number of Copies distributed (remarks) 3889 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) on M. (Mr. Foster) to have Words taken down, 6403 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Insurance Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6922 (iv).
——— Rep., Translation, &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in amended Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Jamaica Disaster, in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
——— Govt. Grant (announcement) 1698 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1879 (i).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 2220 (ii).
See 'N.S.'
Labour Disputes Bill, Distribution of (remarks) 1330 (i).
See 'Coal,' &c.
Long Sault Rapids and International Waterways (remarks) 7544 (iv).
McGee, Thos. D'Arcy, Monument to, &c. (Ans.) 7701 (iv).
McIlwraith, Mr., Charges *re* Halifax Newspapers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7522 (iv).
Magazines, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4185 (iii).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 6204 (iv).
Marier, Mr. J. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7541 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Rep. (presented) 4518 (iii).
Marriages (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7850 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Bill, Consideration of (remarks) 7517 (iv).
Medals Claims Board, Duties, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 6633 (iv).
Metals, Tariff Changes (read) in Budget Speech, 313 (i).
Members occupying Seats on Govt. Side (remarks) 5890 (iii).
Militia Headquarters Staff, Names, Rank, Ages, &c. (Ans.) 6634, 7700 (iv).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7212, 7218; on Sen. Amts., 7840 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan (B. 166) prop. Res, 5781 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7055; in Com., 7569 (iv).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry., Tracks on Mill St., Montreal (Ans.) 7984 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt., Amount collected, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 508 (i).
National Transcontinental Ry. Commission's Re. (remarks) 7010 (iv).
See 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5590 (iii).
Northwestern Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 31 (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com., 4008 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
N. S. Judiciary, Vacancy *re* (remarks) 2220 (ii), 6765 (iv).
Office Specialty Company, Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto "News" (remarks) 6911 (iv).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Meetings, &c. (Ans.) 6906 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Balance Sheet, 3002 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for O. C., 1991 (ii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7210 (iv).
Patent Medicines Bill (remarks) *re* proceeding with, 7439 (iv).
Petawawa Camp (remarks) 6910 (iv).
——— Compensation to Townships *re* Taxes (remarks). 6519 (iv).
——— Confiscation of by Govt., on Inquiry for Papers (Mr. S. Hughes) 6765 (iv).
——— Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7619, 7650 (iv).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3893 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7924 (iv).
Postal Rates, Reduction, &c., on Ques. of Order (remarks) 6631 (iv).
Post Office Employees, Salary Increases (remarks) 6521 (iv).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6647 *See* 'German,' &c.
Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7097 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry., Mr. W. Kitchen, Payments to (Ans.) 7984 (iv).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 6377 (iv).
——— Winter Communication, Terms of Union, &c. (Ans.) 1927 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Montreal 'Star,' 6908 (iv).
——— Ques. of (Mr. Wm. Roche), 6544 (iv).
Prorogation and Govt. Business, Bill withdrn (statement) 7438 (iv).
Provincial Rights, Tel. from Premier of Ont. (remarks) in Com. on Hamilton Radial Bill, 7382 (iv).
See 'Petawawa.'
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5321 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5367 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr Daniel) 5379 (iii)
——— Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5345 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5383 (iii).
——— (M.) to reconsider, 7410 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7705

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies and Boundaries, Additions since Confederation (Ans.) 5286 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, Correction *re* (M.) to receive back from Senate, 7052 (iv).
——— Mess. to Senate (M.) 7775 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, &c. from Senate, in Com. on Res., 7750 (iv).
——— Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate (prop. res.) 7701 (iv).
Public Accounts Com. on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 6765 (iv).
Public Accounts Rep. (presented) 219 (i).
——— Distribution of (remarks) 9 (i).
Pulp Wood, made and cut in Canada, Export Duty *re* (Ans.) 888 (i).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan (B. 169) prop. Res., 6906; in Com. on Res., 7230; 2° m., 7939; on M. for 2° 7946; in Com., 7955 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co., Discussion *re* (remarks) 7009 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners (B. 159) 1° m., 6518; in Com., 7545 (iv).
Quebec-Levis Ferry Service, Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 6256 (iv).
Railway Act (1903) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) 3° m., 7012 (iv).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3688 (ii).
See 'Two-Cent,' &c.
Railway Act (canal penalties) Amt. (B. 170) 1° m., 7246; in Com., 7808 (iv).
Railways Subsidies (presented) 7126 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7799; (Canadian Northern Ry.) 7807; (C.P.R., Gagetown branch) 7803; (C.P.R., Nicola branch) 7805; (Central Ontario Ry.) 7802; (Dom. Atlantic Ry.) 7805; (Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry.) 7805; (Fredericton and Woodstock) 7806; (Inverness Ry. Co) 7804; (Nicolet) 7808; (Temiscouata Ry.) 7807; (Woodstock, N.B.) 7802 (iv).
Residential Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 161) 1°*, 6519; in Com., 7014 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2479, 2763 (ii), 5890 (iii).
Rideau Canal Reserve, Lease of, *re* Brick Factory (Ans.) 6904 (iv)
——— (remarks) 6913 (iv).
Rougemont Senatorship, on Inquiry (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 7518 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 7011 (iv).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3371 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6766 (iv).
Saturday Sittings (M.) 7125 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Saturday Sittings (remarks) 7001 (iv).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7780 (iv).
Smith, Lt. Col. H., Medals Board, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 7248 (iv).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants Bill (remarks) 7311 (iv).
——— P. E. I. Volunteers, Memorial *re* Land Grants (Ans.) 7542 (iv).
Spirits, Denatured for Power Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 223 (i).
See "Tariff".
Supply Bill No. 96 (Jamaica grant) 1°*, 2°* and 3°*, 2727 (ii).
Supply (B. 141) M. for Com. on Res., 5395; 1°* 5397; 2° m. and in Com., 5561 (iii).
Supply Bill (Interim) Announcement *re* 5284 (iii).
Supply (B. 179) M. for Com., 7990 (iv); 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 7993 (iv).
Supply (M.) for Com., 4657 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Connaught, Prince Arthur of, visit) 6901 (iv).
Canals—Beauharnois (south bank) 7668; (staff) 7534; (Valleyfield banks) 7539 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7537 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (gate lifter) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Galops (construction) 7530; (entrance) 7530; (Gilbert contract) 7531; (retaining walls) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Murray (piers, &c.) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (O'Toole, J., claim, &c.) 7538; (tug-boat) 7669 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (Cascades wharf) 7535; (electrical staff) 7535, 7666 (iv).
Canals—Trent (construction) 7667; (Curtis Bros'. claims) 7538; (improvement) 7534; (surveys, &c.) 7531; (tow boat) 7534 (iv).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 7531; (Port Maitland wall) 7534 (iv).
Civil Govt. (Aud. Gen.'s office) 2764 (ii); Finance (increases, &c.) 7690 (iv); (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 2763 (ii), 7685; High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 7692 (iv); Militia (salaries) 7686 (iv); (Post Office) 2812 (ii).
Dom. Police (retiring allowances) 6900 (iv).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 7295 (iv).
Fisheries (dogfish extermination) 5922; (fish transportation) 5936; (jurisdiction of provs.) 5913; (legal expenses) 5971; (oyster culture) 5912 (iii).
Legislation-H. of C. (debates salaries) 7976; (library books) 6763; (voters' lists) 6764 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (book-keeping reorganization) 5948 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 7121; (Canada and Mexico) 7122; (Canada and S. Africa) 7119; (Gaspé Basin) 7120; (G.B. and Canada) 7107; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 7118; (Halifax to Liverpool via Newfoundland) 7116; (Halifax and Yarmouth) 7118; (Magdalen Islands) 7118; (Montreal and Manchester) 7119; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 7122; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 7120; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7118; (P.E.I. and mainland) 7118; (Quebec and Murray Bay) 7121; (St. John and Digby) 7116; (St. John, Dublin and Belfast) 7116; (St. John and Glasgow) 7116; (St. John, Halifax and London) 7116; (St. John and W. Indies) 7117; (Sydney and Whycocomagh) 7121; (Victoria and San Francisco) 7117 (iv).
Militia (properties, &c.) 7981 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 7982; (insurance commission) 6280, 6473; (insurance commission, printing, &c.) 7972 (iv); (Jamaica, grant to sufferers) 2726 (ii); (Pacific cable) 7971 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (compensation *re* accidents) 7837; (pay of force) 7834 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Glace Bay) 3973; (Shelburne) 3974; (Westville) 3974; Ottawa (eastern block) 3951; (tower investigation) 3616 (ii).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Marconi stations) in conc., 7987 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 7675; (surveys, construction) 7530 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Amherst) 7298; (Antigonish 7300; (bridge strengthening) 7523; (drawbars) 7307; (facilities) 7521; (Halifax) 7300; (Indiantown branch) 7663; (maintenance) 7534; (Moncton shops) 7301; (Mulgrave) 7297; (Newcastle) 7299; (New Glasgow) 7663; (Pictou) 7298; (Pirate harbour, water service) 7300; (rolling stock) 7664; (St. John accommodation) 7663; (Ste. Rosalie) 7522; (Sackville) 7298; (Stellarton) 7298; (Syney) 7298; (Truro) 7300 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Brunet, A. remuneration) 7539, 7669 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 7524; (fire damages) 7666; (Murray Harbour branch) 7526 (iv).
Railways—Railway Commission (counsel) 7669; (maintenance) 7534 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (agents salaries) 7097; (grain trade commission) 7983; (iron and steel bounties) 6903 (iv).
Unprovided Items, (general vote) 6902 (iv).
Tariff British Preference on goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4356 (iii).
Tariff Resolutions (presented) 327 (i); amended Resolutions (M.) for Com., 2986 (ii).
Tariff Resolutions, Clerical Errors (remarks) 513 (i).
——— (statement) 524 (i).
——— Colonial Conference and Offer of Imp. Govt. *re* Preference &c. (Ans.) 893 (i).
——— Customs Act Repeal, in Com., 4547 (iii).
Tariff Index, Distribution of (remarks) 424 (i)
——— on inquiry for, 513 (i).
Tariff—French Treaty (remarks) in Com., 1253 (i).
Tariff, Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
——— Application to Foreign Countries *re* (Ans.) 489 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Tariff, Intermediate, Extension to British or Foreign Countries, in Com. on Ways and Means, 845, 996 (i).
——— Negotiations, Pour Parlers, &c. (remarks) 7938 (iv).
——— Preference and Colonial Conference, Memorandum *re* (Ans.) 893 (i).
Tariff Items, Procedure *re* (remarks) 514 (i).
——— Items standing, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1868 (i), 2405 (ii).
Tariff Modifications, Delegations *re* (Ans.) 891 (i).
Tariff—M. (Mr. Taylor) to increase Taxation, 1350 (i).
Tariff Resolutions, Operation, Date of, in Com., 4439 (iii).
Tariff Res., Preferential Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 527 (i).
Tariff, Paper Combines, in Com. on Tariff, 2053 (ii).
Tariff—Preferential Tariff, Distinction between G.B. and other Colonies of the Empire, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
Tariff—Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1230 (i).
Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence (remarks) 423 (i).
——— (Ans.) 709 (i).
Tariff—U.S. Duties, Comparisons, &c. in Com., 1197 (i).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (acetone), 4183 (iii); (agricultural implements) 1355 (i), 4402 (iii); (alum cake) 2115 (ii); (animals, &c.) in Com., 1254; (apples) 1893 (i); (automobiles) 2399 (ii); (barley) 1362; (beeswax) 1332; (berries) 1894 (i), 4148 (iii); (beet root sugar) 4153. (binders) 4427 (iii); (binder twine) 2368 (ii), 4438 (iii); (biscuits) 1865 (i); (books) 2050 (ii); (boots and shoes) 4558; (brass, &c.) 4196 (iii); (brass bars) 2129 (ii); (brass, rolled, &c.) 4555; (breadstuffs) 4143 (iii); (bridging material) 2400 (ii); (britannia metal) 4204 (iii); (British gum) 2121 (ii); (bronze, &c.) 4194 (iii); (brushes, &c.) 2406 (ii); (button blanks) 4550; (casket trimmings) 4432; (caustic soda) 4552 (iii); (cement, &c.) 2122 (ii); (cereals, &c.) 1858 (i); (chains) 4265 (iii); (cheese) 1333; (chickory) 1360 (i); (coal) 2397 (ii); (coal for smelting) 4434 (iii); (cocoa nibs) 1359; (coffee) 1360 (i); (coil chains) 4265 (iii); (collars, &c.) 2406 (ii); (condensed milk) 1361 (i); (confectionery) 4182; (cordage lines, &c.) 4550 (iii); (corks) 2136; (cotton fabrics) 2347 (ii); (cream separators) 1192 (i); (crucibles) 4191 (iii); (curling stones) 2123 (ii); (cutlery) 4430; (dates, &c.) 4148 (iii); (denatured alcohol) 2045; (diamond dust) 2130 (ii); (disinfectants) 4185; (drawbacks) 4423 (iii); (drugs) 2115 (ii); (dumping clause) 1000; (dumping clause, amts.) 1186; dumping clause amts. (binder twine) 1207 (i); (electric bulbs) 4193 (iii); (excise duty, &c.) 1252; (farm products) 1260 (i); (fire brick) 4190 (iii); (fish, &c.) 1919 (i); (flax seed) 4144 (iii); (florist stock) 1868 (i), 4148, 4421 (iii); (fruits, &c.) 1908 (i); (fur skins) 2401 (ii); (galvanized iron) 4264; (garden seeds, &c.) 4145, 4389; (german silver) 4389; (glass, raw) 4435; (glassware) 4193 (iii); (glycerines, &c.) 2407; (glue, &c.) 2118; (granite, &c.) 2134; (gypsum) 2123 (ii); (hay, &c.) 1867 (i); (horse powers) 4419, 4549; (Indian corn) 1362 (i); (iron angles) 4434 (iii); (iron, &c., pipe) 2133 (ii); (iron scrap) 4207; (iron or steel beams) 4207; (iron or steel billets) 4207 (iii); (iron or steel nuts, &c.) 2134; (iron or steel tubing) 2132 (ii), 4265, 4549 (iii); (lamp black, &c.) 2120 (ii); (lamp springs) 4394 (iii); (lime juice) 2044; (locomotives, &c.) 2134 (ii); (mackintosh clothing) 4432 (iii); (macaroni) 1866 (i); (machinery from G. B., preferential duty, &c.) 4551 (iii); (magazines) 2051 (ii); (malleable chains) 4390; (malt flour) 4182 (iii); (manila rope, &c.) 2407; (marble) 2124 (ii); (matrices) 4396, 4548 (iii); (medicines) 2116 (ii); (melons, &c.) 1909; (metallic trading checks) 2413 (ii), 4438 (iii); (military stores, &c.) 2409 (ii); (mining machinery) 4420; (molasses) 4180 (iii); (mould boards) 2134 (ii); (nuts, &c.) 1919; (oats) 1372 (i); (oils, &c.) 2121 (ii), 4187 (iii); (opium) 2117; (paper) 2051; (Paris green) 2120 (ii); (peas) 1361; (pickles, &c.) 1886 (i); (pig iron) 4427; (plums, &c.) 4148; (portable engines) 4417 (iii); (potash) 2115 (ii); (printing materials) 4548 (iii); (printing paper) 2053 (ii); (proof spirit) 526 (i); (pulp wood) 2064 (ii); (rice, &c.) 1858 (i); (rice, sago, &c.) 4143 (iii); (roofing, &c.) 2127 (ii); (roofing slate) 4192 (iii); (rolled iron and steel) 526; (rye) 1859; (sago, &c.) 1859 (i); (seeds, clover, &c.) 4144 (iii); (settlers' effects) 2408; (spirits) 2110 (ii); (starch) 1361 (i); (steel bars) 4209; (steel shafting) 4209; (stove urns) 4419; (structural steel) 4207; (sugar, 16 Dutch standard) 4149 (iii); (tea) 1360 (i); (time-tables, &c.) 4184 (iii); (tomatoes) 1870 (i), 4148 (iii); (trunks, &c.) 2405 (ii); (typewriters) 4549 (iii); (unenumerated items) 2411 (ii); (vegetables) 1881 (i); (vessels, &c.) 2389; (wax, &c.) 2117; (whale oil soap) 2117; (whips) 2402 (ii); (white lead) 4186; (wire cables) 4422 (iii); wire fencing)

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Tariff, The—*Con.*
2133; (wines) 2048; (wool) 2369; (wool batting) 2347 (ii); (wrought iron) 4264; (wrought iron tubes) 4209 (iii); (zinc dust) 2128 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Return, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7252 (iv).
Temporary Loans since Jan. 1, 1906, Rate of Interest, &c (Ques.) 235 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'
Tobacco Excise Duties, Changes in, &c. (remarks) 6141 (iv).
Traders' Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 5285 (iii).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. res (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2337 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Borden) and Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 7575 (iv).
See Ry. B. 6.'
Warships on Great Lakes (remarks) 6279, 6910 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6378, 6618 (iv).
Ways and Means—The Budget (financial statement) 278 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, Customs Act, in Com., 524 (i).
Ways and Means, in Com., 844; (M.) for Com,. 1097 (i).
Winnipeg Terminals (B. 128) 3°. m., 5670 (iii), 6259 (iv).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5697 (iii).
Yukon Banks, Commission paid to Canadian Bank of Commerce (Ans.) 4272 (iii).
Yukon—McInnes, Mr. W. B., Resignation of (Ans.) 2293 (ii).

Finlayson, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*
Public Accounts Com., 2nd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., *re* Sittings, 3840 (ii).
St. Leon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 140) 1°, 5441 (iii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6267 (iv).
Agriculture, Deptl. Changes, &c. (Ans.) 1392 (i).
Agricultural Com., on Inquiry for Evidence, 3001 (ii).
Alberta and Saskatchewan Provs., Population, Details, Copies laid on Table, 1472 (i).
Art Gallery, Committee of Artists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep (P.O. Dept. and N.W. Police) (presented) 3546 (ii).
Barrel, Legal Size, Recommendation from Dom. Horticultural Council, &c. (Ans.) 1390 (i).
Belle River Pier, P.E.I., Rep. *re* Extension, &c. (Ans.) 484 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Belleville Harbour Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1398 (i)
Belleville Revetment Wall, Contract, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 1398 (i).
Berne Convention, Answer *re* Proclamation (Ans.) 7700 (iv).
Bowmanville Poultry Station, Cost of Maintenance (Ans.) 3369 (ii).
Bracebridge, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Brick, Mr. T. A., Emplymnt. by Govt. *re* Census in Alberta (Ans.) 1135 (i).
Butter Production and Exportation, Quantity, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1145 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection (B. 33) M. for Com. on Res., 523; in Com. on Res., 804; 1°*, 838; 2° m., and in Com., 1300-4; in Com., 1615, 1992 (i); 3° m., 2229 (ii); (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6773; on Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).
Cattle Embargo, Cor. with G.B. (Ans.) 1055 (i).
Cattle, Contagious Diseases, Treatment of (remarks) in conc., 7989 (iv).
Cattle Tuberculosis, Compensation *re*, by Govt. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7991 (iv).
Census Forms for Manufacturing, Distribution and Completion, &c. (Ans.) 4217 (iii).
Census of Man. and Sask. and Alberta (presented) 2727 (ii).
Census Population in N. West (Rep. presented) 514 (i).
Chapais, Mr. J. C., Emplymt. by Govt (Ans.) 5504 (iii).
Charlottetown Exhibition, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 1393 (i).
Chatham Armoury. Moneys due Contractors (Ans.) 4048 (iii).
Cheese Arbitrations, Apptmnt. of Officials at Montreal, &c. (Ans.) 1612 (i).
Cheese Curing Buildings, Number, Locations, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 947 (i).
Cheese Hauling to Curing Rooms, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 4211 (iii).
Cheese produced and exported in Canada, Total Cost, Amount, &c. (Ans.)1144 (i) .
Chicago Drainage Canal, Diversion of Water from St. Lawrence Route (Ans.) 2577 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, &c., Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4076 (iii).
Clam Point Canal, Sable Island, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 2836 (ii).
Coal Famine in N.W., Ref. to in debate on Address, 164 (i).
Cobourg Car Ferry: See "Port Hope", &c.
Cold Storage and Cool Curing Plant, Disposal of by Govt. (Ans.) 710 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5169 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses (B. 20), M. for Com. on Res., 515; in Com. on Res., 658 (i); 2° m., 2416; in Com., 2449, 2460 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Production of Papers at Public Accounts Com., 3001 (ii).
Commercial Treaties with Canada (B. 17) 1°*, 657; 2° m., 1552 (i).
Cross Point Wharf, Purchase of Lumber, &c. (Ans.) 1396 (i).
Curry, Mr. S. G., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Dayley, Dr. R., emplymt. by Govt., Rep., &c. (Ans.) 1988 (ii).
Debates, Official, Staff Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7980 (iv).
Digby Pier Vote, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 6028 (iv).
Dolsen's Burying Ground, Cost of Protection Banks (Ans.) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Eastern Townships, Expenditure of Public Money *re* Public Works, (Ans.) 2581 (ii).
Eclipse Furniture Co., Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii).
Electrical Inspection (B. 111) 1°*, 4610 (iii).
Exhibitions at Sherbrooke and Toronto, Dates of (remarks) 2589 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Labourers' Wages and Working Hours, &c. (Ans.) 2576 (ii).
Experimental Stations in P.E.I., Location, &c. (Ans.) 1391 (i).
Floor Oil, used in Govt. Buildings, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5024 (iii).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3671 (ii).
Frude's Point Wharf, Litigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Galt Post Office, Total Expenditure, Cost, Supervision, &c. (Ans.) 719, 1124 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Interim Report, Approximate Cost, &c. (Ans.) 230 (i).
——— on Inquiry for, 3548 (ii).
Govt. Bills, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 1092 (i).
Grain Standards, Evidence before Com., Printing, &c. (Ans) 231 (i)
G.T.R. Car Ferry: *See* 'Port Hope,' &c.
Grosse Isle Yacht, Gasoline Engine, &c. (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
Gunning Cove Wharf, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 2837 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Henderson, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3640 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Heraldic Collection of Canada, Item in 'Le Canada' *re* (Ans.) 1058 (i).
House of Commons, Whip's Rooms (remarks) in conc., 7987 (iv).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Original Colony, Register A, Disappearance of (remarks) 5287 (iii). *See* 'Selkirk,' &c.
Hull Wharf, Number of Steamers using in 1906 (Ans.) 2139 (ii).
Immigration from Ont., Statement of Mr. Southworth (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A Lavergne) 6224 (iv).
Inspection (fruit) and Sale Act Amt. (B. 162) 2°, and (M.) for Com., 6774 (iv).
International Waterways Commission Rep. (presented) 514 (i).
Inverness Public Building, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 6011 (iv).
Jeannette's Creek Wharf, Completion, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 233 (i).
Lachute Public Building, Delay *re* (Ans.) 1124 (i).
Letter Carrier System in Charlottetown, P.E.I., Establishment of (Ans.) 723 (i).
Library Bureau Headquarters, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).
London Post Office Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7251 (iv).
Magog Public Building, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 2141 (ii).
Malloy, John P., and Ira Stratton, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6012 (iv).
Manitoba Public Works, Dredging, &c., Resignation of Hon. Mr. Aylmer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).
Marieville Post Office Building, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5085 (iii).
Maritime Winter Fair, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1393 (i).
Matchadash Bay, Dredging Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5991 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7192 (iv).
'Montague,' Dredge, Total Cost of Repairing (Ans.) 2980 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7059; in Com., 7570 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Dry Docks, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2581 (ii).
Montreal Port, Inspectors of Perishable Products, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1989 (ii).
Moore, Mr. W. W., Report *re* Packing Houses, &c. (Ans.) 230 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf Extension, Damage to (Ans.) 1395 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
New Zealand Flax, Experiments, *re*, in Canada (Ans.) 5286 (iii)
Niagara Falls and International Waterways Commission, Apportionment of Power, &c. (Ans.) 568 (i).
Nominingue Lakes Wharfs, Construction and Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2139 (ii).
North Rustico Breakwater, *re* Extension, &c. (Ans.) 475 (i).
Nouvelle Wharf, Damages to, &c. (Ans.) 1396 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Sussex St., Architects Plans, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
Ottawa Properties purchased by Govt., Prices and Commissions (Ans.) 235 (i), 3839 (ii).
——— Mr. Riopelle's Commission (explanation) 3627 (ii).
Ottawa Post Office, Date of Fire, Total Cost of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1557, 1562 (i).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7312, 7483 (iv).
Panmure Island Wharf, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1559 (i).
Paspebiac Wharf, Damages to, &c. (Ans.) 1396 (i).
Pelican Lake Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Petawawa Docks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Pictou Harbour Dredging, Total Expenditure &c. (Ans.) 566, 1613 (i).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Engineer's Rep. &c. (Ans.) 230 (i).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 5023 (iii).
Porch in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4604 (iii).
Port Bruce Wharf, Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iv).
Port Colborne Improvements, Amount Expended, &c. (Ans.) 484 (i).
Port Hope Car Ferry to Charlotte, on M. for Sup., 7593 (iv).
Port Maitland Pier, Contract *re* (Ans.) 474, 489 (i).
Port Stanley Dock, Car Ferry Slip, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1558 (i).
Poultry Branch, Discontinuation of Stations (Ans.) 1139 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Rep. *re* Immigration to S. Africa (remarks) 2958 (ii).
P.E.I. Dredging, Schedule of Plans, &c (Ans.) 481 (i).
P.E.I Fruit Inspector, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1390 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Telegraph Communication, &c. (remarks) 1298 (i), 3547 (ii).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1992 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
P.E.I. Telegraph Service and Anglo-American Tel. Co., Negotiations *re* (Ans.) 1809 (i).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Investigation, Reps. Plans, &c. (Ans.) 946 (i).
Provincial Wrecking Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 2836 (ii).
Public Buildings in Ont., Total Cost and Revenue (Ans.) 1387 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1841 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7556 (iv).
Rainy River Nav., Obstructions *re* (Ans.) 1142 (i).
Reardon, Mr. F., Wages paid to Painters in Halifax (Ans.) 4218 (iii).
Red Island, N.S., Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 1928 (i), 1987 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2479 (ii), 7985 (iv).
Richmond County Wharf, Purchase of, &c. (Ans.) 1928 (i).
Rideau Hall Conservatory, Collapse of (remarks) 1692 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1554 (i).
Rubenstein Bros., Contracts *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3589 (ii).
Rustico Harbour, Emplymt. of Tug, Owner's Name, &c. (Ans.) 571 (i).
St. Clair River Dredging, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1927 (i).
St. John Harbour Improvements, Transportation Commission's Work, &c. (Ans.) 233 (i)
Sackville Wharf, N.B., Site and estimated Cost (Ans.) 2576 (ii).
San José Scale, Suppression of, &c. (remarks) 2760 (ii).
Seed Branch, Dept. of Agriculture, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1139 (i).
Seedsmen's Report from Dept., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1140 (i).
Selkirk, Lord, Hudson Bay Estate, Land Deeds in Possession of Govt. (Ans.) 5505 (iii).
See 'Hudson Bay.'
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4451 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Erection of, &c. (Ans.) 2579 (ii).
Shelburne Range Lights, Complaints *re* Location (Ans.) 2836 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7817 (iv); (archives) 2958; (census) 2962 (ii); (cold storage) 7815; (Dublin exhibition) 6900; (electric ry., experimental farm) 7818; (exhibitions) 7818; (experimental farms) 7811 (iv); (fumigating stations) 2974; (Year-book) 2971 (ii).
Civil Govt.—(High Commissioner's Office) 2958; (Public Works) 2824 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Legislation—H. of C. (debates, salaries) 7980 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary P.O.) 4036; (barracks) 4036; (Edmonton) 4036 (iii), 7823 (iv).
Public Works — Buildings — B. C. (Fernie) 4042; (Ladysmith) 4042; (New Westminster marine) 4042; (Vancouver) 4042 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 4044; (salaries, &c.) 4043 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 4035, 4599 (iii); (Dauphin) 7822 (iv); (Neepawa) 4599; (St. Boniface) 4600; (Selkirk) 4600; (Winnipeg immigration) 4601; (Winnipeg P. O.) 4601 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 3973; (Glace Bay) 3973; (Inverness) 3974; (Shelburne) 3974; (Westville) 3974 (ii).
Public Works — Buildings — Ont. (Alexandria) 4018; (Belleville) 4018 (iii); (Belleville armoury) 7820 (iv); (Brockville) 4020; (Guelph armoury) 4020; (Hamilton drill hall) 4021; (Hamilton P. O.) 4022 (iii); (Kingston barracks) 7820 (iv); (London P. O.) 4022; (North Bay) 4023; (Owen Sound) 4025 (iii); (Parkhill) 7822 (iv); (Peterborough armoury) 4025 (iii), 7822; (Renfrew) 7822 (iv); (St. Catharines) 4026; (St. Mary's) 4026; (St. Thomas drill hall) 4027; (Simcoe) 4028; (Stratford) 4028; (Toronto customs) 4028; (Toronto drill hall) 4031, 4598; (Toronto postal station 'F') 4035 (iii); (Wingham) 7822 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (alterations) 3608; (Eastern block) 3950 (ii); (elevators) 4609 (iii); (furniture) 3588 (ii); (gas and electric lighting) 4609; (heating, &c.) 4608 (iii); (H. of C. additions) 3610 (ii); (maintenance) 4602; (Major's Hill park) 4610 (iii); (museum) 3616; (observatory) 3581; (picture frames) 3972 (ii); (post office fittings) 4608; (Rideau Hall conservatory) 4607 (iii); (Rideau Hall, improvements) 3615; (Royal mint) 3603 (ii); (steel shelves) 4024 (iii); (Supreme Court) 3625; (Sussex St. property) 3617, 3951 (ii); (telephones) 4609 (iii); (tower investigation) 3972 (ii); (ventilation, H. of C.) 4603 (iii), 7821 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle station) 4009; (Lachute) 4010; (Lévis) 4010; (Montreal barracks) 4010 (iii); (Montreal P. O.) 7820 (iv); (Montreal postal station) 4011; (Nicolet) 4011 (iii); (postal station, Point St. Charles) 7820 (iv); (Que. arsenal) 4012; (Que. immigration) 4009; (Que. immigration buildings) 4011; (Que. trachoma hospital) 4011; (Quebec East, building) 4012; (St. Johns military) 4015; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 4015; (Three Rivers drill hall) 4015 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings Saskatchewan (Alameda land office) 4035 (iii); (Battleford) 7823 (iv); (Medicine Hat) 4039; (Regina P.O.) 4040; (Saskatoon P. O.) 4041 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Yukon (commissioner's residence) 7824 (iv); (rents, &c.) 4605 (iii).
Public Works—Dredging—Maritime Provinces (plant) 7000 (iv).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta., (Old Man's River) 7834 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson Lake) 6996; (Columbia River) 6996; (Coquitlam) 6996; (Fraser River) 6997; (Victoria) 6997; (Williams Head quarantine) 7000 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Man. (generally) 7000; (Mossy Point) 6995; (Red River banks) 7833 (iv); (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6001 (iii); St. Laurent) 6991; (Sandy Point) 6995 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton) 6073; (Caraquet) 6075; (Clifton breakwater) 6076; (Cockfish) 6076; (Dalhousie) 6076; (Dorchester wharf) 7824; (Dover wharf) 7824; Great Salmon) 7824; (Lincoln wharf) 7824; (Mispec) 6076; (North Head) 6076; (Oak Point) 6077; (Petit Rocher) 6077, 7825; (Quaco) 6077; (Richibucto pier) 7825; (Richibucto warf) 7825; (St. Andrew's) 6080; (St. John Harbour) 6081; (St. John river) 6078; (Shippegan) 6082 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6017; (Baddeck wharf) 6019; (Bay St. Lawrence) 6020; (Big Lorraine) 6020; (Broad Cove Mines) 6043; (Charlo's Cove) 6020; (Church's Point) 6021; (Cow Bay) 6022; (Culloden breakwater) 6023; (Digby) 6024; (Eskasoni wharf) 6029; (Glace Bay) 6033; (Grand Etang) 6037; (Half Island Cape) 6041; (Hall's Harbour) 6042; (Inverness Mines) 6044; (Jersey Cove) 6048; (Mabou) 6050; (Marble Mountain wharf) 6050; (Middle country) 6051; (Moose) 6053; (New Campbellton Cove) 6053; (Parker's Cove) 6054; (Parrsboro) 6054; (Petite Rivière) 6057; (Phinney's Cove) 6057; (Poirierville pier) 6057; (Porter's Lake) 6057; (Port Hastings) 6059; (Port Hood) 6063; (Round Hill) 6065; (Scotch Cove) 6066; (Tatamagouche wharf) 6066; (West Head wharf) 6067; (Yarmouth) 6067 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 6933; (Blanche River) 6933; (Bronte) 6933; (Colborne wharf) 6933; (Collingwood) 6933; (Goderich) 6950; (Hamilton) 6954; (Kincardine) 6954; (Leamington) 7820; (Little Current) 6954; (Meaford) 6962; (Midland) 6963; (Otonabee) 6980; (Owen Sound) 6964; (Point Edward) 6964 (iv); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5982 (iii); (Port Burwell) 6965; (Port Stanley) 6967; (Sault Ste. Marie) 6986; (Thames River) 6983; (Toronto) 6986 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 6070; (Point Prim) 6071; (Rustico) 6071; (Summerside) 6071 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse du Cap) 6092; (Baie St. Paul) 6093; (Barachois de Malbaie) 6093; (Bic) 6094; (Chateauguay) 6095; (Chicoutimi) 6096; (Cross Point) 6096; (Disraeli wharf) 7827; (Doucet's Landing) 6097; (Escoumains pier) 6098; (Father Point) 6099; (Grand Mechins) 6101; (Grand Rivière de Beaupré) 6101; (Grosse Isle wharf) 6109; (Lake Aylmer wharf) 7825; (Lake Megantic pier) 7826; (Lake St. Francis) 6111, 7829; (Lake St. John wharfs) 6110; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6111; (L'Isle d'Alma) 6113; (Lotbinière,

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. —*Con.*
&c.) 6114; (Magdalen Islands) 6114; (Murray Bay) 6115; (Perce wharf) 6115; (Peribonka) 6121; (Petities Bergeronnes) 6115; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6116; (Portage wharf) 6115 (iv); (Quebec Harbour) 5979 (iii); (Rimouski) 6120; (Rivière Batiscan 6121; (Rivière du Loup) 6122; (Rivière Maskinonge) 6124; (Rivière Ouelle) 6124; (Rivière à la Pipe) 6121; (Rivière aux Renards) 6121; (St. Anne des Monts) 6128; (St. Charles de Limoilou) 6130; (St. François) 6130; (St. Fulgence) 6132; (St. Jean) 6132 (iv); (St. Mary's Current) 6003 (iii); (St. Maurice River) 6127; (Saguenay) 6124; (Sorel deep water) 6132; (Three Rivers) 6134; (Yamaska) 6134 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain Lake) 7833 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 7001 (iv).
Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay) 6001 (iii), 7819 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration) 7096 (iv).

Swim's Wharf Wharfinger, Remuneration and Revenue (Ans.) 2830 (ii).

Thames River Channel, Deepening of Channel (Ans.) 232 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Changes in Excise Regulations (remarks) 6144 (iv).

Toronto Harbour, Complaints and Pets. *re* Depth of Water (Ans.) 897 (i).

Toronto Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 225 (i).

Transportation Commission, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. res. (Mr. Bennett) 3712 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6086, 6998 (iv).
See 'St. John.'

Tuberculosis Cattle from Nappan, N.S., Treatment, &c. (Ans.) 1390 (i).
See 'Cattle.'

Vancouver Post Office Building, Changes in Contract, &c. (Ans.) 894 (i).

Ventilation in House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3605 (ii).
——— Statement *re* Information asked for, 617 (i).

Victoria Harbour, P.E.I., Extent and Total Cost of Work done (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Wage-Earners Census, Bulletin 1 (presented) 7780 (iv).

Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases, &c., by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 248 (i).

Wharfs and Docks in Ont., Govt. Assistance to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).

Year-book, French Edition, Publication of (Ans.) 1987 (ii).

Yukon—Dawson, Govt. House, Total Expenditure *re*, 1900-6 (Ans.) 1562 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Yukon Tel. Lines, Payments to Kelly, Douglass & Co., &c. (Ans.) 1554 (i).
Yukon Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 714 (i).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E., *North Toronto.*
Address, The, 43 (i).
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5674
American Bank Note Co., Payments to since 1897, &c. (Ques.) 885 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. Inquiry for, 514, 1044 (i), 1991, 3277 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Mail Service, on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) *re*, 7185 (iv).
Australian Papers, Inquiry for, 1699 (i).
Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4154 (iii).
British Textile Goods, Increase in Imports (remarks) 1047 (i).
Budget, The, (reply) to Financial Statement, 399 (i).
Budget Speech, and Distribution of Pub. Accounts and Nav. Rets. (remarks) 92 (i).
Budget Debate, and Unopposed Motions, Precedence &c. (remarks) 238 (i).
Business of the House, Delay in Proceedings, &c. (remarks) 1110 (i).
Canadian Coasting Trade, Names of Countries admitted (Ques.) 3369 (ii).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1777 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 1856 (i).
Canada Newspaper Syndicate, Matrices Plant (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).
See 'Tariff.'
C.P.R. Land Belt, B. C., B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4655 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 108 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 4656 (iii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 811; in Com., 1628 (i), 1993 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Prohibition &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4063 (iii).
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of, (remarks) 7793 (iv).
Coal Strikes in the West (remarks) 514 (i), 6909 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7169 (iv).
——— Tel. from Blairmore (remarks) 7092
——— Tel. from Mr. King (read) 7872 (iv).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c. on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1463 (i).
Cold Storage B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2463 (ii).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse, 5267 (iii).
——— Cor. *re* Imperial Council, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).
Commercial Travellers Tax, Agreement at Conference with Prov. Premiers (Ques.) 4213 (iii).
Congdon, Mr. F., Inquiry for Rep. *re* Investigation into Charges, 6765 (iv).
Contractors' Deposits for Security, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1386 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1564 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7016 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt. B. (Mr. Gervais) on M. to introduce (remarks) 1608 (i).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5634 (iii).
See "Tariff.'
Debates, Official, Staff Salaries (remarks) in in Com. of Sup., 7976 iv).
Dillinger, Mr., Investigation *re* Shortage of Cars (remarks), 7252, 7310 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4720 ; in Com., 4744 (iii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7036 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2238 (ii), 4639, 4651 (iii).
Financial Situation, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7865 (iv).
Fish Transhipment on the Western Coast, O.C., Inquiry for, 3001 (ii).
French Clergy exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6666 (iv).
German Surtax: *See* 'Preferential,' &c.
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7013 (iv).
'Golspie,' Str., Wreck of (remarks) 1106 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2734 (ii).
See 'Business,' &c.
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c. (remarks) 6378 (iv).
See 'Temporary.'
Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
G.T.R. Car Ferry : *See* 'Port Hope,' &c.
G.T.P., Land Grant in B.C. Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2091 (ii).
——— Commission, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. Ques.) 715, 885 (i).
——— Quebec Station Site, Cor. &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1945 (i).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Halifax Barracks, Coal supplied, Quantity and Rate per Ton (Ques.) 713 (i).
Halifax Drill Hall Property, Inquiry for Ret., 1699 (i).
Halifax Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7315, 7346 (iv).
Hudson Bay Retired Servants, Legal Claims *re* Compensation (Ques.) 6011 (iv).
——— Ref. to Justice Dept. (Ques.) 1141 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3574 (ii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Information *re*, 514 (i), 5560 (iii).
——— on Cor., &c., being read, 2740, 2743 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7187 (iv).
——— Resignation as Minister and Member for London (remarks) 1796 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5717 (iii).
Immigration Agents, Dismissal and Suspensions, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 714 (i).
Insurance Commission Bill, Inquiry for, 7251 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5659 (iii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5478 (iii).
——— Charges against Members (remarks) on M. (Mr. Bourassa) to Com. on Ways and Means, 4379 (iii).
——— Charges by Mr. Fowler, on Notice of Ques. of Priv. (remarks) 5509 (iii).
——— Cor. with Min. of Jus. and Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 3910 (ii).
——— Cor. with Mr. Shepley and Mr. Tilley *re* Methods of Investigation, &c. (M. for copies*) 241 (i).
——— Evidence *re*, Printing and Distribution to Members (remarks) 93 (i).
——— Exhibits, &c., Inquiry for, 4441, 4615
——— printing of exhibits (remarks) 4118 (iii).
——— Inquiry for further Cor. not in Return, 2345 (ii).
——— Notice of Discussion, 5859 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) 6400; (M.) that Words (Mr. Martin) be taken down by Dep. Speaker, 6402 (iv).
——— Remuneration to Mr. Shepley (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
——— Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6924 (iv).
——— Total Cost, Communications between Min. of Jus. and Counsel *re* Information supplied (Ques.) 4214 (iii).
——— Translation, &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Insurance Commission, Rep. *re*, in Com. of Sup., (statement) 6281; (reply) in Com. of Sup., 6486 (iv).
Insurance Commission, on M. from Senate for Papers (remarks) 5258 (iii).
See 'Northwest,' &c.
Intercolonial Conference, Printing of Return (M.) 3277 (ii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R., Accidents, Compensation to Injured, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 1056 (i).
I.C.R., Employees' Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1497 (i); in Com., 2908 (ii).
I.C.R. and G.T. Ry. Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2477 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7458 (iv).
Jordan-Erie Power Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 7909 (iv).
Judges' Salaries in Man. and B.C. B. 177 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7785 (iv).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 2215 (ii).
Just, C. F., Suspension and Re-instatement, &c. (Ques.) 228 (i).
Kentville Rifle Range, Number of Acres, Cost, &c., Award, &c. (Ques.) 1385 (i).
'Kestrel,' Str., Cor., &c., *re* Provisioning for Year 1905 (M. for copies*) 580 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Distribution of (remarks) 1330 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2600 (ii).
See 'Coal Strike,' &c. 'Strikes B. 36.'
Laurier Tower Collapse, Cost of Investigation, &c. (remarks) 4665 (iii).
'Lena M.' Wreck of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5871 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N.W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1834 (i).
——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2586 (ii).
MacIlreith, T. R., Legal Expenditure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Johnston) to M. for Ret., 2587 (ii).
McGregor, J. D., License Inspector, Yukon, Number of Permits granted, &c. (Ques.) 4211 (iii).
Manitoba School Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5702 (iii).
Marine Supplies, Purchases of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7845 (iv).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 7780 (iv).
Militia Drill Shed Ret., Inquiry for, 4615 (iii).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7190, 7213; M. to wthdrw., 7212 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7057, 7069 (iv).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P.'
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 22 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 1095 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Additional Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1928 (i).
——— Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5816 (iii).
Northwest Land Deals and Insurance Commission, Charges (Mr. Fowler) *re* Members and Ministers, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 3428, 3445 (ii).
Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto 'News' (remarks) 6911 (iv).
Orders-in-Council, Commission *re* Codifying (remarks) 4657 (iii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Balance Sheet, Inquiry for, 3002 (ii).
——— O.C. *re*, Inquiry for, 1991 (ii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7204, 7312 (iv).
Petawawa Military Camp, Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7641 (iv).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3891 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts (Mr. Conmee) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7902 (iv).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s incorp. B. 166 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 7123; on M. for 2°, 7212 (iv).
Port Hope, Car Ferry to Charlotte, on M. for Sup., 7606 (iv).
Postal Rates Reducton, &c., on Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 6639 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, 6631 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7021 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, ref. to in Com. on Post Office Bill, 7023 (iv).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6649 (iv).
See "Tariff".
Preston, W. T. R., Agents under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7098 (iv).
——— Emplymnt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 229 (i).
Private Bills Pets., on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 1981, 2068 (ii).
Provincial Rights: *See* "Hamilt'on Radial B. 158", "Petewawa", &c.

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A.Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5308; on Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) to M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5368 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to make corrections, 7053 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to reconsider, 7410 (iv).
——— Amt. to B. N. A. Act from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7714 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7776 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., (M) *re* Sittings, 5561 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. and Delayed Returns (remarks) 2907 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co's Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7231; on M. for 2°, 7950; in Com., 7967 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7546 (iv).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7411 (iv).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Printing and Advertising, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1563 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 178) in Com. on Res., 7799; (Central Ontario Ry.) 7802; (Woodstock, N.B.) 7802 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2206, 3461 (ii), 4119 (iii).
Revised Statutes of Canada, Names of Persons, &c. for Distribution of (Ques.) 1801 (i).
——— Distribution of, &c. (remarks) 1614 (i).
Rideau Hall, Expenditure on Construction, &. (Ques.) 1554 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co. (remarks) *re* Question, 1061 (i).
Ross Rifles, Imported Parts fom U.S. (remarks) *re* Question, 2834 (ii).
Ross Rifle Inspection, &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1422 (i).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6766 (iv).
Senators, N.B., Apptmnt. of, Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1662 (i).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, &c., Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4251 (iii).
Sol. Gen., Apptmnt. of (remarks) 1796 (i).
Springhill Coal Strike, (remarks) 5863 (iii).
Stockton, Mr. A. A., M.P., Decease of (remark) 4759 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 37 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1040 (i); in Com., on M. that Com. rise, 3305 (ii); in Com., 3989, 4470 (iii).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
——— on Ques. of Order *re* Statement of Mr. Hall, 3328 (ii).
Sub-Target Gun Co., Cor. O.Cs., &c., with Militia Dept. &c. (M. for copies) 726 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3091 (ii).
——— (M.) to ref. papers to Com. on Pub. Accounts, 3887, 3977 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands—(surveys, &c.) 7257; (timber protection) 7265 (iv).
Fisheries (dog-fish extermination) 5920; (fishery commissions) 5942; (fish curing) 5929; (fish transportation) 5934; (protection service) 5906 (iii).
Justice, Administration of—Yukon (judges' living allowances) 7968 (iv).
Legislation—H. of C. (clerkships) 7972; (debates salaries) 7976 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 5867; (bookkeeping reorganization) 5947; (construction, &c.) 5869; (Marconi stations) 5874; (salaries) 5864; (signals) 5872 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 7121; (Canada and S. Africa) 7119; (Gaspé Basin) 7120; (G.B. and Canada) 7106; (Halifax to Liverpool via Newfoundland) 7116; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 7118; (Quebec and Murray Bay) 7121; (St. John, W. Indies and S. America) 7117; (Sydney and Whycocomagh) 7121 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5880 (iii).
Militia (properties, &c.) 7981 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Colonial Conference) 7982; (insurance commission) 6281, 6486; (Pacific Cable) 7971 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 5946; (N.W.M. patrol boat) 5946 (iii).
Penitentiaries—Generally (maintenance) 7971 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Edmonton) 4037 (iii); Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7820 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Half Island Cape) 6041; (Hall's harbour) 6042 (iv).
Scientific Institution (hydrographic surveys) 5878 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (agents' salaries) 7098 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.B., Apptmnt. of Additional Judge (remarks) 6765 (iv).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Purchase by Govt., Quantity, &c., Rep. *re* (Ques.) 719 (i).
Tariff—in Com. of Ways and Means (acetone) 4182; (agricultural implements) 4402 (iii); (biscuits) 1866 (i); (books) 2050 (ii); (boots and shoes, &c.) 4550; (brass, &c.) 4197; (britannia metal) 4204; (casket trimmings) 4432; (coal for smelting) 4434; (confectionery) 4182 (iii); (cotton fabrics) 2351 (ii); (drawbacks) 4426 (iii); (Dumping Clause Amts.) 1188; (Dumping Clause Amts. *re* binder twine) 1209. (florist stock) 1868 (i); (glass, raw) 4435; (glass ware)

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Tariff, The—*Con.*
4194; (glucose, &c.) 4181; (iron angles) 4434 (iii); (lime juice) 2044 (ii); (liquid fillers) 4186; (mackintosh clothing) 4432 (iii); (macaroni) 1866 (i); (machinery from G.B., preferential duty) 4550; (malleable chains) 4391; (malt flour) 4182; (marble) 4191; (matrices, &c.) 4394, 4549; (molasses) 4180; (oils, &c.) 4187; (pig iron) 4427 (iii); (printing paper) 2055 (ii); (proof spirits) 526; (rolled iron and steel) 526 (i); (roofing slate) 4192 (iii); (sago, &c.) 1859 (i); (springs and axles) 4429; (sugar 16 Dutch standard) 4149; (tinplate) 4426 (iii); (tomatoes) 1871 (i); (wines) 2048 (ii); (wire cables) 4421 (iii); (wool) 2384 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4331 (iii).
Tariff Index, Inquiry for, 513 (i).
Tariff, Inquiry *re* Procedure, 3889 (ii).
Tariff—Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
——— Negotiations, Pour Parlers, &c. (remarks) 7938 (iv).
Tariff—Paper Combine, 2055 (ii).
Tariff—Preferential Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 527 (i).
Tariff, Preferential and Intermediate, Effects of, Ref. to in debate on Budget Speech, 296 (i).
Tariff Resolutions, Clerical Errors, &c. (remarks) 513 (i).
Tariff—U.S. Duties compared with Canada in Com., 1196 (i).
Telegraph Lines (Govt.) Number of Miles, &c. Total Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1469
——— Inquiry for, 7251 (iv).
Temporary Loans since Jan. 1, 1906, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 234 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 582 (i).
Wagner, Philip, Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 229 (i).
Winding-up Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7020 (iv).
Winnipeg Terminals B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 3°, 5670 (iii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5676, 5683 (iii).
Yukon Banks, Commission paid to Canadian Bank of Commerce (Ques.) 4272 (iii).
Yukon Gold Output, Subsidy, &c. (remarks) on M. to Ways and Means, 4535 (iii).
Yukon, Liquor Permits granted to J. D. McGregor, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4211 (iii).
Yukon Ordinances, Approval, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7408 (iv).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5707 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7545 (iv).
Yukon Tel. Lines, Payments to Kelly, Douglass & Co. (Ques.) 1554 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 714 (i).
Yukon, Wheat Raising (remarks) 3548 (ii).
——— Whitehorse Govt. Lands, Patents issued, Names (Ques.) 4212 (iii).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's and Albert, N.B.*
B.C. Elections, Charges against Mr. D. Ross (remarks) in Com. on Strikes Bill, 3316 (ii).
Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7688 (iv).
Coal Strikes, &c. in the N.W. on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7157 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 669 (i); in Com., 2461 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4751 (iii).
G.T.P. Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret., &c., on M. (Mr Crocket) 3131 (ii)
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5661 (iii).
——— on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
I.C.R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2909 (ii).
Land Transactions *re* N.W. Co.'s, Insurance Investigation, &c., Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. on Strikes Bill, 3314 (ii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 924 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Expenditures *re* Govt. Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5964 (iii).
O'Rourke, John, Arrest by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 1130 (i).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A Martin) for Copies, 3262 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges of Graft against Ministers, &c., 3451 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) to M. (Sir Wilfrid Lauriver) 5379; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5384 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 178, in Com. on Res., (Canadian Northern Ry) 7807; (C.P.R., Gagetown branch) 7803; (Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry.) 7805; (Fredericton to Woodstock) 7806; (Nicolet) 7808; (Woodstock, N.B). 7802 (iv).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6749 (iv).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, &c., Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4259 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3311 (ii)

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7811 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (St. John's conduit) 7536; Soulanges (electrical staff) 7535 (iv).
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 7692 (iv); Inland Revenue, 2822 (ii); Labour Dep. (private secretary) 7692 (iv); (Militia) 2822; Post Office) 2799 (ii); Post Office (salaries) 7691 (iv); Public Works, 2824 (ii).
Customs (ports, salaries, &c.) 5973 (iii).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6245; (outside service, salaries) 6244 (iv).
Dom. Police (salaries) 6762 (iv).
Fisheries (protection service) 5963 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6739; (topographical surveys) 6243 (iv).
Justice, Administration of—Supreme Court (Library) 7693 (iv).
Legislation—H. of C. (library books) 6763; (voters' lists) 6764 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5735; (clothing) 5743; (properties) 5736; (surveys, &s.) 5728 (iii).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6397 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 7835
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (generally) 3974 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 3973; (Glace Bay) 3973; (Inverness) 3974; (Shelburne) 3974 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Sussex St. property) 3954; (tower investigation) 3973 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton) 6073; (Caraquet) 6074; (Dorchester wharf) 7824; (Dover wharf) 7824; (Great Salmon) 7824; (Petit Rocher) 7825; Richibucto wharf) 7825 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Church's Point) 6021; (Digby) 6024; (Glace Bay) 6036; (Grand Etang) 6037; (Hall's harbour) 6042; (Inverness Mines) 6046 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829; (Lake Aylmer (wharf 7826; (St. Francis wharf) 7829 (iv).
Railway Commission (maintenance) 7534 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (Amherst) 7298; (maintenance) 7534; (Moncton shops) 7301; (Sackville) 7298 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6250 (iv).
Sussex, N.B., Customs Port (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1018 (i); (printing paper) 2056; (pulp wood) 2066 (ii.)

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*
Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Ry. Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 2482 (ii).
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1755 (i).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Land Grant in B. C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2088 (ii).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).
Great West Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1923 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5719 (iii).
'Lowrey's Claim,' Cor. *re* Prohibition through Mails (M. for copies*) 490 (i).
Lyon, Victor Harold, Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 6005 (iv).
Rock Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 149) 1°*, 6005 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3311, 3870 (ii), 3979 (iii).
Summers, E. W. and H. H., Patent Relief (B. 9) 1°*, 515 (i).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1001 (i).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5699 (iii).

Ganong, Mr. Gilbert W., *Charlotte.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6272 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 836 (i).
Denatured Alcohol, Quantity made and sold, &c. (Ques.) 1121 (i).
Grand Manan Life Savings Station, Establishment of (remarks), 936 (i).
Life Saving Stations, P. E. I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 936 (i).
Sackville Wharf, N.B., Site and estimated Cost (Ques.) 2576 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Fisheries (fish curing) 5928; (hatcheries) 5900; (herring nets) 5916 (iii).
Geological Survey (gas borings) 3160 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi Stations) 5876; (submarine signals) 5872 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Clifton breakwater) 6076; (North Head) 6076; (Oak Point) 6077; (Petit Rocher) 6077; (St. Andrews) 6080; (Shippegan) 6082 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Culloden breakwater) 6023; (Half Island Cape) 6041; (Mabou) 6050 (iv).

Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4323 (iii).
Tariff in Com. on Ways and Means (biscuits) 1865 (i); (diamond dust) 2130; (gypsum) 2123; (marble), 2126 (ii); (melons, &c.), 1910; (nuts, &c.), 1919; (pickles, &c.), 1888; (sago, &c.), 1859 (i); (zinc dust, &c.), 2128 (ii).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 2482 (ii) ; in Com., 5204 (iii).
Dube, R. B., Dismissal of, from 'La Canadienne,' Reps. &c. (M. for copy*) 1978 (i).
Express Companies, Control by Railway Commission, &c. (Ques.) 473 (i).
I.C.R. Roundhouse at Halifax, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 485 (i).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 941 (i).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1553 (i); in Com., 4969 (iii) ; on Senate Amts., 6633 (iv).
Red Island, near Rivière du Loup, Loss of Crew (remarks, &c.) 941 (i).
Senate Appointment, Par. in 'L'Evénement' (ques. of privilege), 5889 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 7523 (iv).

Geoffrion, Mr. Victor, *Chambly and Verchères.*
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7085, 7090 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5848 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec Ry. Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 2415 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Sitting of Com. *re* Collingwood Ship Building Co. (M.) 3721 (ii).
——— 11th-24th Reps. (M.) to conc., 6764 (iv).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5608 (iii).
Erie and Ontario Development Co.'s Bill (remarks) *re* Precedence, 7482 (iv).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accounts Com., 5047 (iii).
Jordan, Light, Heat and Power Co.'s (B. 115) Precedence *re* (remarks) 7482 (iv).
——— to place on Order Paper, 7694 (iv).
——— in Com., 7909 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5853 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3823, 3875 (ii).
Tariff—(brass, &c.) 4200 ; (britannia metal) 4204 (iii).
Transportation Commission's Rep., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1596 (i).

Gervais, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Criminal Code Amt. Bill, (M.) to Introduce, 1608 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. (B. 77) 1°*, 1841 (i).

Gervais, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Criminal Code (exclusive contract clause) Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 3725 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) in Com., 4409, 4482 ; 3° m., 4794 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) to M. for 3°, 4844 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7064 (iv).
Prudential Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 163) in Com., 7312 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands—(homestead inspectors) 6248 (iv).
Justice, Administration of—Supreme Court (Library) 7693 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Helen's wharf) 6001 (iii).
Supreme Court Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 70) 1° m., 1608 (i).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Escoumains) 6098; (Petites Bergeronnes) 6115 (iv).

Gordon, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post office) 2787 (ii).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *North Ontario.*
McPherson, Arthur Leon Relief (B. 157) 2° m., 6376 (iv).
Standing Orders Sel. Com. (M.) to conc. in 7th Rep., 6376 (iv).
Women's Art Association of Canada incorp. (B. 30) 1°*, 803 (i).

Gunn, Mr. B. B., *South Huron.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6268 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1314 (i).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4076 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2449 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3895 (ii).
Red Head, N.S., Channel Cutting, Reps. &c. (M. for copies*) 2840 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3284 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2793 (ii).
Tariff—Wool, in Com., 2374 (ii).

Greenway, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4689 (iii).
Hudson Bay, Construction of a Railway to, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3565 (ii).
Manitoba Boundary Extension, Govt. Policy *re* (Ques.) 1803 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
C.P.Ry. Co. (B. 78), 1°*, 1923 (i).

Haggart, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*
Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 5204 (iii).
Blairmore Town Site, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6574 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 669 (i).
Criminal Code (Public Works) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7187 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7033 (iv).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2241 (ii), 4616; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 4954; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4963 (iii).
G.T.P.Ry. Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret., on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3133 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7344 (iv).
I.C.R., Annual Statement of Minister of Rys. (reply) 5227 (iii).
——— Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1489 (i); in Com., 2911 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7447 (iv).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 4976 (iii).
Manitoba School Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5703 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7194 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7060; in Com., 7570 (iv).
Provincial Rights. *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158."
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7731 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to make corrections, 7054 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7776 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, on M. (Mr. Conmee) Ques. of Order, 7899 (iv).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 5 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) to M. for 3°, 3175 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7566 (iv).
Railway Act (canal penalties) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7810 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Canadian Northern Ry.) 7807; (C.P.R. Nicola branch) 7805; (Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry.) 7805; (Fredericton to Woodstock) 7806; (C.P.R. Gagetown branch) 7803; (Nicolet) 7807; (Temiscouata branch) 7807; (Woodstock, N.B.), 7802 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1039 (i); in Com., 3984, 4775; on M. for 3°, 4993 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5552; Lachine (slope walls) 5548; Quebec (cement) 5552 (iii).
Civil Govt.—(customs) 2767; Post Office (outside service) 3141 (ii).
Fisheries (fishery commission) 5941; (fish transportation) 5933; (inspectors' salaries) 5892 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 3142 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Glace Bay) 6035; Ont. (Collingwood) 6942 (iv).
Tariff Resolutions (customs Act) in Com., 525 (i).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1001; Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1217 (i).
——— Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 532 (i).
——— Vessels, &c., in Com., 2390 (ii).
——— Wool, in Com., 2374 (ii).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1934 (i).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2332 (ii).
Winnipeg Terminals, C.N. and G.T.P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5515 (iii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5699 (iii).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5707 (iii).

Hall, Mr. R. R., *West Peterborough.*
Dominion Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) 1° *, 1119 (i).
Tariff—(agricultural implements) in Com., 4405 (iii).
——— Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1217 (i).
Transportation Commission, Mr. J. H. Ashdown's Rep., Considn. of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1581 (i).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, &c., Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1934 (i).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2339 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Agricultural Implements, Total Value of Exports, 1894-6 (Ques.) 1553 (i).
Bronte Lighthouse, Allowance to Keeper (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1616 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com on Res., 701 (i); on M. for 2°, 2439; in Com., 2474 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6783 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) 5587 (iii).
Debates, Official, Salaries of Staff; in Com. of Sup., 7980 (iv).
Denatured Alcohol, Manufacture of, Legislation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 1969 (i).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7048 (iv).
Farming Implements, Total Amount of Duty collected for 1906 (Ques.) 948 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1067 (i).
Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 164 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 7314 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Commission, Rep. of (remarks) 7010 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7317 (iv).
House of Commons Post Office. Special Stamps, Postal Notes, &c., on Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 1379 (i).
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6780 (iv).
Insurance Rep., French Translation, (remarks) on M. to conc. in Amended Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7473 (iv).
La Compagnie du chemin de fer Colonisation du Nord B. 13 (Mr. Bureau) on M. for 3°, 2768 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5832 (iii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7210 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase in Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
——— Ref. to in Com. on Post Office Bill, 7024 (iv).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 2068 (ii).
Provincial Rights: *See* "Hamilton Electric Radial B. 158"
Public Bills and Orders, Precedence on Monday, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3545 (ii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2460 (ii).
Railway Act (canal penalties) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7810 (iv).
Saturday's Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 7125 (iv).
Sugar Duties, No. 16 Dutch Standard, Total Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 1049 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2778 (ii); Post Office (contingencies) 6622 (iv).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6713 (iv).
Indians, Ont. (Mississaguas' claims) 7292 (iv.)
Interior—Surveys (international boundary) 7272 (iv).
Labour Dept. (printing, &c.) 3580 (ii).
Legislation—H. of C. (debates officials) 7980 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (book-keeping reorganization) 5957; salaries) 5865 (iii).
N. W. T. Govt. (litigation) 7274 (iv).
Poct Office (postmasters' salaries) 7982 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 6933 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 3590; (H. of C. addition) 3610; (Royal Mint) 3604; (Sussex St. property) 3621, 3958 (ii).
Tariff Res., Customs Act, in Com. on Ways and Means, 525 (i).
Tariff Items, Procedure *re* (remarks) 514 (i).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (alum cake) 2115 (ii); (apples) 1893; (beeswax) 1332; (berries) 1895; (biscuits) 1866; (cheese) 1333; (coffee) 1360 (i); (coins) 2130; (cotton fabrics) 2350 (ii); Dumping Clause, Amts. (binder twine) 1217; Dumping Clause, Amts. (cream separators) 1190; (farm products) 256, 1261 (i); (gloves, &c.) 2406 (ii); (indian corn) 1368; (melons, &c.) 1910 (i); (metallic trading checks) 2413 (ii); (oatmeal) 1372; (pickles, &c.) 1891 (i); (printing paper) 2063; (quebracho) 2115; (steel bowls) 2135 (ii); (tea) 1360; (tomatoes) 1879 (i); (unenumerated items), 2411 (ii); (vegetables) 1881 (i); (wire fencing) 2133; (wool) 2377 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for, 1906, &c. (Ques.) 1612 (i).
Trade and Nav. Rets., Distribution of (remarks) 6 (i).
Ventilation in Chamber of House (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3607 (ii).

Herron, Mr. J., *Alberta.*
Blairmore Town Site, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6578 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4615 (iii).
Blood Indian Reserve, Opening up (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Blood and Piegan Indian Agencies, Purchase of Cattle, &c., (Ques.) 1131 (i).
Coal Lands in Western Provs., Control and Regulation by Govt. to prevent Famine (prop. res.) 743; Amt. (Mr. Knowles) agreed to (Y. 80; N. 39) 800 (i).
Coal Strike in N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7134 (iv).

Herron, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Mines Strike and Labour Disputes Bill (remarks) 6006 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) 5580 (iii).
Dom. Lands Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3463 (ii).
Game Preservation in Rocky Mountains (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Grazing (closed) Leases, Galway Horse and Cattle Co. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3465; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 80) 3542 (ii).
Hepburn, W. H., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1558 (i).
Hepburn, Mr. W. F., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2293 (ii).
Lethbridge District Water Reserve Lands, Sale of, Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 4216 (iii).
Lumber Combine in Northwest, Charges *re* (M.) for Sel. Com., 1816 (i).
Lyon, H. E. v. Malcolm McKenzie, Cor. *re* Exchequer Court Suit (M. for copies*) 2838 (ii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 649 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4119 (iii).
S.A. War Veterans, Land Grants to, on prop. res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 733 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2652 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3319 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 2970 (ii).
Civil Govt. (post office) 2811 (ii).
N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 7835 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 3147 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Edmonton) 4036; Sask., &c. (Medicine Hat) 4059 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta. (Old Man's River) 7834 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2031 (ii).
Cigarettes, Sale, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) and Mr. Speaker's ruling, 4088 (iii).
I.C.R. Pension Fund Employees B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2925 (ii).
Life-saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor, 920 (i).
P.E.I. Mail Service, Negligence on part of Govt. (remarks) 3889 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service, &c. (remarks) 1079 (i).
P.E.I Telegraphic Communication, Information *re* (remarks) 1991 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels. &c., on M (Mr A Martin) for Copies, 3198 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 6377 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Construction of Ice-breakers, &c. (Ques.) 3636 (ii).
——— Inefficient Service (remarks) 4942 (iii).
——— Laying off of Steamers, &c. (remarks) 707 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act from Senate, on prop. res. (Mr. Fielding) 7745 (iv).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act (M.) for Address, 2147 (ii).
'Sovinto,' Wreck of, Rep. *re* Life-Boats (Ques.) 1064 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post offices) 2776 (ii).
Fisheries (fish curing) 5924; (hatcheries) 5916 (iii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 6707 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5867 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside) 6073 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour Branch) 7530 (iv).
Tariff—British Gum, in Com., 2121 (ii).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep. on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4114 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of (remarks) 5859 (iii).
——— Appmnt. of Successor (remarks) 6009 (iv).
——— Retirement of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6136 (iv).
British Soldiers, Honourably Discharged as Settlers in Can. (prop. res.) 736 (i).
Canadian Sealers imprisoned by Uruguay an Govt., Release of, &c. (Ques.) 229 (i).
Charges against Conservative Members by Mr. Emmerson, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5668 (iii).
Cannington Postmaster, Retirement of Mr. Talbot (M. for cor.) 501 (i).
Civil Servants, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).
Coal Strike at Lethbridge, Location of Dep. Min. of Labour (remarks) 423 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West (remarks) 6909 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn., 7139 (iv).
——— Additional Information (remarks) 7693 (iv).
Coboconk to Gull River Waterway, Construction of Canal (prop. res.) 493 (i).
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 5270, 5279 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Customs Act, (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5620 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4741, 4826, 4866 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3093 (ii).
Freight Tariff Rates, Local and General, upon Canadian and Foreign Products (M. for ret.) 724 (i).
French Clergymen as Immigrants (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6150 (iv).
——— Exiled from France (personal explanation) 6654; (reply) 6673 (iv).
——— Par. in newspaper *re* Criticisms of (remarks) 6766 (iv).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2731 (ii).
Grain Standards, Evidence before Com., Printing, &c. (Ques.) 231 (i).
Grazing (closed) Leases, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between (prop. res.) 2840; Res. wthdrn., 2901-5 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2585 (ii).
Homestead Rights on Quarter Section 12, Twp. 30, Name of First Applicant, Date of Entry, &c. (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).
Insurance Commission's Rep., in Com. of Sup., 6517 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6923 (iv).
Land and Sub-Land Agents, Homestead Inspectors, &c., Retirement of, &c. (Ques.) 231 (i).
Lindsay Drill Shed, Erection of, &c. (Ques.) 223 (i).
McCallum, Duncan, Claims *re* Drowning in Trent Canal (Ques.) 5023 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* (Ques.) 3884 (ii).
McLaren's Creek Roadway, Completion of (Ques.) 468 (i).
Medals for Nile Voyageurs, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 224 (i).
Militia, Cost *re* aiding Civil Powers, Collection, &c. (Ques.) 895 (i).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 144 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5645 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5803 (iii).
Northwest Rebellion, Graves of Soldiers, Caring for, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6746 (iv).
Petawawa Camp, Confiscation of by Govt., Inquiry for Papers, 6765 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6910 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Petawawa Camp, Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7659 (iv).
Postal Rates between G. B. and Canada, Reduction (remarks) 6632 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Collusion with Militia Dept., 6907 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7233; in Com., 7955 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. McCool) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2526 (ii).
Ry. Rates on Commodities through Canada or to Foreign Countries or G. B., on all Transportation Lines (M. for ret.) 742 (i).
Railway Tariffs upon Commodities, &c. (M. for ret.) 503 (i).
Riflemen, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt. to Rifle Matches (prop. res.) 739 (i).
Rifle Ranges, Victoria County, Site, &c. (Ques.) 224 (i).
Ross Rifle, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3732 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5026 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Snider-Enfield, &c., Chief Differences, Reps. *re* (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii).
St. Johns, Que., Military Barracks, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 4215 (iii).
Sago Flour (remarks) in Com. of Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).
S. A. War Veterans, Land Grants (prop. res.) 730 (i).
Spirits, Denatured for Power Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 223 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 4482 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dublin exhibition) 6900; (electric ry., experimental farm) 7818; (experimental farms) 7811 (iv).
Canals—Trent (construction) 7668; (McLaren's Creek) 7669 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (asst. dep. P. M. G.) 7691 (iv).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspector) 6248: (surveys) 7258 (iv).
Dom. Police (retiring allowances) 6900; (salaries) 6763 (iv).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 7296 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys (steamer) 7685 (iv).
Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6736; (topographical surveys) 6243 (iv).
Legislation—H. of C. (library books) 6763; (stationery, &c.) 6900 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (accountants, &c.) 7681; (salaries) 5865 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 7121; (Canada and S. Africa) 7119 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5735; (Champlain Memorial) 5736; (clothing) 5740; (Dom. arsenal) 5764; (pay and allowance) 5649; (surveys, &c.) 5727; (training schools) 5733 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous (compensation to R. Wainwright) 6901; (Connaught, Prince Arthur, visit) 6901; (insurance commission) 6517 (iv); (Jamaica disaster, grant) 2726 (ii). (Sunday legislation, legal expenses) 6902 (iv).
N.W.T. Govt.—(litigation) 7274; (roads and bridges) 7273; (Yoho Park) 7274 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (compensation *re* accidents) 7837; (pay of force) 7834 (iv).
Public Works—Buildngs — Man. (Brandon drill hall) 4599; (Selkirk) 4600; (Winnipeg immigration) 4601; (Winnipeg P.O.) 4601 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (Peterborough armoury) 7822 (iv); (Toronto drill hall) 4598 (iii); (Wingham) 7822 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (gas, &c.) 4609; (heating, &c.) 4608; (maintenance) 4602; (post office fittings) 4608; (rents, &c.) 4605; (telephones) 4609 (iii); (ventilation) 7820 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings — Sask. (Battleford) 7823; (Humboldt) 7823 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 7824 (iv); (rents, &c.) 4605 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alta. (Last Mountain Lake) 7833 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Eskasoni wharf) 6030; (Parrsboro) 6056 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake Aylmer wharf) 7826; (Peribonka) 6121; (St. François) 6131; (St. Francis wharf) 7829; (Sorel deep water) 6133 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Indiantown branch) 7663; (New Glasgow) 7663; (rolling stock) 7664 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6249 (iv).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, Reps. *re*, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1933 (i).
See 'Cobokonk,' 'McLaren's Creek,' &c.
Trent Canal Water Powers, Leased, Owned, &c. by Govt. (Ques.) 565 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5676; Res. of Board of Citizens of Dawson *re* Political Interference of Govt. Officials (read) 5676 (iii).

Hunt, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*
Armstrong, Trooper, Compensation *re* Injuries at Laprairie Camp (Ques.) 1050 (i).

Jackson, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*
Postmasters Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on B., 7027 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands—(surveys) 7259 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (dredging) 6993 (iv).

Jackson, Mr. W., *West Elgin.*
Central Experimental Farm, Stock, Implements, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3189 (ii).
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5173 (iii).

Jackson, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Express Cos.' Rates, Revision of (remarks) 5861 (iii).
Insurance Commission's Rep., on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
Port Bruce Wharf Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iv).
Port Stanley Customs Collection, for 1900-6 (Ques.) 1558 (i).
Port Stanley Dock, Car Ferry Slip, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1558 (i).
Port Stanley Lightkeeper (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7811 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5864 (iii).
Miscellaneous—(insurance commission) 6419 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (St. Thomas drill hall) 4027 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Burwell) 6966; (Port Stanley) 6967 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 6627 (iv).

Johnston, Mr. A., *South Cape Breton.*
Accident and Guarantee Co.'s Change of Name (B. 106) 1°*, 4117 (iii).
Address, The, 144 (i).
Adjournment for Christmas, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 992 (i).
Blair, Mr. H. C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ques.) 6014 (iv).
Bourinot, John C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ques.) 6013 (iv).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1116 (i).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1790; (M.) to adjn. debate, 1792 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2037 (ii).
Cigarettes, Sale &c., Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain)—(amt.) 4084 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Ques. of Order, Reference to Proceedings in Pub. Accts. Com., 5845 (iii).
Customs Commissioner, Charges *re* sending Official Documents out of Canada (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5721 (iii).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Election Frauds and Corruption, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6845 (iv).
Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°*, 6764; in Com., 7313 (iv).
Financial Situation, Public Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7852 (iv).

Johnston, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2731 (ii).
G.T.Ry. Bill 82, on M. for 3°, 4849 (iii).
G.T.P. Investigation, Payments *re* Construction on M. to Conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5113, (amt.) 5114, agreed to (Y. 114; N. 49) 5120 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7472, 7502, (iv).
Labour Disputes, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden), 2624 (ii).
Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 932 (i).
MacIlreith, T. R., Payments to for Legal Services, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor. (amt.) 2587 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., on M. that Com. rise, 3304 (ii); in Com., 3822, 3850, 3982, 4510 (iii).
——— Bill, Distribution of (remarks) 1331 (i).

SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6746 (iv).
Legislation (voters' lists) 6764 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto drill hall) 4033 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 6022; (Glace Bay) 6033; (Jersey Cove) 6049 (iv).

Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4361 (iii).
——— Matrices, in Com., 4399 (iii).
——— Printing Paper, in Com., 2055 (ii).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s (B. 106) 1°*, 4117 (iii).
Traders Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 4518; in Com., 5285 (iii).
United Baptists' Woman's Missionary Union incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 4117 (iii).
Wilson, Wm., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ques.) 6013 (iv).

Kemp, Mr. Albert E., *East Toronto.*

Associated Press Subsidy, Reps. in English newspapers (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 821; in Com., 1305, 1627 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6788 (iv).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 4633 (iii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7013 (iv).
Imports via Canadian Ports, Value of for 1906, &c. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).
Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 934 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

Manufacturers' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 803 (i).
'Resolute' Wreck, and Life-Saving Apparatus, Complaints *re* (remarks) on debate *re* P.E.I. Life-Saving Stations, 934 (i).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Canada) 7109 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg P.O.) 4601 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto drill hall) 4598 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 4609; (maintenance) 4603 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto harbour) 6987 (iv).
Tariff—British Preferential, applicable to Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 4294 (iii).
——— Farm Products, in Com., 1268 (i).
——— Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 556 (i).
———Oils, in Com., 4187 (iii).
——— Structural Steel, in Com., 4208 (iii).
Walker, Mr. Bruce Rep. *re* Remarks to Immigrants (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Year-book, Omissions from, (M. for ret.*) 3641 (ii).

Kennedy, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*

Canada and Japan Treaty B. 23 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 1548 (i).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1764 (i).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale of, Prohibition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4074 (iii).
'Kestrel,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5969 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1818 (i).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7240 (iv).
Ry. Act, 1903 (fires, &c.) Amt. (B. 62) 1° m., 1380 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (protection service) 5969 (iii).

Knowles, Mr. W. E., *West Assiniboia.*

Coal Lands in Western Provs., Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 761; (amt.) 766 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N. W., Shortage of Fuel, &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7132 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5597 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4694 (iii).
Hudson Bay, Construction of Railway to, &c. (prop. res.) 3548 (ii).

Knowles, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*
Prudential Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 163 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 6630 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co. &c., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2522, 2527 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (post offices) 2791 (ii).
Post Office (mail service) 3156 (ii).
Tariff—Fruit, &c., in Com., 1903 (i).
——— Wool, in Com., 2374 (ii).

Lachance, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*
La Banque Nationale (B. 27) 1°*, 803 (i).

Lake, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Address, The, 162 (i).
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5670 (iii).
Blairmore Town Site, Patents *re*, Charges, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6522 (iv).
C. P. R. Coal Lands, Selection by Govt., Conditions *re* Sale of Coal to Public (Ques.) 3883 (ii).
C. P. R. Crow's Nest Line, Agreement *re* Carriage of Coal, &c. (Ques.) 4666 (iii).
C. F. Ry. Lands Taxation, Appeal to Judicial Com. of Privy Council (Ques.) 3368 (ii), 4665 (iii).
Coal Famine in N. W., Ref. to in debate on Address, 162 (i).
Coal Lands, Leases, &c., Areas, Dates of Purchases, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).
——— Control by Govt. *re* Strikes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 754 (i).
Coal Strike in N. W., Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) 8 (i).
Crooked Lakes Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 4856 (iii).
Crow's Nest Coal, Action by Govt. *re* Price, &c. (Ques.) 6905 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5576 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4696; in Com., 4740, 4789, 4807, 4884 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3094, 3462 (ii).
Dom. Lands in Man., &c., Sales for 1905 (M. for ret.*) 1978 (i).
Doukhobors, Dom. Land Grants to (Ques.) 5780 (iii).
Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6689 (iv).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3516 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2890 (ii)

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Homestead Entries, Section 24, Twp. 21, Extension, &c., *re* Patents (Ques.) 2141 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3559 (ii).
Immigration to Canada, Total Number for 1901 to 1903, &c. (Ques.) 1382 (i).
——— Total Number since 1904, Distribution of, &c. (Ques.) 1053 (i).
Interior Dept., Employees in N. W., Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1804 (i).
Land Patents for Sections 3, 5, 7 and 13, Issue of (Ques.) 4857 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1827 (i).
McCormick & Deering Harvesters, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 566 (i).
Muscowequan Indians Boarding School, Govt. Grants, Treaty Money, Names, Ages, &c., of Pupils (M. for ret.*) 1068 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5380; (amt.) 5382 (iii).
Qu'Appelle Post Office, Change of Name, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Complaints *re* Taxation (Ques.) 3368 (ii).
——— Date of Homestead Entry, &c. (Ques.) 2139 (ii).
S. A. War Veterans, Land Grants, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 731 (i).
——— Terms and Conditions, &c., (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2638 (ii).
Sugar Imports from Fiji Islands, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4455 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 2962 (ii).
Civil govt. (post office) 2797 (ii); (contingencies) 6623 (iv).
Geological Survey (gas borings) 3160; (Nicolas, F., salary) 3164 (ii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6756 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 3143 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (barracks) 4033; (Calgary) 4036 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 4043 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Neepawa) 4600 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Saskn. (Medicine Hat) 4039; (Regina P.O.) 4040; (Saskatoon) 4041 (iii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) 1375 (i), 4405, (iii); (cocoa nibs) 1359; (Dumping Clause) 1004; (fruit) 1916; (hops) 1360 (i); (horse powers) 4419 (iii); (military stores, &c.) 2410 (ii); (oats) 1372 (i); (oils, &c.) 4186 ;(portable engines) 4407, 4414 (iii); (stallions, &c.) 2413 (ii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5675 (iii).

Lalor, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6268 (iv).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 818; in Com., 1622 (i); on Sen. Amts., 6771 (iv).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 670, 683 (i); on M. for 2°, 2423 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6783 (iv).

Dunnville Drill Hall, Erection of (Ques.) 474 (i).

Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7032 (iv).

Germany, Export Trade with Canada during years 1900-6, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).

G.T.P. Ry., Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Public Accts. Com., 5050 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter of Resignation (remarks) 3116 (ii).

Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6779 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7470 (iv).

Knitted Goods, Value of Importations from Germany and G.B. (Ques.) 724 (i).

Militia Arms, 13th Haldimand Battalion, Amounts paid for Storage (Ques.) 2828 (ii).

Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7197 (iv).

Port Maitland Pier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 474, 489 (i).

Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Bill, 7025 (iv).

Six Nation Reserve Schools, Change in Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 478 (i).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. (Mississaguas' claims) 7292; Que. (schools) 7281 (iv).

Militia (clothing) 5741 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Sussex St. property) 3965 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6947; (Port Burwell) 6965 (iv).

Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1001 (i).

——— Intermediate and German Treaties, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 874 (i).

———Matrices, in Com., 4399 (iii).

——— Wool, in Com., 2372 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4411 (iii).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 835; 1319 (i); 2036 (ii)

Dominion Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. Macpherson) on Senate Amts., 4409 (iii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2247 (ii), 4617; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4957, neg. (Y. 38; N. 102) 4968 (iii).

G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4409 (iii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) 7484 (iv).

Harbour-au-Bouche Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 486 (i).

Immigration in Quebec, Ques. of Order, 6726

I. C. R., Accidents, Deaths, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3423 (ii).

Jordan-Erie Power Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 7909 (iv).

Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 2225 (ii).

See 'Supreme.'

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 4976 (iii).

Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7848 (iv).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 595 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Delay of Special Com., 1185 (i).

——— Consideration of (remarks) 7517 (iv).

Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7190 (iv).

National Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. B. 29 (Mr. Pardee) on Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).

Niagara Falls, Map of Dr. Spencer *re*, &c. (Ques.) 487 (i).

——— Water Power and International Waterways Commission, Apportionment to Can. and U. S. (Ques.) 567 (i).

——— Rep., O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies) 1426 (i).

Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7204 (iv).

Port Arthur Development Co.'s B. 167, Protest, on M. (Mr. Conmee) *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).

Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) on Sen. Amts., 4413 (iii).

Ry. Act (arbitrations) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 90; 2° m, 594 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 595, 951 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 641 (i).

Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3278, 3329 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (fumigating stations) 2975 (ii).

Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S., *re* Cor., &c., read on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3925 (ii).

See 'Judicial.'

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (apples) 1893; Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1207; (fruit, &c.) 1904; (Indian corn) 1362; (tomatoes) 1874; (U. S. duties, comparisons, &c.) 1200 (i).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2324 (ii).
Winnipeg Terminals, C. N. and G. T. P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5520 (iii).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5020 (iii).

Lanctot, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. (B. 160) 1° m., 6518 (iv).

Lapointe, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Chapais, Mr. J. C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5504 (iii).
I. C. R., Automobile Cars on Rivière Ouelle Branch (Ques.) 3837 (ii).

Laurence, Mr. F. A., *Colchester.*
Barges Inspection (B. 35) 1° m., 1035 (i).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1450 (i).
I. C. R., Accidents, Compensation to Injured, &c. (Ques.) 1055 (i).
——— (M. for ret.) 3396 (ii).
——— (notices of motion) 1077 (i).
I. C. R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2933 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*
Address, The, 33 (i).
——— (M.) for Precedence, 89 (i).
——— (M.) to present, 218 (i).
——— Reply from His Ex. (presented) 1044 (i).
Alberta and Saskatchewan (readjustment) Representation Act Amt. (B. 51) 1° m., 1120 (i); in Com., 5670 (iii).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment (M.) 2728 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., on Inquiry for, 658, 992 (i).
Beauharnois Canal Water Power Lease, Guarantee *re* Navigation (remarks) 2999 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Leases, &c. (Ans.) 1118 (i).
Binder Twine, Drawbacks up to 1906, &c. (Ans.) 1613 (i).
——— Seizures in 1906, &c. (Ans.) 2140 (ii).
Budget Speech, Prop. Motion *re* Precedence in Debate, 237 (i).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1112 (i).
——— Procedure (remarks) 3728 (ii). *See* 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Canada and Japan Treaty (B. 23) 1°*, 803; 2° m., 1546 (i).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Canada and U.S., Negotiations by Mr. Bryce (remarks) 5508 (iii).
Charges against Conservative Members by Mr. Emmerson, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5667 (iii).
Christmas Adjournment (M.) 991, 1077 (i).
Cigarette Manufacture, &c., Legislation *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 1801 (i).
——— on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 4066; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Ques. of Order, 4088; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 4088 (iii).
Civil Service Employees, Salaries, &c. at Ottawa (Ans.) 2634 (ii).
Coal Strike in N.W., Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) 9 (i).
——— Tel. from Mr. King and Jurisdiction of Govt. (remarks) 220 (i).
Coal Strike at Lethbridge, Location of Dep. Min. of Labour (remarks) 423 (i).
Coboconk and Gull River Waterway, Construction of Canal, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 495 (i).
Cochrane, Mr. Edward, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4367 (iii).
Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) Ques. of Order, 5122 (iii).
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister (remarks) 5260; on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse, 5265 (iii).
——— Canadian Representatives, &c. (Ans.) 891 (i).
——— Cor. with Mr. Deakin and Sir Jos. Ward (remarks) 5525 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt., on Inquiry for, 3002 (ii).
——— Discussions *re* Imperial Council, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 5535 (iii).
——— Subjects to be discussed, &c. (Ans.) 2634 (ii). *See* 'Imperial.'
Commercial Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).
Commercial Travellers' Tax, Agreement *re*, with Provincial Premiers (Ans.) 4213 (iii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.), 6 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 558 (i).
——— (M.) to add Name, 4440 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4728 (iii).
Easter Adjournment, (M.) 5177 (iii).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 4947 (iii).
Emmerson, Hon. H. R., Resignation as Minister of Railways (announcement) 5554 (iii).
Express Companies, Control by Ry. Commission, &c. (Ans.) 473 (i).
Farm Implements, Total Amount of Duty collected, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 948 (i).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Freight Rates, Tariff, Local and General, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 724 (i).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3654 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 2728 (ii).
——— Precedence on Mondays, &c. (M.) 3545 (ii), 4274 (iii).
See 'Business.'
Govtl. and Parliamentary Printing, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 4851 (iii).
Gowan, Hon. Sir James, Resignation as Senator (remarks) 3626 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Quebec-Moncton Section, Surveys, &c. on M. for Copies (Mr. Crocket) 269 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. on M. (Mr. Crocket) 3139 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 4118 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Station on Champlain Market, Quebec (Ans.) 276 (i).
——— Cor. &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1942 (i).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2892 (ii).
Grenfell, Lady Victoria, Decease of (remarks) 2480 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3577 (ii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of Portfolio of Public Works (remarks) 92 (i).
——— on Notice (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2728 (ii).
——— Cor. &c. (read) 2735 (ii).
——— Date and Witnessing of Letter (remarks) 3106 (ii).
——— Information *re* Resignation, 514, 1797 (i).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 581, 1185 (i), 5086, 5560 (iii).
——— Legality of Form (remarks) 7 (i).
——— Letter *re* Resignation (remarks) 3627 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 3171 (ii).
——— Status as a member of the House, &c. (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 842 (i).
Imperial Council in G.B. for Colonies, Cor. *re* (remarks) 4667 (iii.)
See 'Colonial, 'Intercolonial,' &c.
Insurance Commission, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges against Cabinet Ministers, 5457 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5663 (iii).
——— Charges against Members, on M. (Mr. Bourassa) to Ways and Means, 4384; on Notice of Ques. of Privilege (remarks) 5509

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Insurance Commission (remarks) *re* Rep., 992 (i).
——— Cor. with Min. of Justice and Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 3908 (ii).
——— Evidence and Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 2997 (ii).
Insurance Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 4092 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to consider 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 5177 (iii).
Intercolonial Conference, Imperial Defence, &c. (Ans.) 3182 (ii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R., Hillsborough Bridge, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 614 (i).
——— Windsor Branch of Dom. Atlantic Ry., Expiration of Lease, &c. (Ans.) 616 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex., 219 (i).
International Relations, Canadian Representative at Washington (remarks) 2754 (ii).
Jamaica Disaster, &c. (remarks) 1613 (i).
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4140 (iii).
Kittson, Mr. C. M., Resignation of as Canadian Agent in South Africa (Ans.) 1140 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 219 (i).
Labour Troubles, *See* 'Coal.'
Lamontagne and 'Le Soleil' Cos., Amount paid in 1906-7 (Ans.) 3631 (ii).
——— Payments to by Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 3727 (ii).
Library of Parlt. Com. (M.) 611 (i).
Lime Kiln, Lake Erie Channel, Regulation *re* Steamboats Racing, (Ans.) 4045 (iii).
Loggie, W. S. & Co., Payments, to (Ans.) 3048 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W. (M.) for Com., 2585 (ii).
——— (M.) to add Names, 4117 (iii).
MacIlreith, R. T., Payments for Legal Services, on Amt. (Mr. Johnston) to M. for Ret., 2588 (ii).
McInnes, Hon. Wm., Charges *re* Administration of Yukon (Ans.) 2978 (ii).
'Maisonneuve' Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3633 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Agreement with Mr. E. Brown (Ans.) 3840 (ii).
——— Govt. Policy, (Ans.) 1803 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (Ans.) 4857 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 219 (i).
Martin, Thos., late M. P., Decease of (remarks) 4518 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c., Reps, in Press (remarks) 2229 (ii).
Morning Sittings (M.) 5553 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 22) 1°*, 803; 2° m., and in Com., 1092 (i).
Niagara—International Waterways Commission, Reps., O. Cs. &c., on M. (Mr. Lancaster) for Copies, 1439 (i).
N. W. Mounted Police Report presented, 3546 (ii).
N.S. Supreme Court: *See* 'Supreme.'
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 3 (i).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3385 (ii).
Order, Ques. of *re* Motion (Mr. Robitaille) 2588 (ii).
Parliament Buildings, Covering of Steps, &c. (remarks) 174 (i).
Paterson, Rev. G. C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4047 (iii).
Patrick, Mr. J. A. M., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Answer to Question (remarks) 576 (i).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. (remarks) 4666 (iii).
Pilots at Montreal, Invitation *re* Inspection of St. Lawrence Route (Ans.) 3885 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Letter *re* Immigration to South Africa, on M. for Sup., 3731 (ii).
P. E. I. Fisheries, Negotiations with Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 3883 (ii).
P. E. I. Freight Service, &c., Ques. of Order, 1078 (i).
P. E. I. Mail Service, Negligence of Govt. *re* (remarks) 3888 (ii).
P. E. I. Provincial Subsidy, Basis of Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 5084 (iii).
——— Claims of Delegates, Memo. *re*, &c. (Ans.) 1800 (i).
P. E. I. Telegraph Communication, and Marconi Co. (remarks) 1858 (i).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Construction of Ice-breakers, &c. (Ans.) 3636 (ii).
——— Remarks *re* Tunnel, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Lefurgey) 4371 (iii).
Printing Bureau, Names of Employees (Ans.) 3887 (ii).
Printing of Parlt. Com. (M.) 611 (i).
Private Bills, Pets., on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1920 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive 1981 (ii).
——— Rules respecting, Fines, &c. (Ans.) 718 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges of Graft against Ministers, &c., 3441 (ii).
Provincial Premiers, Conference, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 486 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 703 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. Res., Notice of Motion, 4861 (iii).
——— (M.) for Res., 5177, 5288 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies, Amt.. to B. N. A. Act, on Ques. of Order, Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5345 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Member (Mr. Crocket) speaking on Main Motion, 5346 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 5378; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5383 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Delay in bringing down Papers (remarks) 3460 (ii).
——— (M.) to add name, 4440 (iii).
——— 6th Rep., on M. (Mr. Barker) to consider, 4771 (iii).
——— (M.) *re* sitting concurrently with Hse., 5561 (iii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 649; (M.) to refer to Ry. Com., 657 (i); on M. for Com., 3685 (ii).
Ry. Rates on Commodities passing through or from Canada on Transportation Lines, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 743 (i).
Railways, Minister of (Hon. Mr. Emmerson) Resignation of (announcement) 5554 (iii).
Railway Tariffs, upon Commodities, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 503 (i).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2194 (ii).
Reports, on Inquiry for, 1184 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 3626 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1528 (i).
Ross Rifle Factory, Cor. *re*, on Inquiry for (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3277 (ii).
Ross Rifles and N. W. Mounted Police, Abandonment of, &c. (Ans.) 614 (i).
——— (remarks) 573 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Judge, Apptmnt. *re* (remarks) 1300 (i), 1991, 2229 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, Representation (B. 51) 2° m., 1614; M. to refer to Special Com., 1615 (i); M. to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 4928 (iii); in Com., 6766; 3°*, 6766 (iv).
Senators, New, Apptmnt. of (announcement) 1564 (i).
——— (remarks) 1473 (i).
Senators, Apptmnt. of in N. B., Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1651 (i).
Senate Reform, Res. of Liberals in 1893 (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Senate Vacancies from N. B., Applications *re* (Ans.) 708 (i).
Senatorship for Rougemont, Statement of Mr. Girard, 4664 (iii).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4248 (iii).
Sol. Gen., Delay in Apptmnt. (remarks) 843 (i).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—*Con.*
Sol. Gen., Inconvenience *re* Delay of Apptmnt. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).
S. A. War Veterans, Land Grants to, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 736 (i).
Speech from Throne (M.) for considn., 5 (i).
——— Distribution to Members (remarks) 6 (i).
Spohn, Dr., Apptmnt. *re* Senatorship (remarks) 4660 (iii).
Stockton, Mr. A. A., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4757 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1042 (i); in Com., 3298, 3339 (ii).
Supply (M.) 218 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Privy Council) 2764 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (patrol boats) 5772 (iii).
Supreme Court, N. S., Delay in Apptmnt., &c. (remarks) 843 (i).
Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. of Ways and Means, 4324 (iii).
Tariff Res.—Intermediate Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 549 (i).
Tariff—Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1242 (i).
Telephone Cos., Expropriation by Provincial Authorities, &c. (Ans.) 3180 (ii).
Trade and Nav. Rets. (presented) 219 (i).
Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 256 (i).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 219 (i).
Yukon Boundaries Delimitation, on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 3102 (ii).
Yukon Territory Ordinances (presented) 274 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
Dion, Ulric., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6904 (iv).
Dom. Notes, Printing in French (Ques.) 6015 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7049 (iv).
French Immigration to Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1141 (i).
French Language, Action by P. M. G. *re* Extending (Ques.) 6012 (iv).
——— Action of Min. of Rys. *re* Extending (Ques.) 6014 (iv).
——— Use of in Coinage and Postal Notes, &c. (prop. res.) 3641 (ii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2733 (ii).
G. T. P., Advertisement for Tenders in Quebec (Ques.) 3183 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. A.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Quebec-Moncton Section, Progress of Work, Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 468 (i).
——— Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1938 (i).
——— (Ques.) 276 (i).
Heraldic Collection of Can., Item in 'Le Canada' *re* (Ques.) 1057 (i).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, 4759 (iii).
Immigration, Bonuses to SS. Booking Agents, Par. in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) 4519 (iii).
Immigration from France to Canada, Propaganda *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1556 (i).
Immigration Legislation in B. C., Refusal of Lt. Gov. to assent to (remarks) 7985 (iv).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6145, (amt.) 6156 (iv).
Inland Navigation Companies (B. 34) 1° m., 884 (i).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5473; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5662 (iii).
——— French Translation (remarks) 7984 (iv).
——— Rep. and Evidence (M.) to have printed, 5176 (iii)
Intercolonial Conference, Imperial Defence, &c. (Ques.) 3182 (ii).
I. C. R. Passenger Agent, Emplymt. of Mr. John Matthews (Ques.) 6904 (iv).
'Le Nationaliste,' Rep. *re* Abuse of Mr. Fielding, Ques. of Privilege, 4052 (iii).
——— Rep. *re* Speech, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Dubeau) 3844 (ii).
Letter Carriers, Quebec City, Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Marier, Mr. J. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7541 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an Englishman (remarks) 5861 (iii).
Marriages (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 7698 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5805 (iii).
Personal Explanation, *re* Montmagny Patronage, 2482 (ii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 4656 (iii).
Printing Bureau, Chief Foreman, P. M. Draper, Apptmnt. of (Ques.) 6635 (iv).
Printing of Parlt. (M.) that 3rd Rep. be considered, 5176 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Charges of Graft against Ministers, &c., 3455 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B. N. A. Act, from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7712; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7707 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, 7719, 7751 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv).
Quebec Garrison, Permanent Force, Recruits from England (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Quebec-Levis Ferry Service, Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 6256 (iv).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3690 (ii).
Ry. Fares to N.W., Rate to Immigrants from Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 1517 (i).
Revised Statutes, Errors in Printing (Ques.) 5287 (iii).
——— French Translation, Delay, Names of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3183 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Erection of, &c., Cor. (M. for copies*) 1977 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 3277, 3546 (ii).
St. Charles de Caplin, Refrigerator Association, Rep. *re* Bait Freezer (Ques.) 6904 (iv).
Senate Reform, Res. of Liberals in 1893 (Ques.) 3184 (ii).
Senatorship for Rougemont, Apptmnt. of Mr. Dessaulles, Rep. *re* Stmnt. by Mr. Girard, on M. for Sup., 4657 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3088; in Com., 3280, 3867 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. Louis, *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Arthabaska Postmaster's Salary (remarks) 6632 (iv).
Eastern Townships Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 42) 1°*, 1119 (i).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7040 (iv).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7841 (iv).
Postal Rates Reduction, &c. (remarks) 6632
Postmaster's Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on B. 7029 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co's B. 56 (Mr. McCool) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 2526 (ii).

Law, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth, N.S.*,
Lurcher Lightship, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5863 (iii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) 2° m., 6376 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service (maintenance, &c.) 5868 (iii).
Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—N.S. (Yarmouth) 6067 (iv).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *East Prince, P.E.I.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1636 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2446 (ii).
Farm Wagons, Duty, &c. collected *re* Dumping Clause (Ques.) 2138 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Circulars issued to *re* Bonuses, &c. (Ques.) 478 (i).
——— Issued to Officers or Agents, &c. (M. for copies*) 580 (i).
Insurance Commission's Rep., on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6474 (iv).
I.C.R., Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2944 (ii).
I.C.R., McPhee Automatic Signalling Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 2835 (ii).
——— Motor Cars, Investigation and Rep. by Mr. Joughins (Ques.) 722 (i).
Letter Carrier System in Charlottetown, P.E.I. Establishment of (Ques.) 723 (i).
Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Cor. &c. *re* Wrecked Vessels, (M. for copy) 898 (i).
Lobster Hatchery at Egmont Bay, Application for (Mr. Ames) 724 (i).
"McKeen, G.A.", Loss of on Cascumpec Bar, &c. (Ques.) 1146 (i).
Northwest Land Transactions, Charges *re*, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 3458 (ii).
Pictou Harbour Dredging, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).
Pictou Harbour Dues, Collections, &c. (Ques.) 1808 (i).
P.E.I., Dredging, Schedule, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 481 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Services, &c. (remarks) 1081 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Change in Winter Time-Table, Protests *re* (Ques.) 1807 (i).
——— Claims *re* Fire Damages to Mrs. Wiggins and Charles Malley (Ques.) 1808 (i).
——— *See* 'Wiggins,' &c.
——— Coal Supply, Inferior Quality, &c. (Ques.) 1144 (i).
——— Officials, Investigation *re* Charges against (Ques.) 1146 (i).
——— O'Leary and West Cape Branch, Reps. Surveys, &c. (M.) for Copies, 1811 (i).
——— Summerside Freight Shed, Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 1136 (i).
P.E.I. Telegraphic Communication, Marconi Co., &c. (remarks) 1858 (i).
P.E.I Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Martin) for Copies, 3209 (ii).
——— Investigation, Reports, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 945 (i).
——— Surveys, &c. (remarks) 6377 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Condition of Boats, &c. (remarks) 4667 (iii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Winter Communication, 'Empress' and 'Stanley,' Strs., laying off for Season (remarks) 703 (i).
——— Inefficient Service (remarks) 4939 (iii).
——— Prime Minister's remarks *re* Tunnel (personal explanation) 4370 (iii).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Names of Steamers, Through Freight Rates, &c. (Ques.) 612 (i).
——— Tel. (read) *re* Closing of Channel, 512
——— Total Cost and Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1986 (ii).
——— Winter Mail Service, Negligence on Part of Govt. (remarks) 3887 (ii).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5335, (amt.) 5343, Neg. (Y. 34 ; N. 96) 5373 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act, from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7715; in Com. on Res., 7757 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies and Boundaries, Additions since Confederation (Ques.) 5285 (iii).
——— P.E.I., Basis of Arrangement, &c. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
Quahaug Fishing Regulations in P.E.I. (Ques.) 1143 (i).
Revised Statutes, Distribution to P.E.I. Libraries, &c. (Ques.) 2138 (ii).
S.A. War Veterans, Land Grants to, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 734 (i).
'Sovinto' Wreck, P.E.I., Request to Govt. for Lifeboats of Govt. Strs. (Ques.) 711 (i).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (dogfish extermination) 5920 ; (hatcheries) 5902; (oyster culture) 5914 (iii).
Geological Survey (Nicolas, F., salary) 3163; (oil borings) 3162 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7118 (iv).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6474 (iv.)
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Edmonton) 4037 (iii); B.C. (Vancouver) 4042 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 6070; (Miminegash) 6070; (Summerside) 6071 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (fire damages) 7665 (iv).
Warburton Property, Purchase for Rifle Range, &c., Cor. Tels. &c. (M. for copies*) 2584 (ii).
Wiggins, Widow James, and Charles Malley, Property burned, Cor. with Govt., &c. (M. for copies*) 4458 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 1808 (i).

Lemieux, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé*,
Arthabaska Postmaster's Salary (remarks) 6633 (iv).
Atlantic Fast Mail Service (statement) 7185 (iv).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Bell Telephone Strike, Toronto Investigation, Tel from W. L. Mackenzie King (read) *re* Settlement, 3276 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Civil Service Regulations *re* (Ans.) 2837 (ii).
——— Complaints *re*, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 1990 (ii).
Bethany Asst. Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ans.) 723, 1147 (i).
Brandon Postmaster, Salary and Allowances, &c. (Ans.) 1558 (i).
Brighton Postmaster, Vacancy, Cancellation of Apptmnt., &c. (Ans.) 3426 (ii).
British Periodicals, Postage, &c. (Ans.) 1135 (i).
Canada and G.B. Mail Service (statement) 7185 (iv).
Cannington Postmaster, Retirement of Mr. Talbot, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 502 (i).
Cape Tormentine and Summerside Mail Contracts, Termination, &c. (Ans.) 573 (i).
Centreville Postmaster, Absence, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
——— Removad of from Belleville (remarks) 7781 (iv).
Charing Cross Station, Closing of, &c. (remarks) 1110 (i).
City Post Offices, Civil Service Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 2583 (ii).
Coal Famine in N.W. (remarks) in debate on Address, 166 (i).
Coal Lands in Northwest, Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 793 (i).
Coal Strikes in N.W., Statement *re* Settlement, 174 (i).
——— Information *re* Settlement (remarks) 276 (i).
——— Meeting of Dep. Min. of Labour and Mr. Mitchell (Ans.) 488 (i).
——— Terms of Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 616 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N.W., Shortage of Fuel, &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7136 (iv).
——— Telegram from Blairmore (remarks) 7092 (iv).
——— Tel. from Calgary Board of Trade (remarks) 6908 (iv).
——— Telegrams from C.P.R. (read) 424 (i).
——— Tel. *re* Conference (read) 7543 (iv).
——— Tel. from Dep. Min. of Labour (read) 514 (i).
——— Tel. from Fernie, B.C. (read) 7838 (iv).
——— Tel. from Mr. King (read) 7871 (iv).
——— Tel. from Mr. A. F. Sherman (read) 7310 (iv).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes in the West, on Inquiry (Mr. R. L. Borden) for further Information, 7518 (iv).
——— Additional Information (remarks) 7693 (iv).
——— Cor. *re* Taber Mines (read) 6144 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 2143 (ii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Investigation *re* Charges (Ans.) 4049 (iii).
Crow's Nest Pass Mines, Settlement of Strike by Dispute Bill (remarks) 6007 (iv).
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co., Settlement under Disputes Bill (remarks) 6005 (iv).
Debates, Official, Salaries of Staff (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7978 (iv).
Eastern Townships, Applications for new Offices, Grants, &c. (Ans.) 2580 (ii).
'Empress of Britain,' Str., Arrival in Halifax, Montreal and St. John, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 951 (i).
'Empress of Ireland,' Delays in Canadian Fast Mail *re* Halifax Route (Ans.) 1059 (i).
French Clergy, Exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6665 (iv).
French Language, Action by P.M.G., Extending of (Ans.) 6012 (iv).
——— Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3662 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Speech of P.M.G., Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 572
Govt. Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6689 (iv).
Hall, Mr. Z., Postmaster at Hampton, N.S., Corrupt Practice *re* Elections (Ans.) 231 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6257 (iv).
——— Penalties *re* N.S. Election Act (Ans.) 1062 (i).
Harbour au Bouche, Mail Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 487 (i).
House of Commons Postal Facilities, Special Stamps and Postal Orders (explanation) 1378 (i).
Immigration, Encouragement of Eastern Citizens to go to N.W. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6193 (iv).
Industrial and Co-operative Societies B. No. 2 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 594 (i).
——— Rep. of Com., 7309 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Printing in French (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7005 (iv).
I.C.R., O'Rourke, Mr. John, Charges *re* Stealing Postage Stamps (Ans.) 3425 (ii).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlements, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1166 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Distribution of (explanation) 1378 (i).
See "Coal Strikes", "Bell Telephone", "Strikes Bill 36," &c.
Lakeville P.O., P.E.I., Change in Location, &c. (Ans.) 7250 (iv).
Lansdowne, Mail Delivery by Night Trains, &c. (Ans.) 2581 (ii).
Leopold, Mr. Louis, Rep. *re* Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and Immigration of skilled Labour (Ans.) 4217 (iii).
Letter Carrier Service, Extension to Edmonton and Calgary, (Ans.) 615 (i).
Letter Carriers, in Quebec City, Increase in (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Mail Service to G.B.: *See* "Empress", &c.
Mail Service, to St. Damase, Ste. Perpetue, &c. (Ans.) 718 (i).
Manitoba (Western) Mail Service, Complaints *re* Condition (Ans.) 2982 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an Englishman, (remarks) 5861 (iii).
Michipicoten Mail Service, Irregularity, &c. (Ans.) 2831 (ii).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7220 (iv).
Newspaper Articles, Objectionable Reading, &c. (remarks) 2758 (ii).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Contract *re* Construction, Supervisor (Ans.) 1387 (i).
Nicolet and St. Gregoire Mail Service Contract *re* (Ans.) 1386 (i).
Nicolet Vacancy, (statement) 513 (i).
North Lake P.O., P.E.I., Change in Location (Ans.) 7249 (iv).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3388 (ii).
Ophir Postmaster, Reduction of Salary and Increased Mail Service (Ans.) 4219 (iii).
Orangeville, P.O., Vacancy *re* (Ans.) 7249 (iv).
Parcel Post, C.O.D. System, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2344 (ii).
Pisquid East, Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. McDonald, Apptmnt. of Successor (Ans.) 897 (i).
Postal Arrangements, between Canada and United States, Cancellation of, &c. (Ans.) 473 (i).
——— Ref. to in Speech on Address (Ans.) 613 (i).
Post Cards, Coated with Isinglass, Prohibition of (remarks) 5284 (iii).
Postal Cards and Stamps, Complaints *re* Quality of Paper (Ans.) 572 (i).
Postal Delivery, Charlottetown, Inauguration of (Ans.) 3425 (ii).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Postal Delivery, Free, Names of Places, Revenues, &c. (Ans.) 2636 (ii).
Postal Parcel System, Protests *re* Extension in Man. (Ans.) 2829 (ii).
Postal Rates between G. B. and Canada, Reduction of (announcement) 6630 (iv).
——— (explanation) 6636 (iv).
Postal System, C.O.D., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2576 (ii).
Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected and due (Ans.) 1134 (i).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 219 (i).
Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries (remarks) 7024, 7780 (iv).
——— Compensation *re* &c. (Ans.) 5779 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. (B. 113) 1°*, 4610 (iii); in Com., 7020; on Senate Amts., 7839 (iv)
Post Offices in Cities, Employees' Salaries (Ans.) 5779 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* Salaries, (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
——— (remarks) 6520 (iv).
Post Office, Registered Letters, System *re* (Ans.) 2829 (ii).
Prince Albert Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1555 (i).
P.E.I.Ry., Terms *re* Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1389 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Mail Service, Contract *re* Carrying Mails, &c. (Ans.) 948 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj., *re* Amt. to B.N.A.Act, from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7719 (iv).
Qu'Appelle Post Office, Change in Name, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6624 (iv).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7421 (iv).
Railway Blockade in N.W., Delays in Mails, &c. (remarks) 6521 (iv).
Railway Strikes, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3188 (ii).
Regina Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1555 (i).
Registered Letters, Number carried in 1907 (Ans.) 3186 (ii).
See 'Post Office, Registered,' 'Southport,' &c.
Registration Fee, Increase of (Ans.) 3185 (ii).
St. Charles Postmistress, Compensation *re* Loss by Fire, &c. (Ans.) 1612 (i).
St. Timothée Post Office, Investigation *re* Mismanagement, &c., (Ans.) 2828 (ii).
Salmon River and Hectanooga Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4612 (iii).
Southport Postmaster, P.E.I., Age of, Loss of Registered Letter, &c. (Ans.) 7251 (iv).
Stanley, N.B. Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Rogers (Ans.) 7542 (iv).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Stonefield Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 1125 (i).
Stratton, Ira, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6012 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention (B. 36) 1° m., 1036 (i); 2° m., 3002; in Com., 3091, 3278, 3367, 3802; in Com., Memorandum of Dep. Min. of Justice (read) 3844 (ii); in Com., 3978, 4458, 4772; 3° m., 4978; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4980 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts, Enforcement of Statute (remarks) 6007 (iv).
Strikes in Industrial Concerns (remarks) 5862 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Labour Dept., 2958 (ii); (Acland, F. A.) 6619; (McNiven, J. A.) 6619; (private secretary) 7692; Post Office (asst. dep. P.M.G.) 7691 (iv); (outside service) 3141; (post office) 2770 (ii).
Excise (B.C. officers) 6626; (wood alcohol) 6626 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6742 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Bell Telephone commission) 6620; (printing, &c.) 6618 (iv); (printing 'Gazette') 3579 (ii).
Legislation—H. of C. (debates, salaries) 7978 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé Basin) 7120; (G. B. and Canada) 7116 (iv).
N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 7836 (iv).
Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 3158; (mail service) 3141 (ii); (postmasters' salaries) 7982 (iv); (Yukon mail service) 3158 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse du Cap) 6092; (Barachois de Malbaie) 6093; (Doucet's Landing) 6098; (Father Point) 6100; (Magdalen Islands) 6114; (St. Anne des Monts) 6128 (iv).
Toronto, Mails to the East, Cost of Carrying (Ans.) 1121 (i).
——— Postal Stations in Centre Toronto (Ans.) 4861 (iii).
Toronto Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 224 (i).
Vaulvagnas, Pet. *re* Post Office (Ans.) 1066 (i).
Victoria Harbour and Ry. Station Mail Contracts, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2144 (ii).
Wellburn Post Office, Pet. *re* Daily Mail Service (Ans.) 896 (i).
Yukon Officials, Absence of Postmaster (remarks) 888 (i).
Yukon Winter Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 890 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6260 (iv).
Allandale Postmaster, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2805 (ii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7517 (iv).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7695 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1328 (i).
Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 4557 (iii).
Coboconk and Gull River Canal Construction, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 497 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2460 (ii).
Collingwood Ship Building Co., Sitting of Pub. Accounts Com. (objection) 3721 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4741, 4785, 4804, 4868 (iii).
Election Act, Amts. *re* Corruption and Frauds, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6824, 6836 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7035 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2242 (ii).
Galt Post Office Building, Total Expenditure, Cost, Supervision, &c. (Ques.) 719 (i).
——— Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4445; on M. for 3°, 4794; (amt.) 4798; neg. (Y. 22, N. 48) 4800; on Amt. (Mr. Bennett) to M. for 3°, 4802 (iii).
G.T.Ry. Co., Use of G.T.P. Rolling Stock, Terms and Conditions (Ques.) 5656 (iii).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts., 5114 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7344, 7395 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Inquiry for further Information, 7186 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Cor. beween Min. of Justice and Commissioners, on M. for Sup., 3899 (ii).
——— on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6379 (iv).
Insurance Commission Rep., (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6913, Amt. neg. (Y. 51; N. 92) 6931 (iv).
——— French Translation, &c. (remarks) on M. to conc. in Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1485 (i), 2913 (ii).
Jordan-Erie Power Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 7910 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 61) 1° m., 1380 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Judges of Provincial Courts, and Extra-Judicial Work, Cor. (M. for copies*) 1978 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3461 (ii).
Kelly, John, Compensation for Slaughter of Animal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
McInnes, Hon. Wm., Charges *re* Administration of Yukon (Ques.) 2978 (ii).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Senate Amts., 5205 (iii), 6205 (iv).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7841 (iv).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7203, 7217, 7253 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7067 (iv).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7311, 7483 (iv).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s B. 167 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 7212 (iv).
Postmasters, Rural, Increase in Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6621 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 5779 (iii).
——— Inquiry *re*, 7780 (iv).
Post Office Employees, Salary Increases (remarks) 6520 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Rep. to English Press *re* Immigration to S. Africa (Ques.) 2984 (ii).
——— Delay in Answering Question (Ques.) 5506 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Paper, 3728 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2958 (ii).
Private Bills, Precedence *re* (remarks) 7482 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Bill.'
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj., &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7707; in Com. on Res., 7750 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Collingwood Dock on (M.) *re* Sittings, 3841 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7245, 7960 (iv).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4970 (iii).
Queens and Shelburne Election Trial, Ref. to in debate, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Election Frauds, 6824 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2457 (ii).
Railway Act (two-cent rate) B. 6 on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) for Com., 3681 (ii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7434 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 5175 (iii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Revised Statutes, Schedule 'A,' Amt. (B. 148) (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6769 (iv).
Simcoe County Judgeship, Par. in 'Northern Advance,' on Personal Explanation (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4369 (iii).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 4228 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3278, 3320, 3816, 3847 (ii), 4462, 4772; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5012, neg. (Y. 44; N. 104) 5014 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7815 (iv); (archives) 2960; (census) 2967 (ii); (electric ry., experimental farm) 7818 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (St. Johns conduit) 7536 (iv); Quebec (cement) 5552 (iii); Trent (construction) 7667; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 7532 (iv).
Civil Govt. (Aud. Gen.) 2765; Post Office (post office) 2770 (ii); (contingencies) 6621 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (bookkeeping reorganization) 5955 (iii), 7682 (iv).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6379 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 7678 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton car shops) 7303 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Brunet, A., remuneration) 7539 (iv).
Scientific Institutions—Meteorological Service (Found, A. W., allowance, &c.) 7684; (surveys) 7684 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 6628; (inspections) 6626 (iv).
Tariff—(beeswax) in Com., 1332 (i); (clover seeds, &c.) in Com., 4145 (iii).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, &c., Reps. *re*, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1931 (i).
——— Severn Route, &c. (remarks) 4840 (iii). *See* 'Coboconk.'
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5020 (iii).
Yukon, Charges *re* Administration of Hon. Mr. McInnes (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*
G.T.P., Payette, Mr. Philias, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2984 (ii).
St. Pierre and Miquelon Immigrants, Arrival of (Ques.) 4855 (iii).

Lewis, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*
Canada and U. S. Treaty Commission, Par. in London "Free Press", (remarks) 6258 (iv).
International Relations, Canadian Representative at Washington (remarks) 2751 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2772 (ii).

Logan, Mr. Hance J., *Cumberland.*
Abitibi and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 142) 1°*, 5504 (iii).

Logan, Mr. Hance J.—*Con.*
British Preference, &c. (reply) 4352 (iii).
Budget, The, (remarks) *re* debate, 467 (i).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1495 (i).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement of Minister of Rys., 5237 (iii).
Labour Disputes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2610 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3080; in Com., 3353, 3823, 3848 (ii), 3981, 3998; on M. for 3°, 5005 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2774 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference, applicable to Goods shipped direct to Canadian Ports, in Com. on Ways and Means, 4276, (amt.) 4291 (iii).
Tariff—(chains) in Com., 4276 (iii).
Tariff—Preferential Tariff (remarks) in Com., 1252 (i).
United Baptist Womens' Missionary Union (M.) to remit Fees, 5504 (iii).

Loggie, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2024 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6772 (iv).
I.C.Ry. Accidents, Deaths, Compensation, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3411 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (fish transportation) 5933; hatcheries) 5916; (herring nets) 5916 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Oak Point) 6077 (iv).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, Amts. in Com., 1029, 1201; Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1222 (i).
Tariff—Pulp Wood, in Com., 2067 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Blairmore Town Site, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6610 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2028 (ii).
Cigarettes, Sale and Manufacture, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4064 (iii).
Civil Servants' Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7690 (iv).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1457 (i).
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1760 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Investigation *re* Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5118 (iii).
I.C.Ry., Accidents, Deaths, Compensation, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3404 (ii).
——— Employees Annuities System, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 1469 (i).
——— Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2911 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 916 (i).

Petawawa Military Camp, Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7640 (iv).

Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Post Office B., 7022 (iv).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7022 (iv).

P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service (remarks) 1083 (i).

P.E.I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3272 (ii).

Public Bills and Orders, Precedence on Monday, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3546 (ii).

Railway Act (two-cent rate) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Com., 3694, (amt.) 3695, 6 m.h., agreed to (Y. 80; N. 37) 3695 (ii).

Railway Act (liability) Amt. (B. 98) 1° m., 3424 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2181 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3758 (ii).

Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3045; in Com., 3300 (ii).

SUPPLY—

High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 7692 (iv).

Legislation—H. of C. (voters' lists) 6764 (iv).

Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S., Cor. *re*, Read on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3938 (ii).

Tariff—Intermediate and German Treaties, in Com. on Ways and Means, 869 (i).

——— Printing Paper, in Com., 2062 (ii).

——— Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1248 (i).

Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2333 (ii).

Macdonell, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*

Assets of Canada, Interest and non-interest bearing, Total Amount (Ques.) 3882 (ii).

Australia and Canadian Export Trade, Application *re* Subventions, &c. (Ques.) 4271 (iii).

Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6540 (iv).

——— Ques. of Order, 6563 (iv).

Canadian Mercantile Marine, Condition of, Vessels registered in Canada, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2146 (ii).

Canadian Naval Reserve, Establishment of, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copy*) 2147 (ii).

Macdonell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7797 (iv).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 83) 1° m., 1985 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 612 (i).

Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2276 (ii).

Exhibitions at Toronto and Sherbrooke, Dates *re* (remarks) 2589 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 4275 (iii).

Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3527 (ii).

Halifax Naval Dockyards, Relinquishment of, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (M. for copy*) 241 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7318, 7489 (iv).

Hudson Bay Deep Water Harbour, Govt. Action *re* Transportation (Ques.) 2574 (ii).

Immigration from Ont., Rep. of Mr. Southworth, 4667; (remarks) 4661 (iii).

Insurance (Fire) Cos., Chartered within five years, Capital subscribed, Location of Head Office, &c. (M. for ret.*) 249 (i).

I.C.R., Carpets purchased, Canadian-made or Foreign (Ques.) 3637 (ii).

Labour Disputes, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2590 (ii).

Penitentiaries in Canada, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2828 (ii).

Petawawa Military Camp, and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7631 (iv).

Post Office Employees, Legislation *re* Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2289 (ii).

——— (remarks) 6519 (iv).

Private Bills on Order Paper (M.) to take precedence on Monday, 7919 (iv).

Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158,' 'Petawawa,' &c.

Residential Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 28) 1°*, 803 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3890 (ii).

Statutes, Revised 'Schedule 'A' Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5884 (iii).

Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3076; in Com., 3282 (ii), 3981, 4503, 4775; on M. for 3°, 5003 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (clothing) 5740; (properties) 5738 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (life saving stations) 5768 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto harbour) 6986 (iv).

Tariff—Fur Skins, in Com., 2400 (ii).

——— Marble, in Com., 2123 (ii).

——— Melons, in Com., 1909 (i).

——— Vessels, &c., in Com., 2389 (ii).

Temiscaming and Northern Ontario Ry., Cor. *re* Subsidy Applications, &c. (M. for copies*) 239 (i).

Macdonell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Toronto Fort, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Commissioners and City of Toronto, Cor. *re* Dredging, Breakwater, Piers, &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Toronto Harbour, Complaints and Reps. *re* Depth of Water (Ques.) 897 (i).
——— Life-Saving Stations, *re* Marine Disasters, &c. (Ques.) 487 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5768 (iii).
——— Wrecks, Govtl. Action *re* (remarks) 7 (i).
Toronto, Mails to the East, Cost of Carrying, &c. (Ques.) 1121 (i).
Toronto Post Office, Repairs, Completion of (Ques.) 224 (i).
Traders' Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 5285 (iii).
Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 87) 1° m., 2342 (ii).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1304 (i).
Tariff—Cheese, in Com., 1350 (i).

Maclean, Mr. A. K., *Lunenberg.*
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c. (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 1670 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Ques. of Order, Reference to Proceedings before Pub. Accts. Com., 5846 (iii).
Election Frauds, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6844 (iv).
Frude's Point Wharf, Litigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3532 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 608 (i).
——— Evidence and Papers of Sel. Com. (M.) to place on Table, 1985 (ii).
Modus Vivendi and American Fishermen, Notice of Discussion, 1379 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Audit of Books (Ques.) 3884 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7101 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. Petite Riviere) 6057 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (agents' salaries) 7101 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*
Address, The, 61 (i).
Budget Speech, and Deputations *re* Tariff (remarks) 238 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).
C. P. Ry. Subways at Calgary, Order from Ry. Board, &c. (Ques.) 2289 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale Prohibition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4064 (iii).
Coal Strikes, &c., in the N. W., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7146 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7310 (iv).
Criminal Code (militia stores) Amt. B. 85 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 1°, 2068 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) Res. prop., 4864 (iii); in Com., 6786 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 1996 (i); in Com., 2229 (ii).
Federal Laws, Enforcement of: *See* 'Justice.'
Fidelity Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 164 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 7313 (iv).
Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 4274 (iii).
——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2729 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c. (remarks) 6378, 7409 (iv).
Govt. Rys., Running Rights, &c., Proposals *re* (Ques.) 5780 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Bureau) on Order for 2°, 2827 (ii); in Com., 4442; on M. for 3°, 4844 (iii).
G. T. P. Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for copies, 1951 (i).
G. T. R. 2-cent a Mile Rate (remarks) on M. for Ways and Means, 4371 (iii).
See 'Two-cent,' &c.
G. B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2888 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7327 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation, on Notice by Mr. Speaker, 2728 (ii).
Insurance Commission's Rep., on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
Insurance Commission and Evidence, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to print, 3722 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Legislation *re* (remarks) 4442 (iii).
——— Rep. *re*, on Notice of Motion (Mr. Bourassa) 5259 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 4091 (iii).
I. C. R. Employees' Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2909 (ii); on Senate Amts., 4865 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7453, 7500 (iv).
Jamaica Earthquake, Imperial Prestige, &c. (remarks) 1842 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4119 (iii).
Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'
Marconi Tel. Co., &c. (remarks) 1299 (i).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7224 (iv).
Northwestern Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 31 (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com., 4008 (iii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3387 (ii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7211, 7484 (iv).
Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 66 on M. (Mr. Campbell) to wthdr., 3720 (ii).
P.E.I. Telegraphic Communication with Mainland (remarks) 3547 (ii).
Private Bills, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1922 (i).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Provincial Subsidies, prop Res., on M. for Address to His Maj., 4862 (iii).
Prudential Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 163 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 7312 (iv).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 1045 (i); in Com., 2110, 2525 (ii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. McCool) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2527 (ii).
Railway Act (1903) Amt. Bill (remarks) 222 (i).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. (B. 7) 1°, m., 2° m., 961 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraph cos.) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 274; 2° m., 618 (i); (M.) for Com., 3674 (ii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7412, 7422; (amt.) to 3°, 7435, Neg. (Y. 38; N. 80) 7435 (iv).
Railway Grievances (remarks) on M. for 3° of G. T. Ry. Bill, 4847 (iii).
Ry. Passenger Tickets, Change in Revised Statutes (remarks) 7309 (iv).
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2188 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for *re* Pub. Accounts Com., 3889 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1523 (i).
Revised Statutes, Schedule 'A,' Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (eliminations, &c.) 6766 (iv).
Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.'s B. 37 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for 3°, 2769 (ii).
San Jose Scale, &c., Suppression of (remarks) 2760 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Scalping Ry. Tickets: *See* 'Ry. Passenger Tickets B. 7.'
Spirits, Customs and Excise Duty in Can. and U.S. (Ques.) 1057 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1036 (i), in Com., 3279 (ii), 3996, 4479 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2771; (privy council) 2764 (ii).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6462 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto customs) 4028; (Toronto drill hall) 4031 (iii).
Supreme Court Judges, Sask. and Alberta Salaries B. 146 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7441 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (animals, &c.) 1254 (i); (automobiles) 2398 (ii); (beeswax) 1332 (i); (coal) 2397 (ii); dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1208; (farm products) 1257; (fruit) 1914; (hay, &c.) 1867 (i); (marble) 2124 (ii); (portable engines) 4418 (iii); (proceedings *re* combinations, &c.) 1230; (rice, &c.) 1858 (i); (spirits, &c.) 2106 (ii); (tomatoes) 1870; (vegetables) 1882 (i); (wool) 2373 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4319 (iii).
Telephone Cos. Expropriation by Provincial Authorities (Ques.) 3180 (ii).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2300; on Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2330 (ii).
See 'G.T.R.'
Water Powers, of Dom., Public Ownership of, on M. (Mr. Monk) *re* Soulanges Canal Power, 250 (i).
Welland Canal Water Power, Amount contracted for, &c. by Cataract Power Co. (Ques.) 1923 (i).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6264 (iv).
B.C. Judgeships, Alleged Sale of, Reps. in Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 718 (i).
Burrard, Westminster and Boundary Ry & Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71) 1°*, 1794 (i).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 1726 (i).
C.P.R. and B.C. Electric Rys. Agreement (B. 52) 1°*, 1293 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 810, 822; in Com., 1313 (i).
Cigarettes, Sale of, &c., Prohibition of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 4088 (iii).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*
Dominion Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1293(i); on Senate Amts., 4409 (iii).
Financial Situation—Public Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7851 (iv).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. (B. 137) 1°*, 5258 (iii).
G.T.P. Land Grant in B.C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2096 (ii).
G.T.Ry. Co., 2-cent a Mile Rate, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Ways and Means, 4375 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N.W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1826 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 599 (i).
Prudential Savings Society, (B. 80) 1°*, 1923 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (C.P.R. Nicola branch) in Com. on Res., 7805 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3737 (ii).
St. Mary's River Bridge Co.'s (B. 131) M. for 2°, 5258 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (protection service) 5906, 5963 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 4042; Ontario (Toronto drill hall) 4034 (iii).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1472 (i).
Yukon Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 95) 1°*, 2482 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. Leighton Goldie, *North Simcoe.*
Collingwood Ship Building Co. and Pub. Accounts Com., on Objection (Mr. Lennox) 3721 (ii).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) 1°*, 6005 (iv).
Green, Hunt, McMurrich, Messrs., Patent Relief (B. 155) 1°*, 6135 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5487 (iii).
Macpherson, Arthur Leon, Relief (B. 157) 1°*, 6206 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. No. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 598 (i).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1921 (i).
Private Bills Pets., (M.) to receive, 1981; 2063 (ii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 122) 1°*, 4838 (iii).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 987 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2203; (M.) to adjn. debate, 2294, agreed to (Y. 78; N. 48) 2204 (ii).
Simcoe, County Judgeship, Par. in "Northern Advance" (personal explanation) 4368 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 18) 1°m., 657 (i); 2°*, and ref. to Sel. Com. on Masters and Mates Bill, 4838 (iii).
Tobacco Excise Duties, Ques. of Order, 6143 (iv).
Trent Canal, Rice Lake, Reps. &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. Ward) 1932 (i).
——— Severn Route, Par. in Toronto "Globe" (remarks) 4839 (iii).
Tariff—Farm Products, in Com., 1264 (i).
Wharfs and Docks in Ont. Govt Assistance to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*
B.C. Railway Belt., Sales or Leases of Timber Lands from 1st July, 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1149 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s System, Land Grants, Subsidies, &c. O.Cs., &c. *re* (M. for copies*) 2584 (ii).
Clements, Judge, Promotion to Supreme Court, B.C. (Ques.) 1056 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Tel. from Calgary Board of Trade (read) 6908 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4700; in Com., 4739, 4901 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3463 (ii).
Govt. Land, Section 14, Twp. 24, &c., Applications for Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 1810 (i).
Grazing Lands in Sask., Applications for Leases, 1905 (M. for copies*) 1978 (i).
Irrigation in Western Provinces, Investigations *re* Conservations of Water Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 4453 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1820 (i).
North Western Trusts & Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 31) 1°*, 803 (i); in Com., 4008 (iii).
S. A. Veterans' Land Grants Bill (remarks) 7311 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co. and Robbins Irrigation Co. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2491, Neg. (Y. 53, N. 86) 2725 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3300, 3308, 3807 (ii), 3992 (iii).
SUPPLY—
N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 7835 (iv).
Tariff—Wool, in Com., 2369 (ii).
Wool Duties imposed in 1897, Quantities imported, Rebates, &c. (Ques.) 1125 (i).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).
Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7639, 7660 (iv).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1293 (i); in Com., 2453 (ii); on Senate Amts., 4412 (iii).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4112 (iii).

McCraney, Mr. G. E., *Saskatchewan.*
Coal Strikes in the N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7175 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4788, 4818, 4914 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip, Apptmnt. of Commissioner, Method of Extinguishing Claims, &c. (Ques.) 4457 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip issued in 1906, Number and Name of Commissioner (Ques.) 4456 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, on prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3570 (ii).
Prince Albert Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1555 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on M. for 2°, 1045 (i); on M. to rep. for 3° (amt.) 3172 (ii).
Railway Blockade in N. W., Delays of Mals, &c. (letters read) 6521 (iv).
Regina Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1555 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 11) 1°*, 515 (i).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 4227 (iii).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 5084 (iii); in Com., 6585 (iv).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H., *South Perth.*
Cold Storage Warehouse B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2420; in Com., 2463 (ii).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3650 (ii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7350 (iv).
Labour Disputes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2597 (ii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7206 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial B. 158.'
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 649 (i).
St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 1293 (i).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Tariff, Flax-seed, Ques. of Order, 1348 (i).
——— Indian Corn, in Com., 1364 (i).

McIntyre, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*
Athabaska Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 1120 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 4045 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 154) in Com., 7911 (iv).
Coal Lands in the Northwest, Control and Regulation by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 782 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4816, 4875 (iii).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6187 (iv).
Letter Carrier Service, N. W. T., Extension to Calgary and Edmonton (Ques.) 615 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 803; 2° m., 1045 (i); in Com., 2110; (M.) for Com., 2525; (M.) to report for 3°, 3172 (ii).
Southern Alberta Land Co.'s Transactions, on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2551 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. P. H., *South Bruce.*
Cold Storage Warehouse B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2424 (ii).
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5164 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (hatcheries) 5897 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6756 (iv).
Tariff—Farm Products, in Com., 1280 (i).
——— Indian Corn, in Com., 1365 (i).

McLean, Mr. A. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Canals Expenditure for 1907-8, Total Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 567 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1619 (i), 2035 (ii).
Civil Servants Employees at Ottawa, Total Amount of Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2140; 2289, 2634 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 2839 (ii)
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2431 (ii).
"Fielding" Dredge, Total Expenditure at Pictou Harbour, &c. (Ques.) 1798 (i).
G.T.P. Steel Rails, Tenders for &c. (Ques.) 7006 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ques.) 614 (i).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2946 (ii).
I.C.R., Pictou Station, Amount of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4857 (iii).
——— Servis Tie Plate Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 2835 (ii).

McLean, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Wallace Quarries Ballasting, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2839 (ii).

Lakeville P.O., P.E.I., Change in Location, &c. (Ques.) 7250 (iv).

North Lake P.O., P.E.I., Change of Location, &c. (Ques.) 7249 (iv).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Meetings, &c. (Ques.) 6905 (iv).

Pictou Harbour Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1613 (i).

Point Prim, P.E.I. Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 5023 (iii).

Postal Delivery, Charlottetown, P.E.I. Inauguration of (Ques.) 3425 (ii).

P.E.I., Claims *re* Additional Subsidy, Delegates' Memo *re* (Ques.) 1800 (i).

——— Claims for Refund *re* Hay Shipment (Ques.) 4854 (iii).

——— Fisheries, Negotiations with Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 3883 (ii).

——— Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3547 (ii).

——— Telegraph Service, Anglo-American Tel. Co., Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1809 (i).

——— Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. Tels., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3231 (ii).

——— Winter Communication, Inefficient Service (remarks) 4941 (iii).

Private Bills, Rule Respecting Fines, &c. (Ques.) 717 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5385; (amt.) 5395 (iii).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7717; in Com. on Res., 7763 (iv).

Provincial Subsidies, and Quebec Resolutions, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2584 (ii).

Provincial Subsidies, Inquiry for Cor., 5086 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2190 (ii).

Rustico Harbour, Emplymt. of Tug Boat in 1904-5-6, Owner's Name, &c. (Ques.) 571 (i).

S.A. War, P.E.I. Volunteers, Memorial *re* Land Grants (Ques.) 7542 (iv).

Southport Postmaster, P.E.I., Age of, Loss of Registered Letter, &c. (Ques.) 7250 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt. (Post office) 2811 (ii).

Fisheries (fish curing) 5924; (jurisdiction of provs.) 5913; (oyster culture) 5909; (protection service) 5905, 5963 (iii).

Geological Survey (boring for gas, &c.) 3159; (maps, &c.) 3163 (ii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 6750 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 5875 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 7122 (iv).

McLean, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (life-saving stations) 5770 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (alterations) 3610 (ii); (experimental farms) 4044 (iii); (furniture, &c.) 3602 (ii); (picture frames) 3971; (Sussex St., property) 3958 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (plant) 7000 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 6071; (Summerside) 6072 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7524 (iv).

Ventilation in Chamber, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3605 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, P.E.I., Extent and Total Cost of Work done (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

Wallace Quarries, Cumberland Co., N.S., Branch Ry., Govt Aid to, &c. (Ques.) 2582 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Port Hawkesbury Ry. Station, Papers and Cor. with Ry. Dept. *re* (M. for copies*) 3373 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt. (Post Office) 2800 (ii).

Fisheries (hatcheries) 5902 ; (herring nets) 5919 (iii).

Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5881 (iii).

Post Office (mail service) 3154; (Yukon mail service) 3158 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Grand Etang) 6038; (Inverness Mines) 6044; (Mabou) 6050; (Marble Mountain wharf) 6051; (Port Hastings) 6060 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*

Bonaventure and Gaspé Telephone Co.'s incorp. (B. 126) 1°*, 4928 (iii).

See' Speaker, Mr. Dep.'

Marshall, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 809 (i); in Com., 1306, 1638 (i), 2015 (ii).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2448 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6785 (iv).

Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6779 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid to Companies, &c. (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4053 (iii).

Lord's Day Act, Prohibition of Sunday School Papers (Ques.) 5023 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7087 (iv).

Marshall, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Port Bruce Harbour, Contracts, Apptmnts., Material purchased, &c. (M. for ret.*) 490 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 4666 (iii).
Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Apptmnts., Material purchased, &c. (M. for ret.*) 490 (i).
Port Stanley and Port Burwell, Port Bruce Harbours, Expenditure *re*, Inquiry for Ret., 3277 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on Bill, 7029 (iv).
Slate Quarries, Location, Quantity imported, &c. (Ques.) 1053 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7811 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6747 (iv).
Justice, Administration of Yukon (judges' living allowances) 7970 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Leamington) 7820 (iv); Ottawa (maintenance) 4604 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6019 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Bruce) 6979; (Port Burwell) 6965 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 6628; (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6254 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (fruit) 1917; (horses, &c.) 2414 (ii); (pease) 1362; (pickles) 1886; (tomatoes) 1880 (vegetables) 1884 (i).

Martin, Mr. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Agriculture Deptl. Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1392 (i).
Barrel, Legal Size, Recommendation of Dom. Horticultural Council, &c. (Ques.) 1390 (i).
Belle River Pier, P.E.I., Extension, &c. Rep. *re* (Ques.) 484 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1622 (i), 2038 (ii).
Cape Tormentine and Summerside Mail Contracts, Termination of, &c. (Ques.) 573 (i).
Charlottetown Exhibition, Amount contributed (Ques.) 1393 (i).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 669 (i); on M. for 2°, 2437 (ii).
Experimental Station in P.E.I., Location, &c. (Ques.) 1391 (i).
Gibson Creek, P.E.I., Privileges *re* Laying of Water Pipes, &c. (Ques.) 2575 (ii).
House of Commons, Members' Accommodation (remarks) in Conc., 7987 (iv).
Immigration, Promotion *re* Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 716 (i).
I.C.R. Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1487 (i); in Com., 2943 (ii).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Life Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 913 (i).
——— Number, &c. (Ques.) 230 (i).
McDonald, Mr. Angus, Dismissal from Pisquid East Post Office, Apptmnt. of Successor, &c. (Ques.) 896 (i).
Maritime Winter Fair, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1392 (i).
'Montague,' Dredge, Total Amount for Wages, &c. (Ques.) 3189 (ii).
North Rustico Breakwater, Rep. *re* Extension, (Ques.) 475 (i).
Panmure Island Wharf, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1559 (i).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Engineer's Rep., &c. (Ques.) 230 (i).
Port Daniel Pier, Contract *re* Construction, Cor., Tels., &c. (M. for copies) 726 (i).
Postal Cards and Stamps, Complaints *re* Quality of Paper (Ques.) 572 (i).
Praught, Ed., Claims for Compensation *re* P .E. I. Ry. (Ques.) 4456 (iii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Freight Service, Accumulation of (remarks) 1078, 1089 (i).
P. E. I. Freight Rates, Res. of Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 717 (i).
P. E. I. Fruit Inspector, Applications *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1390 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Kitchen, Mr. W., Payments to (Ques.) 7984 (iv).
——— Motor Cars, Experiments *re* (Ques.) 1382 (i).
——— Murray Harbour and Montague Bridge Branches, Expropriation of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 470 (i).
——— Terms *re* Mail Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1388 (i).
P. E. I. and Mainland Telegraph Communication, Complaints *re* (remarks) 1297 (i).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1992 (ii).
P. E. I. Tunnel and Winter Communication, Cor. ,Tels., &c. (M. for copies) 3189 (ii).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Res. of Board of Trade, Tunnel, &c. (Ques.) 716 (i).
——— Contract *re* Carrying Mails, &c. (Ques.) 947 (i).
——— Ice-bound Steamers (remarks) 4841 (iii).
——— Inefficient Service, &c. (remarks) 4929 (iii).
——— Location of Govt. Steamers (Ques.) 3186 (ii).
——— Terms of Union *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1927 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr Lefurgey) 5344, 5352; (amt.) 5358 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7764 (iv).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7948 (iv).
Representation in H. of C., Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J Hughes) 2153 (ii)
Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 485 (i).
'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Instructions *re* P.E.I. Route (Ques.) 2293 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2773, 2816 (ii).
Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 7524; (Murray Harbour branch) 7526 (iv).
Tariff—Animals, &c., in Com., 1256 (i).
——— Whale Oil Soaps, in Com., 2117 (ii).
Tuberculosis Cattle from Nappan, N. S., Treatment, &c. (Ques.) 1390 (i).

Martin, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*
Insurance Commission, Charges against Members *re* Investment Moneys, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6399 (iv).
Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7843 (iv).

Martin, Mr. T., *North Wellington.*
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4065 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2819 (ii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (farm products) 1286 (i); (gypsum) 2123 (ii); (Indian corn) 1366 (i); (marble) 2126 (ii); (oatmeal) 1373 (i).

Meigs, Mr. D. B., *Missisquoi.*
Campbell, Mr. Narcisse, Application *re* Farm Crossing, Delay, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).

Michaud, Mr. P., *Victoria, B.C.*
Allegash River, Diversion of Water (Ques.) 6635 (iv).

Miller, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*
Budget, The, 425 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2009 (ii).
Central Canada Manufacturers Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 4409 (iii).
Civil Servants Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7690 (iv).
Denatured Alcohol, Manufacture, &c., Legislation *re* (prop. res.) 1956 (i).
Desks, Furniture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3598 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4900 (iii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter of Resignation, &c. (remarks) 3115 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5494 (iii).

Miller, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7467 (iv).
National Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp., B. 29 (Mr. Pardee) on Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5796 (iii).
Senators, Apptmnt. of in N.B., Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1669 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3834 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2809 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (fittings, &c.) 3598 (ii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4322 (iii).
——— Denatured Alcohol, in Com., 2046 (ii).
——— Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1210; Amts. (cream separators) 1196 (i).
——— Farm Products, in Com., 1256, 1267 (i).
——— Fire Brick, in Com., 4190 (iii).
——— Indian Corn, in Com., 1369 (i).
Traders' Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Johnston) in Com., 5285; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 5285 (iii).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Beauharnois Canal Water Power, O.C. *re* Alienation of (inquiry for) 1473 (i).
——— Disposal of by Govt. (Ques.) 1388 (i).
British Textile Goods, Increase in Imports, &c. (Ques.) 1047 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 812 (i); in Com., 2002 (ii).
Cigarettes, Manufacture of, Prohibition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4066; (amt.) 4083 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 4088 (iii).
Coal Strike at Lethbridge, Meeting of Dep. Min. of Labour and Mr. Mitchell, &c. (Ques.) 488 (i).
Colonial Conference, Canadian Representatives, &c. (Ques.) 891 (i).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt., Inquiry for, 3001 (ii).
——— Offer from Imp. Govt. *re* Preferential Tariff (Ques.) 893 (i).
——— Subjects to be discussed, &c. (Ques.) 2634 (ii). *See* 'Tariff' &c.
Contracts in Ottawa, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6107 (iv).
Co-operative and Industrial Societies (B. 2) (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 945 (i). *See* 'Industrial.'

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* (M. for copies*) 490 (i).
"Favoured Nation" Treaties, Between Can. and Foreign Countries, Names, &c., Commercial Arrangements with Italy. &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).
"Galveston" Dredge, Date of Purchase, Cost of Transference, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 574 (i).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
Glass imported from G.B., Increase in, &c. 1048 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Location of Line between Quebec and Lake Pohenegamook, Rep., Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Granger, Mr. Magloire, Emplymt. as Civil Servant (Ques.) 5288 (iii).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Amts. expended, &c. (Ques.) 894 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1057 (i).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6213 (iv).
Industrial and Co-Operative Societies (B. 2) 1°m., 89; 2°m., 582 (i).
——— (remarks) 7308 (iv).
See Co-operative.'
Inland Revenue, Dep. Collectors, Classification, Number, &c. employed by Govt. (Ques.) 916 (i).
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4137 (iii).
Lamontagne and "Le Soleil" Cos., Amounts paid for 1906-7 (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
Leather Goods Shipments to U.S., Increase in, &c. (Ques.) 1048 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmnt. of Chairman as per Statute 6 Edward VII., &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Purchase of Site, Rep. in Press (remarks) 2228 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt., Amounts collected, &c. (M. for ret.) 503 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Refusal of Mr. Beddoe to give Evidence, Notice of Motion, 5502 (iii).
——— Amt., 5782, Neg. (Y. 50 ; N. 99) 5857 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims, Amounts paid by Govt., Cor. *re* (M. for ret.) 1038 (i).
Pilots, of Montreal, Investigation *re* Inspection of St. Lawrence Route (Ques.) 3885 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increases to (Ques.) 5779 (iii).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4975 (iii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1525 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Pilots, Number in Ocean SS. Service &c. (Ques.) 4456 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Dredging at Cap à la Roche, &c. (Ques.) 575 (i).
——— Widening of Channel at Cap. Charles, Pet. from Pilots, and Grounding of SS. Victorian (Ques.) 573 (i).
Sea-Weed Industry at Isle Verte, Collection of Tax *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
Seven Islands Bay Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4451 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3062; in Com., 3287 3342, 3859 (ii), 3991 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (barracks) 4036; (Edmonton) 4037 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 4042; (Vancouver) 4042 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (salaries, &c.) 4043 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 4035 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brockville) 4020; (Peterborough armoury) 4025; (St. Thomas drill hall) 4027; (Simcoe) 4028; (Toronto customs) 4030; (Toronto drill hall) 4032; (Toronto postal station 'F') 4035 (iii).
Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (steel shelves) 4024; (Sussex St. property) 3952 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. arsenal) 4012; (Grosse Isle station) 4009; (immigration) 4009; (immigrant buildings) 4011; (Lachute) 4010; (Montreal barracks) 4010; (Nicolet) 4011; (Quebec East, building) 4012; (St. Johns military) 4015; (Three Rivers drill hall) 4015; (trachoma hospital) 4011 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Medicine Hat) 4040; (Regina P.O.) 4040; (Saskatoon) 4041 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a L'Ilot) 6083; (Bic) 6094; (Chateauguay) 6096; (Grand Mechins) 6107; (Lavaltrie wharf) 6112; (L'Isle d'Alma) 6114; (Lotbinière, &c.) 6114; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6116; (Rivière Batiscan) 6122; (St. Maurice River) 6126; (Saguenay) 6125; (Sorel deep water) 6132 (iv).
Tariff—Inter-Imperial Preference, and Colonial Conference, Memorandum *re* (Ques.) 892 (i).
Tariff, Intermediate, Application of Foreign Countries *re* (Ques.) 489 (i).
——— Intermediate and German Treaties, in Com. on Ways and Means, 879 (i).
Tariff Modifications, Delegations *re* (Ques.) 891 (i).
Tariff : *See* 'Colonial.'
Tobacco Excise Duty, Changes in Regulations (remarks) 6140 (iv).
Transportation Commissioner's Report, Suggestions adopted by Govt (remark) in Com. of Sup., 6083 (iv).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases, Transfers, &c. by Govt., Contracts, Cor. &c. (M. for copies) 241 (i).
Wood, Dr. H. W., Transfer from St. Johns Collectorship, &c. (Ques.) 3636 (ii).
Yukon Placer Mines owned by Messrs. Guggenheimer, Operations *re* (Ques.) 892 (i).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*
Coal Strikes in the N.W., &c. on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7168 (iv).
Drummond Counties Ry., Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Route from Quebec Bridge East, &c. (M. for papers*) 1978 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7832 (iv).
——— Route from Quebec to Lake Pohenegamook, Total Length and Cost of Construction (Ques.) 3886 (ii).
——— Surveys, Quebec-Moncton Section, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Copies, 271 (i).
I.C.R., Drummond Branch, Outlay at Mitchell and St. Leonard, &c. (Ques.) 5086 (iii).
I.C.R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1489 (i); in Com., 2948 (ii).
Mail Carriers, Salary Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv).
Sussex St. and Mackenzie Avenue Properties, Purchase by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 490 (i).
——— Properties, Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 235 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6623 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Sussex St. property) 3955 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829; (Grande Rivière de Beaupré) 6101; (St. François) 6130; (St. Johns) 6132; (St. Maurice River) 6127 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 7524 (iv).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Coal from Canadian Mines, Quantity transported in British and Foreign Vessels to the Port of Montreal (Ques.) 1388 (i).
Estimates, Protest against bringing down at close of Session, 7831 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act (registrar's salary) Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7257 (iv).
G. T. Ry., Madoc-Eldorado Extension, Pet. to Govt. (Ques.) 614 (i).
——— Subsidies granted to, &c. (Ques.) 950, 1064, 1130 (i).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7324 (iv).

Northrup, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*
'Maisonneuve' Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3633 (ii).
Medals Claims Board, Duties, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 6633 (iv).
See 'Smith,' &c.
Military Schools of Instruction, Number and Location, &c. (Ques.) 476 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5835 (iii).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Ry. B. 158.'
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His. Maj. *re* Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7708; on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7720; in Com. on Res., 7763 (iv).
Returns, Delay in bringing down, *re* Public Accounts (remarks) 2762 (ii).
Ross Rifle Co., Amounts paid for Extras (Ques.) 4213 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Amounts paid to Sir Chas. Ross or Ross Rifle Co., &c. (Ques.) 5025 (iii).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3770 (ii).
Smith, Lt.-Col., and Medals Board, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 7248 (iv).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Sales of Lands, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 4219; on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4260 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2712 (ii).
Tariff (disinfectants) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2336 (ii).

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*
Agents and Sub-Land Agents, Homestead Inspectors, &c., Retirement of, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
Algoma District, Indian Land Sales, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 6015 (iv).
Baxter Island No. 136, Sale of (Ans.) 2833 (ii).
Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6560 (iv).
Blood Indian Reserve, Opening for Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Blood and Piegan Indian Agencies, Purchase of Cattle, &c. (Ans.) 1131 (i).
Bone Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 2983 (ii).
Boston, Robt., Apptmnt. as Inspector of Immigration (Ans.) 2143 (ii).
B. C. Millls, Timber and Trading Co.'s Lands, Applications *re* Cancellation of Lease (Ans.) 2145 (ii).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Reserve, Selection of, &c. (Ans.) 6011 (iv).
C. P. R. Coal Lands, Selection of, Conditions *re* Sale of Coal to Public (Ans.) 3884 (ii).
C. P. Ry. Land Belt, B. C. (B. 102) 1° m., 3977; 2°* and in Com., 4655 (iii).
Coal Lands in Western Provinces, Control, &c., by Govt., *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 750 (i).
Coal Mining Rights, Application of Mr. C. F. Caldwell, &c. (Ans.) 486 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7158 (iv).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserves, Sale of Land, &c. (Ans.) 4856 (iii).
Dominion Lands Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 703 (i); 2° m., 4669; in Com., 4739, 4785, 4804, 4865 (iii).
Dom. Lands Bill, Legislation this Session (remarks) 5864 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4615 (iii).
Dom. Lands Surveys and Surveyors (B. 59) 1° m., 1293 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 3091; in Com., 3462 (ii).
Dom. Lands Surveys (B. 172) 1° m., 7308; in Com., 7437 (iv).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Completion of Survey (Ans.) 5024 (iii).
Doukhobors, Alleged Importation of as Contract Labourers (Ans.) 889 (i).
——— Dom. Land Grants to (Ans.) 5780 (iii).
Dugas Indian Reserve, Land Sales, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7282 (iv).
French Immigration to Canada, &c. (Ans.) 1142 (i).
Garden River Indian Reserve, Representations *re* Settlement (Ans.) 2830 (ii).
Govt. Lands in Sec. 14, Two. 14, &c. (Ans.) 1810 (i).
Grand Forks Cattle Co., Lands withdrawn for Watering of Stock, O.C., &c. (Ans.) 950 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. Coal Lands Pre-emption (Ans.) 6257 (iv).
——— Land Grant, B.C. Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. on Ways and Means, 2074 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Clause *re* 15 per cent over due Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 1557 (i).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3519 (ii).
Grazing Lease granted to J. R. Craig, Date of, &c. (Ans.) 1806 (i).
Grazing Leases granted by Govt of Twps. 32, 33 (Ans.) 485 (i).
Grazing Leases, Original Applicants, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 1062 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Half-Breed Scrip, Apptmnt. of Commissioner, Method of Extinguishing Claims, &c. (Ans.) 4457 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip issued in 1906, Number, Names of Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 4457 (iii).
Hay Permits in Prince Albert District, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 7541 (iv).
——— Additional Answer, 7701 (iv).
Hepburn, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1558 (i), 2294 (ii).
Hindoos, Arrival and Deportation from B.C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 234 (i).
Homestead Duties, N.W. Quarter Section 2, &c., Entries, &c. (Ans.) 1924 (i).
Homestead Entries issued on Quarter Sections, 20, &c., Issue of Patents, &c. (Ans.) 4851 (iii).
Homestead Entries, Section 24, Two. 21, &c., Extension *re* Residence, Patents, &c. (Ans.) 2141 (ii).
Homestead Entry of Township 51, Alberta, Application *re* (Ans.) 1137 (i).
Homestead Inspectors, Instructions *re* Interference with Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
Hudson's Bay Co.'s Original Colony Register A., Disappearace of (Ans.) 5287 (iii), 7541 (iv).
Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cancellation of, on M. for Copy (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1068 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 143) 1° m., 5504; in Com., 5717 (iii).
Immigration Agents, Belgium, Names, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1805 (i).
Immigration Agents, Circular issued *re* Bonuses, &c. (Ans.) 479 (i).
Immigration Agents, Dismissal and Suspensions, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 714 (i).
Immigration Agents in Germany, Number and Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1988 (ii).
Immigration Agents in Eastern Townships &c. (Ans.) 1142 (i).
Immigration Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 1128 (i).
Immigration Agents in Ont., Number and Names (Ans.) 713 (i).
Immigration Agents, Messrs. Ward, Johnston, &c., dismissal of (Ans.) 5655 (iii).
Immigrants' Bonuses, Amounts paid to Agents for 1904-5-6, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).
——— Bonuses to SS. Booking Agents, Par. in Montreal 'Star,' 4519 (iii).
Immigrants, Contract *re* Bonuses (remarks) 4615 (iii).
——— Number of Arrivals for 1906, Location, &c. (Ans.) 571 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Immigrants, Total Number since 1904, Distribution of (Ans.) 1053 (i).
Immigration to Canada, Total Number from 1901 to 1903, &c. (Ans.) 1382 (i).
Immigration to the Eastern Townships, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 1395 (i), 2580 (ii).
Immigration Employment Agents (Ans.) 4861 (iii).
Immigration from France to Canada, Propaganda *re*, &c. (Ans.) 1556 (i).
Immigration from Ont., Rep. of Mr. Southworth (remarks) 4668 (iii).
Immigration Policy of the Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6156 (iv).
——— Promotion *re* Mar. Provinces, &c. (Ans.) 716 (i).
Indian Boarding Schools, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 4210 (iii).
——— Qualifications of Teachers, &c. (Ans.) 2582 (ii).
——— Average Salaries (Ans.) 3629 (ii).
Indian Lands, Algoma District, Sales and Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 3371 (ii).
Indian Lands sold or leased, Number of Acres, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 492 (i).
Indian Lands, Nipissing District, Open for Settlement (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
——— Total Acres sold, &c. (Ans.) 2835, 2980
Indian Timber Lands on Reserves, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Interior, Deptl. Employees in N.W., Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1805 (i).
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1119 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 174, 658, 992 (i).
Irrigation Applications, Assignments, &c. (Ans.) 1806 (i).
Irrigation in Western Provinces, Investigation *re* Water Supplies (Ans.) 4453 (iii).
Just, C. F., Suspension and Reinstatement, &c. &c. (Ans.) 228; (explanation) 489 (i).
Kaien Island Title Papers, Ret. (remarks) 1699 (i), 3977 (iii).
King and H. E. Lyon, Papers *re*, laid on Table, 4839 (iii).
Land Patents for Sections 3, 5, 7 and 13, Issue of (Ans.) 4858 (iii).
Lands: *See* Govt.', Dom.', 'Robbins,' 'Saskn.', 'Southern,' 'Homestead,' &c.
Leech, R. E., McLean, Mr., and Others, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2986 (ii).
Lees, Mr. W. A. D., Contract *re* Fencing (Ans.) 710 (i).
Little Beausoleil Island, Georgian Bay, Sale to Mr. Pratt, &c. (Ans.) 2833, 2984 (ii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1819 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Malley, Mr. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3370 (ii).
New Ottawa, Settlers not complying with Settlement Duties, &c. (Ans.) 1046 (i).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Purchase, &c. (Ans.) 2832 (ii).
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Applications *re* Water Power, &c. (Ans.) 2144 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Additional Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1928 (i).
——— Audit of Books (Ans.) 3885 (ii).
——— Claims and Amounts paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 1071 (i).
——— Homestead Entries, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ans.) 1147 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6752 (iv.)
——— Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5788 (iii).
N. W. Rebellion, Graves of Soldiers, Care of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6747 (iv).
Patrick, J. A. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 569 (i).
——— Explanation *re* Answer to Question, 576 (i).
Peace River District, B. C., Selection and Location of Lands (Ans.) 2633 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 229 (i).
——— Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa (remarks) 3728 (ii).
——— Rep. to English Papers *re* Immigration to S. Africa (Ans.) 2984 (ii).
——— Delay in answering Question (Ans.) 5506 (iii).
——— Evidence *re* Investigation into misconduct, &c., on M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 578 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Deptl. Documents (explanation) 2999 (ii).
Railway Fares to N. W., Rate to Immigrants from Quebec (Ans.) 3184 (ii).
Repatriation of Canadians, Agents' Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1058 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 4119 (iii).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Entries (Ans.) 223 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Application of C.P.R. for Lands (Ans.) 1138 (i).
——— Application of E. H. Cuthbertson and G. T. Robbins, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).
——— Constitution of (Ans.) 1139 (i).
——— Date of Authorization (Ans.) 1060 (i).
——— Plans, Examination of (Ans.) 1137 (i).
——— Rep. of J. Stewart *re* Character of Land (Ans.) 2143 (ii).
St. Ann's Island Lease, Date and Terms, &c. (Ans.) 6017 (iv).
St. Pierre and Miquelon Immigrants, Arrival of, &c. (Ans.) 4855 (iii).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Salvation Army Immigrants, Circular Letters *re* (Ans.) 4454 (iii).
Saunders, Mr. B. J., Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Complaints *re* Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 3368 (ii).
——— Date of Homestead Entry (Ans.) 2139 (ii).
——— Section 2 of Twp. 25 &c. (Ans.) 485 (i).
School Lands, Man., Exchange with Winnipeg Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 4610; in Com., 5701 (iii).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers of Estate, &c. (Ans.) 5287 (iii).
Settlement Duties in New Ottawa, Sask., &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).
Shephard, Mr. Arthur, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3369 (ii).
Six Nations Schools Reserve, Changes in Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 478 (i).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4240 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co. and Robbins Irrigation Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2498 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—(Indian Affairs) 2957; (Interior) 2957 (ii).
Dom. Lands (gratuity to Mrs. Young) 6245; homestead inspectors) 6246; (outside service, salaries) 6244; (surveys) 7257; (timber protection) 7265 (iv).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c.) 6707; (agents, Ont.) 6711; (agents, Que.) 6717; (bonuses) 7277; (deportations) 7278; (fuel, &c.) 7278; (Just, Mr. C. F., salary) 6242; (topographical surveys) 6243 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (Babines) 7293; (Babine investigation) 7286; (industrial schools) 7291 (iv).
Indians—N.B. (seed grain) 7291 (iv).
Indians—N.S. (superintendent) 7293 (iv).
Indians, Ont. and Que.—(agents) 7284; (Giant's Tomb) 7288; (Mississaguas's claims) 7292; (roads, &c.) 7288 (iv).
Indians—Que. (Oka settlement) 7291 (iv).
Indians—Yukon (medical attendance) 7293 (iv).
Interior—Hydrographic Institutions (astronomical surveys) 7269 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Banff sewerage) 7279; (maps, &c.) 7275; (timber inspector) 7294 (iv).
N.W. Ter. Govt. (commissioner's salary) 7272; (litigation) 7274; (roads and bridges) 7273; (Yoho Park) 7274 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (council grant) 7278; (salaries, &c.) 6249 (iv).
Surveys and Surveyors Bill: *See* "Dom. Lands".
Swamp Lands in Man., Leases to Sporting Clubs, &c. (Ans.) 1388 (i).
——— Lease to Hon. Mr. Kirchhoffer (remarks) 1849 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Swan Lake Reserve, Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 946 (i).
"Tagish Charlie", Rep. *re* Recompense for Mining Property (Ans.) 890 (i).
Timber Regulations, Number of Permits, &c. (Ans.) 7008 (iv).
Wagner, Philip, Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 229 (i).
Water Reserve Lands in Lethbridge, Sale of, Applicants, &c. (Ans.) 4216 (iii).
Wire Fencing on Boundary between U.S. and N.W.T., Contract, Price, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
Yukon Mining Claims, Held by Canadian Cos., U.S. Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1561 (i).
——— Officials, Absence from Duties (Ans.) 887, 1063 (i).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 5022; in Com., 5704 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7544, 7579 (iv).
Yukon Territory Ordinances Approval (prop. res.) 7542 (iv).
Yukon Act Amt. (B. 109) 1° m., 4440; 2° M., and in Com., 5016; in Com., 5674 (iii).
Yukon Concessions, Bronson, Ray, &c., Transfer to Guggenheimers (Ans.) 3425 (ii).
Yukon Council, Audit Grant, (remarks) 6008 (iv).
Yukon, Gold Commissioners, Names and Salaries, (Ans.) 1136 (i).
——— Gold Output, Subsidy to Steamers, &c. (remarks) on M. to Ways and Means, 4527 (iii).
——— Liquor Permits granted by J. D. McGregor, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4212 (iii).
——— Mining Concessions, Cancellation *re* Failure of Conditions (Ans.) 889 (i).
——— Ordinances, Approval (prop. res.) 7408 (iv).
Yukon Placer Mines, Owned by Messrs. Guggenheimer, Operations, &c. (Ans.) 892 (i).
——— Whitehorse Govt. Lands, Patents issued, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4212 (iii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*
Address, The, 120 (i).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7367 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7466 (iv).
Provincial Rights: *See* "Hamilton Radial B."
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7434 (iv).
Tariff—(animals, &c.) in Com., 1255; Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1214 (i).

Paquet, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*
French Immigration of Clerical Orders (remarks) on M for Sup., 6379 (iv).

Paquet, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Grosse Isle Yacht, Tenders *re* Gasolene Engine (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
Immigration Agents, Belgium, Number, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1805 (i).
I.C.R., Elgin Road Station, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 718 (i).
Mail Service to St. Damase, Ste. Perpetue, &c. (Ques.) 718 (i).
Repatriation of French Canadians, Agents' Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1058 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 3°, 4996 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6739 (iv).
Tariff—Farm Products, in Com., 1283 (i).

Pardee, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1794 (i); in Com., 4410 (iii).
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5091 (iii).
International Paper Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 73) 1°*, 1794 (i).
National Accident and Guarantee Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 29) 1°*, 803 (i); on Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3875 (ii), 3978, 4461, 4514, 4776 (iii).

Parent, Mr. Geo., *Montmorency.*
Immigrants entering Canadian Militia, &c. (Ques.) 2633 (ii).
Immigrants promoted in Militia Force, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3189 (ii).

Parmelee, Mr. Charles H., *Shefford.*
British American Insurance Co.'s (B. 112) 1°*, 4610 (iii).
Geo. E. Smith Lumber Co.'s Patent Relief B. 10) 1°*, 515 (i).
Insurance Report and Evidence, Printing of in French (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7001 (iv).
——— Amt. to 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Masonic Protective Association of Can. incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1472 (i).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 803 (i).
Printing Committee, 3rd Rep., (M.) to conc., 7001 (iv).

Paterson, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, for 1905-6 (Ans.) 570 (i).
——— Total Value of Exports, 1894-6 (Ans.) 1554 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*
Apples, Hay, Maple Sugar, &c., Total Exports for 1905-6 (Ans.) 2582 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., on Inquiry for, 2069 (ii).
Australian and Canadian Export Trade, Applications *re* Subventions (Ans.) 4271 (iii).
Beet Root Sugar Industry (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4155 (iii).
Binder Twine Machinery, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).
Blair, Mr. H. C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ans.) 6014 (iv).
Boots and Shoes, and Tanners Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4594 (iii).
Bourinot, John C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ans.) 6013 (iv).
British Textile Goods, Increase in Imports, &c. (Ans.) 1047 (i).
Canadian Coasting Trade, Names of Countries admitted (Ans.) 3369 (ii).
Coal brought to Montreal in British and Foreign Vessels, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1388 (i).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1452 (i).
——— (Ans.) 1051 (i).
Coboconk and Gull River Canal, Construction of, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Ret., 495 (i).
Cordage Co., Amounts of Fines (Ans.) 4048 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) prop. Res., 4862; in Com., 5511; on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5581; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 5640 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 165) in Com. on Res., 6781; 1°*, 6790; 2° m., 7517 (iv).
Customs, Commissioner, Charges *re* Sending Official Papers out of Canada (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5722 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4882 (iii).
Duties collected at Sydney, Sault Ste. Marie, &c. (Ans.) 1926 (i).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2282 (ii), 4637, 4649 (iii).
Emerson Customs Collector, &c. (Ans.) 1562
Exports from Canadian Ports, Total Value for 1906 (Ans.) 3883 (ii).
Farm and Garden Products, Quantity entered at Sault Ste. Marie (Ans.) 483 (i).
Farm Wagons, Duty, &c., collected *re* Dumping Clause (Ans.) 2139 (ii).
Fish Transhipment on Western Coast, O.C. on Inquiry for, 3001 (ii).
Foreign Goods and British Preference, German Surtax, &c. (remarks) *re* Par. in "Citizen", 4843 (iii).
Fruits and Vegetables, Canned, Importation and Exportation, &c., on M. (Mr. E. D. Smith) for Ret., 492 (i).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
German Export Trade during years 1900-6, Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 1124 (i).
German Tariff, Cor. with J. B. Jackson, on Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 5864 (iii).
Glass imported from G.B., Increases in (Ans.) 1048 (i).
Goods imported free, Rebates, &c., on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 727 (i).
Grain exported from Can. and U. S. Ports, &c. (Ans.) 476 (i).
Grain received at Montreal from Lake Ports, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 570, 1046 (i).
Horses imported into Canada, Minimum Tariff (Ans.) 1055 (i).
Importations from United Kingdom, Names of Ports, Quantities, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).
Imports via Canadian Ports, Value of, in 1906 (Ans.) 5085 (iii).
Insurance Commission, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) and M. (Mr. Foster) that Words (Mr. Martin) be taken down, 6404 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7464 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid to Companies (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
Iron, Steel and Lead Manufactories, Quantity of Production (Ans.) 4047 (iii).
Iron Tubing (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Knitted Goods, Importations from Germany and G. B., Value, &c. (Ans.) 724 (i).
Leather Goods Shipments to U. S., Increase in (Ans.) 1048 (i).
McCormick & Deering Harvesters, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3894 (ii).
Petroleum, Bounties on, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4052 (iii).
Pig Iron imported from U. S., Names of Entries (Ans.) 708 (i).
Port Stanley Customs Collections for 1900-6 (Ans.) 1558 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7564 (iv).
Return ordered, on Inquiry for, 582 (i).
Ross Rifle Co., Contracts with Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Copies, 727 (i).
——— Imported Parts from U. S., &c. (Ans.) 2833 (ii).
Slate Quarries, Location, Quantity imported, &c. (Ans.) 1053 (i).
Spirits—Customs and Excise Duties in Can. and U. S. (Ans.) 1057 (i).
Standard Chemical Co., &c., Cor., &c., with Govt., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 725
——— on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 7520 (iv).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Stoves imported into Western Canada, Values, &c. (Ans.) 2293 (ii).
Sugar above No. 16 Dutch Standard, Duty collected (Ans.) 1050 (i).
Sugar Duties, No. 16, Dutch Standard, Total Amount collected, &c. (Ans.) 1049 (i).
Sugar Importations, Names of Countries, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 568 (i).
——— from Fiji Islands, Total Amount (Ans.) 4455 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Customs) 2765 (ii).
Customs (Bain, Mr., gratuity) 5977; (collectors salaries) 5975; (McDougald, Mr., gratuity) 5979; (new ports) 5973 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture) 3585; (Rideau Hall improvements) 3615 (ii).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) 4402 (iii); (animals, &c.) 1254 (i); (beet root sugar) 4423 (iii); (berries) 1899 (i); (brass, nickel, &c.) 4195; (britannia metal) 4204; (chains) 4265, 4266 (iii); (cheese) 1335 (i); (coal for smelting) 4435; (confectionery) 4182 (iii); (corks) 2136 (ii); (crucibles) 4191; (cutlery) 4431; (drawbacks) 4424 (iii); Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1208 (i); (glass, raw) 4436; (glassware) 4193; (glucose, &c.) 4181 (iii); (glue, &c.) 2120 (ii); (horse powers) 4419 (iii); (intermediate tariff) 534 (i); (iron angles) 4434 (iii); (lime juice) 2044 (ii); (liquid fillers) 4186; (machinery from G. B., preferential duty) 4551; (malleable chains) 4391; (malt flour) 4182; (marble) 4191; (matrices) 4395 (iii); (melons) 1909 (i); (military stores) 2411 (ii); (mining machinery) 4421 (iii); (nuts, &c.) 1919 (i); (oils) 4188 (iii); (paper bags) 2051 (ii); (pig iron) 4427; (portable engines) 4407, 4414 (iii); (printing paper) 2057 (ii); (rice, &c.) 1858 (i), 4143 (iii); (sago, &c., in Com., 1860 (i); (seeds, &c.) 4145 (iii); (spirits) 2108 (ii); (springs and axles) 4429; (steel bars) 4208; (steel wire) 4264; (sugar, 16 Dutch standard) 4150 (iii); (tea) 1360 (i); (tin plate) 4426 (iii); (tomatoes) 1872 (i); (unenumerated items) 2412 (ii); (U. S. duties, comparisons, &c.) 1200 (i); (wire cables) 4422 (iii).
Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4338 (iii).
——— Preferential Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 528 (i).
Threshers, Total Value of Importations (Ans.) 3635 (ii).
Timber and Lumber imported into Canada free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 570 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2824 (ii).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Trade and Nav. Rets., Distribution of (remarks) 6 (i).
——— Misprint, &c. (remarks) 278 (i).
——— (statement) 424 (i).
Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector and Customs Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5551 (iii).
Wilson, Wm., Emplymt. by Customs Dept. (Ans.) 6014 (iv).
Wood, Dr. H. W., St. John's Customs Collector, Transfer, &c. (Ans.) 3636 (ii).
Wool Duties imposed in 1897, Quantity exported, Rebates, &c. (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Perley, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil*
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2040 (ii).
Denatured Alcohol, Manufacture of, Legislation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 1973 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4707; in Com., 4742 (iii).
Frude's Point Wharf, Litigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Greece's Point Wharf, Number of Steamers landing, &c. (Ques.) 2574 (ii).
Gunning Cove Wharf, Purchase of Land (Ques.) 2837 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Hull Wharf, Number of Steamers using in 1906 (Ques.) 2139 (ii).
Lachute Public Building, Delay *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).
Mines Dept. Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7190 (iv).
Nominingue Lakes Wharfs, Construction and Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2139 (ii).
North East Harbour, N.S., Wharf, Letters, Reps, &c. (M. for copies*) 2840 (ii).
Paper Combine, in Com. on Tariff, 2052 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on B., 7028 (iv).
Provincial Wrecking Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 2836 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7235 (iv).
Stonefield Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 1125 (i).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3866 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (post office) 2811 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Eskasoni wharf) 6030 (iv).
Swim's Wharf Wharfinger, Remuneration and Revenue (Ques.) 2830 (ii).
Tariff—Agricultural Products, in Com., 1358 (i).
——— Denatured Alcohol, in Com., 2045 (ii).
——— Printing Paper, in Com., 2052 (ii).
——— Wines, in Com., 2049 (ii).

Pickup, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6018 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*
Belleville Drill Hall, Progress of, &c. (Ques.) 1397 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Dredging, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1398 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, &c. (Ques.) 2288 (ii).
——— Revetment Wall, Contract, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 1398 (i).
——— Revetment Wall, Govt. Aid *re* Construction (Ques.) 2632 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Civil Service Regulations *re*, &c. (Ques.) 2837 (ii).
——— Complaints *re*, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 1989 (ii).
Brass, Rolled, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4554 (iii).
Brighton Postmaster, Apptmnt., &c. (Ques.) 3426 (ii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1616 (i), 2012 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouse B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2426 (ii).
G. T. P. Land Grant in B. C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2098 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (milk) Amt. (B. 84) 1° m., 1985 (i).
Insurance Commission, Cor. with Min. of Justice, and Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Lennox) 3906 (ii).
Insurance Commission's Report, on Statement (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
——— Evidence *re*, Printing and Distribution of (remarks) 2906, 2997 (ii).
Justice, Administration of by Federal Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4134 (iii).
Magazines, Tariff Rates (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).
Milk Inspection : *See* 'Inspection and Sale Act.'
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3390 (ii).
Postal Delivery, Free, Names of Places, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 2636 (ii).
Post Offices in Cities, Civil Service Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).
Quinte Bass Pond, Expenditures, for 1904-6, Amount paid to J. Hurley (Ques.) 3426 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3185 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3982 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6424 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (brass, &c.) in Com., 4201; (brass, nickel, &c.) 4194 (iii); (magazines) 2050 (ii).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5715 (iii).

Power, Mr. Wm., *West Quebec.*
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7964 (iv).

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*
Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1751 (i).
I.C.R. Employees' Pension B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1493 (i).
Old Age Pensions (prop. res.) 3374 (ii).
Tariff—Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2361 (ii).

Ratz, Mr. V., *North Middlesex.*
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 55), 1°*, 1293 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 90 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 5205 (iii).
Binder Twine Machinery, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 3629 (ii).
Business of the House, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1115 (i).
Canada and Japan Treaty B. 23 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 1550 (i).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) on Sen. Amts., 6773 (iv).
Coal Mining Rights, Application of Mr. C. F. Caldwell, &c. (Ques.) 486 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5847 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4748 (iii).
Estimates, Protest against Delay in bringing down, 7831 (iv).
'Golspie,' Str., Wreck of (remarks) 1106 (i).
Goods, Dutiable, Imported Free, Rebates, &c. (M. for ret.) 727 (i).
G.T.P., Route from Quebec Bridge, Contract &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7832 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7359 (iv).
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6775 (iv).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement of Minister of Rys., 5242 (iii).
'Kestrel' Str., Supplies purchased, Cor., &c. with agents, &c., (M. for copies*) 1470 (i).
McIlwraith, Mr., Charge *re* Halifax Newspaper (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).
Marriages (minor) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7850 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificate Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 607 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7570 (iv).
Mulloy, Mr., Relief to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
'Neptune' Str., Repairs, Supplies, &c., Amounts paid (Ques.) 3637 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries (remarks) 7781 (iv).
Prescott Wharf, Govt. Assistance to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Provincial Rights : *See* 'Hamilton Radial B.'
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj., *re* B.N.A. Act on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7780 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Delay in bringing down papers (remarks) 3460 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 582 (i).
——— Inquiry for *re* Public Accounts Com., 3089 (ii).
Ross Rifle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Canals, Chambly (St. John harbour improvements) 5549 (iii).
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5553 (iii); (gate lifter) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Galops (construction) 7530; (entrance) 7530; (Gilbert contract) 7531; (retaining walls) 7533 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (tug-boat) 7669 (iv).
Canals—Trent (McLaren's Creek) 7669 (iv)
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 7531 (iv).
Dom. Lands (gratuity to Mr. Young) 6245; (homestead inspectors) 6247; (outside service salaries) 6244 (iv).
Fisheries (oyster culture) 5911 (iii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 6707; (agents, Ont.) 6715 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5865 (iii).
Marine, Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 5773 (iii).
Militia (clothing) 5748 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Brunet, Mr. A., remuneration) 7669 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (patrol vessels) 5772; (wrecking plant) 5771 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. rooms) 7820, 7821 (iv); (Sussex St. property) 3967 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (wharfs) 7833 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Great Salmon) 7824; (St. Andrew's) 6081 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Poirierville pier) 6057; (Port Hastings) 6061; (Port Hood) 6063; (Round Hill) 6066; (Yarmouth) 6067 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6936; (Goderich) 6953; (Little Current) 6957; (Port Stanley) 6972 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside) 6072 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Baie St. Paul) 6093; (Barachois de Malbaie) 6093; (Bic) 6094; (Chateauguay) 6096; (Chicoutimi) 6096 ; (Cross Point)

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que.—*Con.*

6096; (Disraeli wharf) 7827; (Escoumains pier) 6098; (Lake St. John wharfs) 6110; (Magdalen Island) 6114; (Murray Bay) 6115; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6116; (Rivière à la Pipe) 6121; (Rivière Maskinonge) 6124; (St. François) 6131; (St. Maurice) 6128; (Saguenay) 6125; (Sorel deep water) 6132 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) 7521; (Indiantown branch) 7663; (St. John) 7663 (iv).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 7524 (iv).

Railways—Railway Commission (maintenance) 7534 (iv).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (berries) 1897; Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) 1229 (i); (glucose, &c.) 4181 (iii); (sago, &c.) 1864 (i); (structural steel) 4208; (sugar) in Com., 4178 (iii).

Transportation Committee's Rep. (J. H. Ashdown) Consdn. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennet) 1597 (i).

——— Suggestions &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6091 (iv).

Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2326 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector and Customs Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii).

Robitaille, Mr. L., *Quebec County.*

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 823 (i).

Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6227 (iv).

Militia Officers and Provisional Courses Allowance, (M. for ret.) 1072 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness of Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 511 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Summoning Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5855 (iii).

Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3392 (ii).

Order, Ques. of *re* Motion, 2588 (ii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7939; in Com., 7959 (iv).

Quebec County Election and Speech of Mr. Aylesworth at Wiarton, &c. (Ques.) 470 (i).

Quebec Harbour Improvements *re* Ry. Terminals, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 2584 (ii).

Spirits in Bond, Two-year Maturing, Amt. *re* Application of Consolidated Revenue Act of 1883, Cor. &c. (M. for copy*) 802 (i).

Standard Chemical Co., O.Cs., Cor., &c. with Govt. (M. for copies) 725 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 7519 (iv).

Robitaille, Mr. L.—*Con.*

Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 709 (i).

Tariff—Pickles, &c., in Com., 1886 (i).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, for 1905-6 (Ques.) 569 (i).

Brandon Postmaster, Salary and Allowances, &c. (Ques.) 1558 (i).

Brandon Post Office, Names of Employees, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2838 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Land Reserve, Selection of, &c. (Ques.) 6010 (iv).

Coal Lands in Northwest, Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 766 (i).

Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5599 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 4713; in Com., 4740, 4789, 4815, 4871 (iii).

Dom. Lands Surveys and Surveyors B. 59 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3098 (ii).

Emmerson Customs Collector, &c. (Ques.) 1562 (i).

G.T.P., Tax Exemption in N.W.Provs., Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1611 (i).

Homestead Inspectors, &c., Instructions *re* Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).

Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cancellation by Govt., Cor. between Five Corporations, &c (M. for copies*) 1119 (i).

Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cor. *re* Cancellation (M. for copies*) 1068 (i).

I.C.R., Gibson, N.B., Water Tank, Construction of, &c. (Ques.) 2983 (ii).

Lake Winnipeg Fishing, Restrictions, Cor. *re* with Board of Trade, Winnipeg (M. for copy*) 1067 (i).

Lees, W. A. D., Contracts, Agreements, Cor., &c. *re* Fencing Contracts (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).

——— (Ques.) 710 (i).

Lumber Combine in N.W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1834 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2295 (ii).

——— Legislation *re* (Ques.) 4857 (iii).

Manitoba King's Bench, Apptmnt. of Mr. Henderson (Ques.) 4858 (iii).

Manitoba School Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5703 (iii).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Entries (Ques.) 223 (i).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Deeds *re* Hudson Bay Estate in Possession of Govt. (Ques.) 5505

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Southern Alberta Land Co., and Robbins Irrigation Co., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2509 (ii).

Swamp Lands, Man., Lease to Hon. Mr Kirchhoffer (remarks) 1853 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 2970 (ii).
Civil Govt. (post office) 2795 (ii).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6243; (outside service, salaries) 6244 (iv).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 5891 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Mossy Point) 6995 (iv); (St. Andrew's rapids) 6001 (iii); (Sandy Point) 6995 (iv).

Tariff—Animals, &c., in Com., 1258 (i).

Winnipeg Terminals, C.N. and C.P.Rys B. No. 127 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 2°, 5512; in Com., 5522; on M. for 3°, 5670 (iii).

Yukon-Dawson Govt. House, Total Expenditure *re* for 1901-6 (Ques.) 1562 (i).

Yukon Gold Commissioners, Names and Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1135 (i).

Yukon, Mining Claims held by Canadian Cos. and by U.S. Cos., &c. (Ques.) 1560 (i).

Yukon Mining Concessions, Cancellation of *re* Failure to comply with Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 889 (i).

Roche, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Atlantic Mail Service Distances, &c. (remarks) 7186 (iv).

Boots and Shoes, and Tanners Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4585 (iii).

Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 1724 (i).

Canadian Sealers imprisoned at Montevideo, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 1382 (i).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1624 (i).

Coal Strikes in the N.W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. House, 7173 (iv).

Election Frauds (personal explanation) 7095 (iv).

"Empress of Britain," Arrival at Halifax, Montreal and St. John, Delays, &c., (Ques.) 950 (i).

French Clergy exiled from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6672 (iv).

Government Officials and Political Interference, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup. 6692 (iv).

Insurance Commission's Rep., on Statement, (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6468 (iv).

Insurance Commission's Rep., in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).

Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7211 (iv).

Personal Explanation *re* Correction in Hansard, 6544 (iv).

Roche, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Provincial Subsidies Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5364 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3733 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries (fish curing) 5932 (iii).
Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5882 (iii).
Miscellaneous (insurance commission) 6468 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Eskasoni wharf) 6032; (Porter's Lake) 6058 (iv).

Supreme Court Vacancy, N.S., Cor. &c. *re* read, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3931 (ii).

Tariff—Boots and Shoes, &c., in Com., 4585 (iii).

Tariff on British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4312 (iii).

Ross, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*

B. C. Appellate Court, Representation from Provincial Govt. (remarks) 4945 (iii).

Cigarettes, Sale, &c., Prohibition, Ques. of Order, 4088 (iii).

Coal Lands in Northwest, Control by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 786 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7135, 7144 (iv).

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1293 (i).

Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7030 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4444 (iii).

Great Northern Ry., and Mr. J. J. Hill, Insinuations *re*, Rep. in 'Journal' (personal explanation) 3457 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7319 (iv).

Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Ministers, on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Com. of Sup., 5426 (iii).

——— Charges against h. m. *re* J. J. Hill's Rys., Ques. of Order, 5492 (iii).

Land Cos. in N. W., Scandals, &c., Charges *re* Conservative M.P.'s (remarks) 3314 (ii).

Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7196, 7221 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Homestead Entries, Number of Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 1147 (i).

Private Bills Com. (M.) to sit concurrently with Hse., 7246 (iv).

Railway Committee, Voting, &c. (personal explanation) 4388 (iii).

Riflemen, Payment of Ry. Fares by Dom. Govt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) Ques. of Order, 741 (i).

Ross, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4255 (iii).
S. A. War and B. C. Soldiers, Names of, Nurses, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3373 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3292 (ii), 3993, 4463, 4782 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (fumigating stations) 2976 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Jersey cove) 6050 (iv).
Tobacco Duty, Change in Excise Regulations (remarks) 6142 (iv).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 58) 1°*, 1293 (i).

Schaffner, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5562; (amt.) 5573, Neg. (Y. 22, N. 56) 5627 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4813, 4878 (iii).
Lumber Combine in N. W., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2586 (ii).
Man. Franchise Act, Fraud *re* Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7934 (iv).
Manitoba (Western) Mail Service, Complaints *re* Condition (Ques.) 2982 (ii).
Pelican Lake Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Postal Parcel System, Protests against Extension in Man. (Ques.) 2829 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (mail service) 3146 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 7823 (iv).
Swamp Lands near Lake Manitoba, Leasing of, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1564 (i).
——— Lease to Mr. Kirchhoffer (remarks) 1846 (i).
——— Leases to Sporting Club, &c. (Ques.) 1388 (i).
Tariff—Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1222 (i).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 1120 (i).
G. T. P. Ry. Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1950 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co., 2-cent a Mile Rate, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Ways and Means, 4377 (iii).
Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7632 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Conmee) 7937 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7948 (iv).

Schell, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Rainy River) 5999; Que. (St. Mary's current) 6002 (iii).
Tariff—Glass, Raw, in Com., 4436 (iii).
——— Wood Veneers, in Com., 2404 (ii).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4107 (iii).

Schell, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1120 (i).
Cold Storage System *re* Transportation, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) to Com. of Sup., 5150 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 683 (i); on M. for 2°, 2425 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C., *Brandon.*
Provincial Boundaries Extension, &c., Cor., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 240 (i).
Territorial Boundaries, O. C. *re*, &c. (M. for copies*) 239 (i).

Sinclair, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1783
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2032 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2468 (ii).
Customs Duties collected at Sydney, Sault Ste. Marie, &c. (Ques.) 1926 (i).
Fish Scrap Reduction Works, Rep. *re* Experiments (M. for copy*) 802 (i).
Govt. Dredging during 1901-6, Names of Ports, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2584 (ii).
I.C.R. Fish Transportation, Quantity and Revenue *re* (Ques.) 4850 (iii).
"Lena M.", Schr., Wreck of, Plans, Reps., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 3189 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5870 (iii).
Leopold, Mr. Louis, Rep. *re* Canadian Manufacturers Association and Immigration of Skilled Labour (Ques.) 4217 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 600 (i).
Modus Vivendi Licenses and Fines of U.S. Vessels, Total Amount collected (Ques.) 1049 (i).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (fish transportation) 5939; (herring nets) 5918 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 6734 (iv).
Interior—Miscellaneous, (maps, &c.) 7276 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction &c.) 5870; (Marconi stations) 5876 (iii).
Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5880 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Eskasoni wharf) 6032; (Half Island Cape) 6042; (Middle Country) 6051 (iv).

Sloan, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*

Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c., on M. for Ways and Means, 1699 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. &c. (Saskatoon) 4041 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D., *Wentworth.*

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 809; in Com., 1300, 1643, (i), 2011 (ii).

Cold Storage Shipments *re* Atlantic Service, Five Years past (M. for ret.*) 490 (i).

Cold Storage System for Transportation of Food Products, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5122, 5123 (iii).

Cold Storage *re* Trans-Atlantic SS. Regulations *re* (M. for ret.*) 3189 (ii).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 687 (i) ; on M. for 2°, 2445; in Com., 2461 (ii).

Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 4631; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4967 (iii).

Fruits and Vegetables, Canned, Importation and Exportation, Quantity, &c. (M. for ret.) 492 (i).

Govt. Bills, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 1092 (i).

G. B. and Her Colonies, Partnership Union between, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2883 (ii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 604 (i).

Revised Statutes, Distribution to Members (Ques.) 481 (i).

San Jose Scale, Suppression of, &c. (remarks) 2761 (ii).

Steamship Contracts, Transatlantic, Bonuses paid in 1906 (M. for copies) 491 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (alterations) 3609; (furniture, &c.) 3597; (Royal mint) 3604; (Sussex St. property) 3622, 3956 (ii).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means(apples) 1892; (berries) 1894 (i); (brass, &c.) 4203 (iii); Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1003; (farm products) 1269; (florist stock) 1869; (fruit, &c.) 1908; (hay, &c.) 1867 (i); (marble) 4192 (iii); (melons) 1910; (rye) 1859 (i); (sugar) 4156 (iii); (tomatoes) 1875; (vegetables) in Com., 1881 (i).

Thermograph Records, Ventilation, &c., on Steamships, Names, Dates of Sailing, &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).

Vaulvagnas Beach, Pet. *re* Post Office (Ques.) 1066 (i).

Smith, Mr. Geo., *North Oxford.*

Grand Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 2482 (ii).

Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4310 (iii).

Smith, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Aids to Navigation on Pacific Coast, Rep. of Capt. Anderson (Ques.) 480 (i).

Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 7794 (iv).

Coal Lands in Northwest, Control of by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 789 (i).

Coal Strikes, &c. in the N. W., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse, 7139, 7147 (iv).

——— Terms of Settlements, &c. (Ques.) 616 (i).

Doukhobors, Alleged Importation of as Contract Labourers, Rep. in Ottawa "Citizen" (Ques.) 888 (i).

Esquimalt Station, Establishment of School of Instruction (Ques.) 3370 (ii).

Experimental Farm, Labourers' Wages, Working Hours, &c. (Ques.) 2576 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Coal Lands, Pre-emption, &c. (Ques.) 6256 (iv).

——— Land Grants in B. C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2100 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 158) 1°*, 6377 (iv).

Hindoos, Arrival and Deportation from B.C., Number, &c. (Ques.) 234 (i).

Immigration, Fraudulent Representations in G.B., Cor. with W. L. Mackenzie-King *re* (M. for copies*) 3373 (ii).

Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlement, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1174 (i); (Amt.) agreed to (Y. 78; N. 40) 3697 (ii).

Life Saving Station on Pacific Coast, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 479 (i).

Marine Road on Vancouver Island, Cor. with Mr. McBride, &c. (Ques.) 481 (i).

See 'Vancouver,' &c.

Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7226 (iv).

Provincial Premiers' Conference, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 486 (i).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Circulars *re* (Ques.) 4453 (iii).

Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3285, 3848 (ii), 3979, 3991; on M. for 3°, 4997 (iii).

Vancouver Island Marine Road, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 579 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5682, 5714 (iii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland), *North Essex.*
Bills, Royal Assent: (Mess. from His Ex., 2315 (ii); 5176, 5185 (iii); 6518 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounty B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 7986 (iv).
Blairmore Town Site, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonell) 6563 (iv).
B.C. Judgeship, Statement of Sale of, Members' remarks checked (ruling) 580 (i).
Canned Foods B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6773 (iv).
Cigarettes, Prohibition, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain), on Amt. (Mr. Monk) (ruling) 4085 (iii).
Coal Lands in Northwest, Control by Govt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Stockton) *re* Amt. (Mr. Knowles)—(ruling) 773 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Members remarks checked, 7543 (iv).
Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith), and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5123; Ruling read (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 5123 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., (remarks) *re* interruptions, 682 (i).
——— Members remarks checked (ruling) 520, 523 (i).
Collingwood Ship Building Co., and Sittings of Pub. Accounts Com., on Objection (Mr. Lennox) 3721 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing, 4th Rep (remarks) 2287 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. Bill (Mr. Gervais) on M. to introduce, 1608 (i).
Debates, Official, Staff Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7977 (iv).
Electoral Districts, Vacancies, Issue of Writs (notification) 2 (i).
Election, New Members, Certificates of Election (notification) 2 (i).
Elections Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 1 (i).
French Hansard, Members remarks checked, 582 (i).
Fuel Famine in N.W., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Burrows), 2826 (ii).
Govt. Officials, &c. and Political Interference, Members' Remarks checked, 6664 (iv).
G.T.Ry. Co.'s B. 82 on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to M. for 3°, 4800 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Payments *re* Construction, Members' Remarks checked, 5088 (iii).
G.T.Ry. Co., 2-cent a Mile Rate, Ques. of Order, 4376 (iii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Announcement &c. (remarks) 581 (i).
——— (announcement) 7246 (iv).
——— Legality as to Form (remarks) 7 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland)—*Con.*
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation, Letter (read) 2 (i).
——— Rep. of Committee *re* (remarks) on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4762 (iii).
——— Warrant of Supersedeas *re* Writ (notification) 3276 (ii).
See "London", &c.
Insurance Commission and Charges against Cabinet Ministers, Ques. of Order, *re* Ref. to previous debate, 5400 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) and Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) Ruling, 5426 (iii).
——— Charges *re* Mr. Ross' Connection with J. J. Hill Rys. (ruling) 5493 (ii).
——— Charges against Cabinet Ministers, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa), Ques. of Order, 5657, (ruling) 5665, agreed to (Y. 104; N. 37) 5665 (iii).
Insurance Commission, Cor. *re*, Members' Remarks checked, 2345 (ii).
I.C.R., Accidents and Compensation, Notice of Motion *re* (remarks) 1077 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 219 (i).
Jamaica Disaster, Members' Remarks checked, 1613 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1879 (i).
Labour Disputes Bills, Members' Remarks checked, 1299 (i).
L'Assomption Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 5022 (iii).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 5 (i).
Life Saving Stations, &c., Minister's Remarks checked, 993 (i).
London Electoral District, Issue of Writ (notification) 2943 (ii).
——— Resignation of Hon. C. S. Hyman (remarks) 2 (i), 7186 (iv).
See "Hyman, Hon. C. S.," &c.
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Senate Amts., 5205 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an Englishman (remarks) 5860 (iii).
Meeting of House at later hour (remarks) 5808 (iii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates, 1907-8 (read) 278 (i).
——— Reply to Address (read) 1044 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2294 (ii), 7837 (iv).
——— Suppl. Estimates, 1907 (presented) 5643
Mess. from His Ex., Suppl. Estimates (1908) (read) 7213 (iv).
Nicolet Electoral District, Notice of Certificate, 1380 (i).
——— Vacancy (notification) 515 (i).
Ontario Development Co., Par. in Toronto 'News' (ruling) 6912 (iv).
Opening of Parliament: Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland)—*Con.*
Order, Ques. of *re* Motion (Mr. Robitaille) 2588 (ii).
——— Ques. of *re* Remarks (Mr. Ward) on 'Globe' Reports, 3278 (ii).
Port Arthur Development Co.'s B. 154 (Mr. Conmee) on Protest (Mr. Conmee) *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, on M. (Mr. Conmee) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Haggart)—(ruling) 7899 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7901; (ruling) 7922 (iv).
Postal Rates, Reduction, &c. (remarks) 6632 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa (remarks) 3728 (ii).
P.E.I., Winter Communication (ruling) *re* Discussion, &c., 703 (i).
——— Members' remarks checked, 4370, 4841 (iii).
——— Freight Service, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1078 (i).
P.E.I. Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) Ques. of Order *re* Seconder, 3198; (ruling) 3206 (ii).
Private Bills Pets., Expiration of Time for Receiving, 1981 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1923 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. German) for Precedence, 7482 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive (ruling) 2068 (ii).
——— Precedence, &c. (ruling) 7483 (iv).
Private Bills from Senate, on M. (Mr. Talbot)) to place on Order Paper, 4928 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa) Charges *re* Members, &c. (remarks) 3429 (ii).
Prorogation, Comn. from Gov. Gen. Sec.'s (read) 7983 (iv).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 7993 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5345 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. A. Martin) Ruling, 5358 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) Ruling, 5379 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5383 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule)—(ruling) 7709 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, &c., on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, (ruling) 7778 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Collingwood Dock, on M. *re* Sittings, 3841 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. Rep., on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 6765 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) h. m. asked to wthdw. statement *re* 'dirty work,' 7942 (iv).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland)—*Con.*
Queens and Shelburne Election Petition, Rep. of Judges (presented) 1 (i).
Ques. of Order (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Debate on Address, Reading from Documents (ruling) 153 (i).
Railway Grievances (Mr. Maclean) Members' Remarks checked, 4849 (iii).
Richelieu Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 5083 (iii).
Riflemen, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt., on prop Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) Ruling *re* Ques. of Order, 741 (i).
St. Mary's Electoral Div., Certificate of (notification) 468 (i).
Speech from Throne (read) 3 (i).
SUPPLY—
Legislation—H. of C. (clerkships) 7972; (debates, salaries) 7977 (iv).
Three Rivers Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 4044 (iii).
——— Vacancy (notification) 3101 (ii).
Transportation Commission, Reading of Letter by Min. (ruling) 3713 (ii).
Trent Canal, Outlet, &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) to adjn., 3627 (ii).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts (notification) 2977 (ii).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. Marcil), *Bonaventure.*
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5673 (iii).
Bills, Royal Assent (message) 2743 (ii).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. (ruling) *re* Discussion, 2008 (ii).
Cold Storage Systems, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Ruling of Mr. Speaker (read) 5123 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5846 (iii).
Digby Pier Vote, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 6028 (iv).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation (notification) 2728 (ii).
Insurance Commission on Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Charges (Mr. M. Martin) and Reply (Mr. Fowler) 6400 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to take down words (Mr. M. Martin)—(ruling) 6404 (iv).
——— Rep., Member's Remarks checked, 6459 (iv).
——— printing in French (remarks) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7004 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2742 (ii).
Montreal (St. Antoine) Electoral District, Pet. *re* (notification) 1470 (i).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7312 (iv).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. Marcil)—*Con.*
Provincial Subsidies, &c., on Ques. of Order, h. m. (Mr. Lavergne) requested to withdraw word 'cowardice,' 7720 (iv).
——— in Com. on Res., on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7751 (iv).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4974 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6633 (iv).
Ross Rifles, Discussion in Com. of Sup., on Quebec Harbours, Ques. of Order (ruling) 6091 (iv).
Strikes and Lockouts B. 36, Ques of Order *re* Statement reflecting on Minister by Outsiders (ruling) 3327 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 6[illegible] (iv).
Tariff, Flax Seed, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1348 (i).
Transportation Commission's Rep., Members' Remarks checked, 6084 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) *re* Discussion in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 6087 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Address, The, 77 (i).
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6260, 6274 (iv).
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5673 (iii).
Aylmer, Lord, Retirement of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).
Benjamin, Mr. R. W., Compensation *re* Slaughter of Cow (remarks) in Conc., 7988 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounty B. 174 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 7986 (iv).
Boots and Shoes and Tanners' Combine, in Com. on Ways and Means, 4581 (iii).
British Columbia Mills, Timber and Trading Co., Applications *re* Cancellation of Leases, &c. (Ques.) 2145 (ii).
Cattle, Tuberculosis, Compensation *re* by Govt. (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7992 (iv).
Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 807 (i); in Com., 2008 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6771 (iv).
Cheese Curing Buildings, Location, Cost, Amount of Transportation Charges, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1148 (i).
——— (Ques.) 947 (i).
Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7688 (iv).
Coal Lands in the Northwest, Control by Govt. *re* Strikes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 747; on Amt. (Mr. Knowles) 797 (i).
Coal Strikes in the N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7153 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7310 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes, Additional Information (remarks) 7693 (iv).
Cold Storage System, on Amt. (Mr. E. D. Smith), Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5122 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 670, 679 (i).
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 5276 (iii).
Committees, Sel. Standing, 4th Rep. (remarks) 2287 (ii).
——— on M. to sit concurrently with Hse., 6834 (iv).
Criminal Code (Public Works, &c.) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7187 (iv).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6783 (iv).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5622 (iii).
Digby Pier Grant, Ques. of Order, in Com. of Sup., 6028 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4792, 4867 (iii).
Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 72 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7438 (iv).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7032 (iv).
Electric Power Exportation B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 4946; (amt.) 4953; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) to M. for 3°, 4962 (iii).
French Language, Use of in Public Matters, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3667 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
German Treaties, *re* Tariff, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
G. T. Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 4450; on M. for 3°, 4849 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7355, 7389 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Public Works, for 1897-1906, Total Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2839 (ii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter from Sir Wilfrid *re* Resignation (remarks) 3627 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5719 (iii).
Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to M. for Sup., 6164, 6239 (iv).
Indian Reserve Timber Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
I. C. R., Accidents, Deaths, &c., on M. (Mr. Laurence) for Ret., 3412 (ii).
I. C. R. Employees Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1500 (i); in Com., 2948 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Inspection and Sales Act (fruit) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6776 (iv).
Insurance Commission, Charges against Cabinet Minister, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5662 (iii).
——— Evidence, Printing (remarks) 3881 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fieldin) in Com. on Res., 7456 (iv).
Jordan-Erie Power Co.'s B. 115, on M. (Mr. German) to place on Order Paper, 7694 (iv).
Justice, Administration of by Dom. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4131 (iii).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Labour Disputes, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2619 (ii).
Life Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 942 (i).
Lion's Head Life Saving Apparatus, Establishment of, &c. (remarks) 942 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii).
Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. Bole) on Sen. Amts., 6204 (iv).
Manitoba School Lands Exchange B. 114 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5702 (iii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 133 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 6586 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 604 (i).
Mines Dept., Establishment B. 139 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7189, 7218 (iv).
Mines Dept. Apptmnt. of Mr. McInnes (remarks) 5688 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7080; in Com., 7571 (iv).
Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5589 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5792 (iii).
Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 7206, 7312 (iv).
Paper Combines, in Com. on Tariff, 2053 (ii).
Parcel Post, C.O.D. System, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 2344 (ii).
Petawawa Military Camp and Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7650 (iv).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 3890, 3897 (ii).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.'s incorp, B. 167 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 7123 (iv).
——— on Protest *re* moving on Order Paper, 7911 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Ques. of Order, 7901, 7922 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Postal System, C.O.D., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 2575 (ii).
Post Office Employees, Salary Increases (remarks) 6520 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Rep. *re* Immigration to S. Africa and Canada (remarks) 2958 (ii).
Private Bills, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1923 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 1983 (ii).
Private Bills from Senate, on M. (Mr. Talbot) to place on Order Paper, 4928 (iii).
Provincial Rights: *See* 'Hamilton Radial Bill,' 'Petawawa'.
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5299 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 5379 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5383 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5346 (iii).
——— On Amt. (Mr. A. Martin) to M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 5359 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to make corrections, 7054 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj. *re* Amt. to B. N. A. Act, from Senate, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 7711; Ques. of Order, 7702 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, &c. from Senate, in Com. on Res., 7749 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to send Mess. to Senate, 7776 (iv).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. W. McIntyre) for Com., 2526 (ii).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., on M. for 2°, 7953; in Com., 7955 (iv).
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Gauvreau) in Com., 4973 (iii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6(Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 644 (i); on M. for Com., 3683 (ii).
Railway Act (counsel) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7414, 7426 (iv).
Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 982 (i).
Representation in H. of C., from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2171 (ii).
Revised Statutes B. 19 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 1505 (i).
Ross Rifle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5761 (iii).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, &c., Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4257 (iii).
Standing Orders Sel. Com., 7th Rep. on M. (Mr. Grant) to conc., 6376 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3055; on M. that Com. rise, 3310; on Ques. of Order *re* Statement of Mr. Hall, 3327; in Com., 3341 (ii), 4470 (iii).

Strikes and Lockouts, Enforcement of Statute (remarks) 6008 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2961; (census) 2964; (fumigating stations) 2974 (ii); (live stock products) in conc., 7988 (iv); (Year-book) 2972 (ii).

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 5553 (iii); (Port Colborne elevator) 7532 (iv).

Civil Govt (Aud. Gen.'s) 2764; Customs, 2767; Interior, 2957 (ii); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 5766 (iii); Militia (salaries) 7686 (iv); Post Office, 2770 (ii).

Customs (Bain, Mr. gratuity) 5977 (iii).

Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 5909; (cold storage bait) 5910; (dogfish extermination) 5921; (fish breeding) 5893; (fish curing) 5931; (fish transportation) 5935; (legal expenses) 5971; (oyster culture) 5909 (iii).

Immigration (bonuses) 7277; (deportations) 7278; (fuel, &c.) 7278 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 7291 (iv).

Indians—Ont. (roads, &c.) 7289 (iv).

Indians—Que. (Oka settlement) 7291 (iv).

Indians—Yukon (medical attendance) 7293 (iv).

Interior (timber inspector) 7294; miscellaneous (maps, &c.) 7275 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (book-keeping reorganization) 5949 (iii).

Marine, Public Works (Cap à la Roche) 5776; (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 5773 (iii).

Militia (Dom. arsenal) 5764; (pay and allowance) 5647; (R.M. College) 5764; (supplies) 5763; (surveys) 5724 (iii).

Miscellaneous (litigated expenses, Dom. and Provinces) 7972; (Revised Statutes) 7972 (iv).

N.W.T. Govt. (litigation) 7274; (roads and bridges) 7273 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766; (Govt. steamers, repairs) 5946; (life saving stations) 5767; (Quebec Coal Co.'s claim) 5947 (iii).

Post Office (postmasters' salaries) 7982 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Hamilton drill hall) 4021; (London militia stores) 4022; (North Bay) 4023; (Owen Sound) 4025; (Peterborough armoury) 4025; (St. Catharines) 4026; (Simcoe) 4028; (Toronto, customs) 4030; (Toronto, drill hall) 4032 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (eastern block) 3951; (Supreme Court) 3625; (Sussex St. property) 3621, 3960 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (generally) 7000 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6018; (Glace Bay) 6034; (Inverness Mines) 6047; (Moose) 6053; (Parrsboro) 6056; (Port Hastings) 6060; (Port Hood) 6064; (Scotch cove) 6066; (Yarmouth) 6067 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 6941; Goderich) 6953 (iv); (ice-breakers) 5994 (iii); (Little Current) 6954; (Meaford) 6962 (iv); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5982 (iii).

Public Works—Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 7001 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton car shops) 7306; (Mulgrave) 7297 (iv).

Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4350 (iii).

Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) in Com., 4402 (iii); (berries) 1898 (i), 4148 (iii); (binders) 4228; (boots and shoes, &c.) 4581 (iii); (casket trimmings) 4434 (iii); (cements, &c.) 2122; (coins) 2130; (denatured alcohol) in Com., 2046 (ii). (flax seed) 4144; glass, raw) 4435; (iii); (intermediate tariff) 532; (extension to British or foreign countries) 844 (i); (iron, &c., pipe) 2133 (ii); (machinery for sugar refining) 2135; (marble) 2125 (ii); (matrices) 4401; (metallic trading checks) 4438 (iii); (pickles, &c.) 1889 (i); (printing paper) 2053 (ii); (starch, &c.) 4143 (iii); (sago, &c.) 1864 (i).

Transportation Commission's Rep. (J. H. Ashdown) Considn. of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1591 (i).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Letter read to contradict statements by hon. mem., 3713 (ii).

Treaties (commercial) Canadian B. 17 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 1552 (i).

Trent Canal, Rice Lake, &c., Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1937 (i).

Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 260 (i).

Wiarton Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).

Winnipeg Terminals C. N. and G. T. P. Rys. B. 128 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 5523 (iii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5017, 5675, 5682 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5708 (iii).

Yukon Territory Ordinances Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7409 (iv).

Staples, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Agriculture (remarks) *re* Information asked for, 7832 (iv).

Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5574 (iii).

Leech, R. E., McLean, Mr., and Others, Emplymt. by Govt., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 2985

Malley, Mr. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3370 (ii).

Malloy, John P., and Ira Stratton, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6012 (iv).

Staples, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Shephard, Mr. Arthur, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3369 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7817; (electric ry., experimental farm) 7819; (exhibitions) 7818; (experimental farms) 7814 (iv).

Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6247; (surveys) 7263 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Carman) 7822 (iv); (Neepawa) 4599 (ii); (Red River bank protection) 7833 (iv); (Winnipeg immigration) 4600; (Winnipeg P. O.) 4602 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Red River) 6995; (St. Laurent) 6991 (iv).

Swamp Lands, Man., Lease to Hon. Mr. Kirchhoffer (remarks) 1842 (i).

Swan Lake Reserve, Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 946 (i).

Tariff—Agricultural Implements, in Com., 1375 (i).

——— Oats, in Com., 1372 (i).

Stewart, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*

Morgan, Henry J., Cor. *re* Superannuation, &c. (M. for copies*) 239 (i).

Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 119 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5589 (iii).

Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2455 (ii).

Stockton, Mr. A. A., *St. John City and County.*

Address, The, 204 (i).

Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1769 (i).

C. P. R. Mail Contracts, Landing at Halifax, N.S., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 491 (i).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 816; in Com., 1328, 1615 (i).

Coal Lands in the Northwest, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Knowles) 772 (i).

Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1460 (i).

Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. 8 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 1754 (i).

G. T. P. Land Grant in B. C., Indian Reserve, on M. for Ways and Means, 2078 (ii).

Hampton Postmaster, Mr. Z. Hall, Corrupt Practices *re* Elections, &c. (Ques.) 231 (i).

I. C. R., Employees' Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 1486 (i).

——— Mail Service to Halifax and St. John (remarks) on M. to adjn., 2205 (ii).

Judicial Apptmnts. to Supreme Court, N.S., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 2211 (ii).

Labour Disputes Bill (remarks) on M. to adjn., 1299 (i).

——— Distribution of (remarks) 1330 (i).

Stockton, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Life-Saving Stations, P.E.I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) 906, 931 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 599 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 22 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, and in Com., 1093 (i).

Niagara—International Waterways Commission, Reps., O.Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. Lancaster) for Copies, 1444 (i).

Newspaper Articles, Objectionable Reading, &c. (remarks) 2757 (ii).

Queen's and Shelburne Election Trial, Ref. to in Debate on Address, 207 (i).

Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2173 (ii).

Senators, N.B., Apptmnt. of, Residential Qualifications, &c. (remarks) 1656 (i).

Sub-Target Machine Guns, Purchase and Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 225 (i).

Tariff—Cheese, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to increase Tax, Ruling of English Speaker (read) 1349 (i).

——— Dumping Clause Amts. (binder twine) in Com., 1228 (i).

——— Proceedings *re* Combinations, &c., in Com., 1243 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Com. on Res., 523; in Com. on Res., 697 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4808 (iii).

French Clergy and Exiles from France, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6666 (iv).

G.T.P. Ry. Surveys, Quebec-Moncton Section, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Copies, 273 (i).

Insurance Commission's Rep., Ques. of Order, 6459 (iv).

Live Stock Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 151) 1°*, 6005 (iv).

Lake Superior Power Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 4839 (iii).

Marriage (minors) Invalid B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7846 (iv).

Members occupying Seats on Govt. Side (remarks) 5890 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., (Mr. Beddoe) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5810 (iii).

Ottawa Terminals Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Caldwell) 1°*, 6005 (iv).

Post Office Employees, Salary Increases (remarks) 6520 (iv).

Preferential Tariff and German Surtax, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 6653 (iv).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., O'Leary and West Cape Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Copies, 1815 (i).

Private Bill (M.) for Second Readings, 4927 (iii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s Loan. B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 7940 (iv).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7558 (iv).

Ross Rifles, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Sup., 3801 (ii).

Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3293, 3830 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 6738 (iv).

Public Works—H. of C. (telephones on 4th floor) 7820 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. Geo., *Leeds.*

Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6276 (iv).

Breweries and Distilleries in Local Option Municipalities, Pet. *re*, Prohibition of, &c. (Ques.) 4452 (iii).

Brooks, E. L., & Co., Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept. (Ques) 472 (i).

Canadian Fog Signal Co., Amounts purchased by Marine Dept. (Ques.) 472 (i).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 831; in Com., 1308, 1623 (i). 2023 (ii).

Coal Strike in N.W., Inquiry &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7163 (iv).

Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 671 (i).

Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 7050 (iv).

Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2255 (ii), 4629 (iii).

"Fielding" Dredge, Construction, and Cost of Maintenance (Ques.) 3187 (ii).

G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Pub. Accts. Com., 5072 (iii).

House of Commons, Whip's Rooms (remarks) in conc., 7987 (iv).

Immigration Agents, Messrs. Ward, Johnston, &c., Dismissal of (Ques.) 5655 (iii).

I.C.R. Train Service at Rimouski, Complaints *re* Delays in Mails, &c. (Ques.) 615 (i).

Judges Salaries in Man. and B.C. B. 177 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 7782; (amt.) 7792 (iv).

Labour Disputes, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2616 (ii).

Lansdowne Mail Delivery by Night Trains, &c. (Ques.) 2581 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service, Total Expenditure from 1892 to 1896, and from 1902 to 1906 (Ques.) 471 (i).

McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymnt. in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).

Magee, Mr. Justice, Delays in rendering Judgments, &c. (Ques.) 884, 1927 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on Judges B., 7782 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Auditing of Purchases, &c. (Ques.) 709 (i).

Merwin, Geo. T. & Co., Amount of Goods purchased for Lighthouse Service (Ques.) 471 (i).

Nipissing Indian Reserve, Surrender of, O. Cs. Reps. &c. (M. for copies*) 2585 (ii).

Parliament Buildings, Covering of Steps, &c. (remarks) 174 (i).

Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges *re* (Mr. Conmee) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7923 (iv).

Postmasters' Salaries, Ref. to in Com. on B. 7028 (iv).

Post Offices in Cities, Employees Salaries, increases to (Ques.) 5779 (iii).

Private Bills, Precedence, &c. (remarks) 7483 (iv).

Provincial Subsidies, &c., on M. (Mr. Fielding to send Mess. to Senate, 7780 (iv).

Revised Statutes, Advance Copies sent to Persons, Firms, &c. (Ques.) 2578 (ii).

Rideau Canal Reserve Land, Lease of, &c. (Ques.) 6903 (iv).

——— Letters from Farmers in District (read) 6912 (iv).

Senatorship for Rougemont, Rep. in "Gazette" *re* Statement of Mr. Girard, 4662 (iii).

Smith, Mr. Obed, Land Sales, Fraudulent Representations *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Ways and Means, 4257 (iii).

Speech from Throne, Distribution to Members (remarks) 6 (i).

Strikes and Lockouts Settlement B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3294, 3880 (ii).

Strubb, Chas., Amounts purchased by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 472 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7816 (iv); (archives) 2961; (census) 2969 (ii); (cold storage) 7815 (iv); (Year-book) 2972 (ii).

Canals—Trent (Curtis Bros'. claims) 7538; (O'Toole, J., claims, &c.) 7538 (iv).

Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6735; (Just, Mr. C. F., salary) 6242 (iv).

Legislation (voters' lists) 6763 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston barracks) 7820; Ottawa (H. of C. rooms) 7822 (iv); (Sussex St. property) 3957 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Little Current) 6957; (Port Stanley) 6979; Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (salaries, &c.) 6249 (iv).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (axes, scythes, &c.) 4418; (brass, &c.) 4196; (chains) 4266 (iii); (cheese) 1338 (i). (drawbacks) 4423 (iii); (Indian corn) 1366 (i); (malleable chains) 4392; (oils) 4187; (springs and axles) 4429; (sugar) 4169; (timetables, &c.) 4184 (iii); (tomatoes) 1873 (i); (trunks, &c.) 2405 (ii); (wire cables) 4422 (iii).
Tariff—British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4365 (iii).
Tariff—Cheese, in Com., 1338 (i).
——— (M.) to increase Duty, 1349 (i).
——— Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 1350 (i).
Tariff—Dumping Clause, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1025; (binder twine) 1220; (felloes of hickory, &c.) 1190 (i).
Wharfs and Docks in Ont., Govt. Assistance to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Wilson, Thos. & Co., Amounts purchased, &c. (Ans.) 472 (i).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5018 (iii).
Yukon, McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Resignation as Commissioner, &c. (Ques.) 2293 (ii).

Telford, Mr. W. P., *North Grey.*
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2427 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (hatcheries) 5895 (iii).

Templeman, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Victoria City, B.C.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. (B. 127) 1° m., 4929 (iii); 2° m. and in Com., 6259 (iv).
Athabaska Fishing Co., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames), 6259 (iv).
Bait Cold Storage Establishments, Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 5910 (iii).
Blind River, Ass't Inspector, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
Breweries and Distilleries, in Local Option Municipalities, Pets. *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 4452 (iii).
Canada-United States Boundary Surveys, Extent, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1610 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 165 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 6789 (iv).
Denatured Alcohol, Quantity made and sold, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).
Dion, Ulric, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6904 (iv).

Templeman, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Electric Inspection (B. 111) 2° and in Com., 7030 (iv).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5085 (iii)
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5965 (iii).
G.T.P. Land Grant in B.C., Indian Reserve, on M. (Mr. R. L Borden) for Ways and Means, 2082 (ii)
Granger, Mr. Magloire, Emplymt. as Civil Servant (Ans.) 5288 (iii).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1092 (i).
Inland Revenue, Dep. Collectors, Classification, Number, &c., employed by Govt. (Ans.) 946 (i).
Maple Syrup, Adulteration of, &c. (Ans.) 2634 (ii).
Marconi Stations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii).
Marconi Station at Clarke City (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5875 (iii).
Marine Supplies, Method of Purchase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii).
Mines Dept., Establishment (B. 139) 1° m., 5258 (iii); 2° *, and in Com., 7189; in Com., 7212, 7213, 7252; 3° *, 7255 (iv).
Mines, Dept. of, Apptmnt. of Mr. McInnes (remarks) 5688 (iii).
Niagara Falls, Map of Dr. Spencer *re* (Ans.) 487 (i).
——— International Waterways Commission, Reps, O.Cs., &c., on M. for Copies, 1443 (i).
Patent Medicines Inspection (B. 99) prop. Res. 2637; in Com. on Res., 3464; 1°* of Bill, 3465; 2° m. and in Com., 3890 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* this Session (remarks) 5863 (iii).
——— Postponement of (remarks) 4441 (iii).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt. (B. 97) 1°*, 2728 (ii); in Com., 4656 (iii).
St. Charles de Caplin Refrigerator Association *re* Bait Freezing (Ans.) 6904 (iv).
St. John River Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 6634 (iv).
Standard Chemical Co., on Inquiry (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 7521 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt. (Inland Revenue) 2822 (ii); Labour Dept. (McNiven, J. A.) 6620; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 7678 (iv).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 6630, 7295 (iv).
Fisheries (bait, cold storage) 5910; (Canadian exhibit) 5908; (dog fish extermination) 5920; (fish breeding) 5892; (fishery commissions) 5941, 5971; (fish curing) 5923; (fish transportation) 5932; (herring nets) 5917; (inspectors' salaries) 5890; (legal expenses) 5970; (marine biological stations) 5932; (oyster culture) 5909; (protection service) 5905, 5963 (iii).
Geological Survey (boring for gas, &c.) 3159; (clerical assistance) 3166; (maps, &c.)

Templeman, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey—*Con.*

3163; (Nicolas, F., salary) 3163; (salaries) 3159; (specimens) 3165 (ii).

Hydrographic Surveys (steamer) 7685 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 5867 (iii), 7679 (iv); (book-keeping reorganization) 5947; (construction, &c.) 5869 (iii); (lighthouses, &c.) 7679 (iv); (maintenance, &c.) 5868; (Marconi stations) 5874; (salaries) 5864; (signals) 5872 (iii).

Marine Hospitals (distressed seamen) 5880 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 5946 (iii); (life saving stations) 7678 (iv.); (N. W. M. P. patrol boat) 5946; (Quebec Coal Co.'s claim) 5947 (iii).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 5878 (iii).

Meteorological Service, 5690 (iii); (allowances, &c.) 7684 (iv); (steamer, B.C.) 5879

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration) 7096 (iv).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 6628; (gas inspection) 6627; (inspectors) 6627 (iv).

Tariff—Denatured Alcohol, in Com., 2046; Spirits, in Com., 2112 (ii).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount collected for 1906 (Ans.) 1612 (i).

——— Excise Duties, Changes *re* (remarks) 5862 (iii).

——— Manufactures in Can., Duties on Foreign Products, &c. (Ans.) 1925 (i).

——— Raw Leaf, Amount imported from U.S. in 1906 (Ans.) 2141 (ii).

Waubaushene Light, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5969 (iii).

Weights and Measures, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 219 (i).

Wiarton Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Alaska and Yukon Ry. incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 1472 (i).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 1119 (i); in Com., 2769 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Justice, Administration of, Yukon (judges' living allowances) 7971 (iv).

Tariff (mining machinery) in Com., 4420 (iii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5691 (iii).

Yukon Boundaries Delimitation, on M. for Sup., 3102 (ii).

Yukon Gold Output, Subsidy to Steamers, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4519 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5708 (iii).

Yukon Wheat Raising, Samples placed on Table, 3548 (ii).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *Norfolk.*

Address, The, 199 (i).

G. T. P. Total Yardage, Winnipeg Div., Govt. Policy *re* Labour, &c. (Ques.) 1799 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 600 (i).

Private Bills Pets., on M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to receive, 1983 (i).

Ry. Passenger Tickets Sale Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 986 (i).

Ross Rifle Inspections, &c., on M. (Mr. Worthington) for Ret., 1408 (i).

Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 37 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 1040 (i).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7827; (Lake Aylmer wharf) 7826 (iv).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 7027 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries (herring nets) 5917 (iii).

Transportation Commission's Rep. (J. H. Ashdown) Considn. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1600 (i), 3698 (ii).

Turriff, Mr. J. G., *East Assiniboia.*

Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5672 (iii).

Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1794 (i).

Blairmore Town Site, Charges *re* Patents, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).

Coal Lands in the Northwest, Control and Regulation by Govt. *re* Strikes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 773 (i).

Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) in Com., 5623 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4753, 4792, 4815, 4867 (iii).

Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co., on Amt. (Mr. Herron) 3471 (ii).

Lumber Combine in N. W., Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1839 (i).

Nichols Copper Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 119) 1°*, 4927 (iii).

Ottawa Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 4927 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. W. McIntyre) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) to M. for 3°, 3175 (ii)

Quinze and Blanche River Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 2455 (ii).

Saskatchewan and Alberta Representation B. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 6766 (iv).

Turriff, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
S. A. War Veterans, Land Grants to, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 732 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Transactions, &c., on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2569 (ii).
Tariff, British Preference on Goods shipped to Canadian Ports, on M. (Mr. Logan) to Ways and Means, 4307 (iii).
Tariff—Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2357 (ii).
Travellers' Indemnity Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 120) 1°*, 4927 (iii).

Verville, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Coal Strikes in the N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Bole) to adjn. Hse., 7135 (iv).
Govtl. Printing, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 4851 (iii).
I. C. R. Employees' Pension Fund B. 68 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2938 (ii).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlement, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1171 (i).
See 'Coal.'
Labour on Public Works, Hours (B. 32) 1° m., 803 (i).
Montreal Harbour Dry Dock, Plans, Reps., &c. (Ques.) 2581 (ii).
Old Age Pensions, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3388 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Rules and Regulations governing (M. for copies*) 2147 (ii).
Strikes and Lockouts Prevention B. 36 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 3071; in Com., 3284, 3815, 3856 (ii), 4465; on M. for 3°, 4996 (iii).
Tariff—Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2360 (ii).

Walsh, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*
Cigarettes, Manufacture and Sale, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4081 (iii).
Customs Act (Tariff) Amt. B. 134 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Schaffner) 5575 (iii).
Homestead Duties, N. W., Quarter Section 22, &c., Entries, &c. (Ques.) 1924 (i).
Lloyd, T. H., Imprisonment of, &c. (Ques.) 2983 (ii).
Malone and Hopkins Point Ry. Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 515 (i).
Post Cards, coated with Isinglass, Prohibition of (remarks) 5284 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7817 (iv).
Civil Govt. (Post office) 2795 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay) 6095 (iv).
Tariff—Animals, &c., in Com., 1258 (i).

Walsh, Mr. J. C., *Montreal, St. Ann's.*
G.T.P. Investigation *re* Payments on Construction, on M. to conc. in 6th Report of Pub. Accts. Com., 5110 (iii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*
Bethany Ass't Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ques.) 723, 1147 (i).
——— Charges *re* Loss of Registered Letters (M. for cor.*) 1148 (i).
Bowmanville Poultry Station, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 3369 (ii).
Cobourg, Ry. Ferry to Charlotte (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).
See "Port Hope".
'Globe' Newspaper Reports, Order, Ques. of, 3278 (ii).
Port Hope and Charlotte Car Ferry, on M. for Sup., 7579 (iv).
See "Cobourg".
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 637 (i).
Registered Letters, Number carried for 1906 (Ques.) 3186 (ii).
Registration Fee on Letters, Increase of, &c. (Ques.) 2829, 3185 (ii).
Rideau Hall Conservatory, Collapse of Dome (remarks) 1091 (i).
Ross Rifles, Criticism *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3795 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (construction) 7667 (iv).
Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6720 (iv).
Militia (clothing) 5744; (training schools) 5730 (iii).
Trent Canal, Outlet, &c. (M.) to adjn., 3627 (ii).
——— Rice Lake, and Lake Ont., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 1929 (i).
——— Survey by E. J. Walsh, Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 4664 (iii).

White, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Speech of P.M. G., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 571 (i).
——— Surveys, Inquiry for, 3547 (ii).
Petawawa Docks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Petawawa Military Camp, Compensation to Township *re* Taxes (remarks) 6519 (iv).
——— Provincial Rights, on M. for Sup., 7663 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay) 7819 (iv).
Tariff—Dumping Clause Amts. (cream separators) in Com., 1205 (i).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4103 (iii).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.*
G.T.P. Medical Health Officers, Apptmnt. of (Ques.) 2633 (ii).
Immigration from Mar. Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
Railway Subsidies B. 178 (C.P.R., Gagetown branch) in Com. on Res., 7803 (iv).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D.—*Con.*

St. John River, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 6634 (iv).

St. John River Sewerage, Pollution at Frederickton (Ques.) 6017 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 6733 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (plant) 7000 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Lincoln wharf) 7824; (Oak Point) 6077; (St. Andrew's) 6080; (St. John River) 6079 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Disraeli wharf) 7829 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. N. F., *Russell.*

Binder Twine Seizures, in 1906 &c. (Ques.) 2140 (ii).

Printing Bureau, Names of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 2886 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Agricultural Com., Evidence *re*, Inquiry for, 3001 (ii).

American Silver exported by Banks, Commissions paid, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

Boots and Shoes, Tanner's Combine (remarks) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4587 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 72 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 4410 (iii).

Canned Foods Inspection B. 33 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1205 (i), 2010 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 81 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. 4557 (iii).

Centreville Postmaster, Absence, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

——— Removal from Belleville, &c. (remarks) 7781 (iv).

Commercial Agencies for 1905-6, Names of Agents, Salaries, Locations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 241 (i).

Commercial Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

Immigrant Bonuses, Amounts paid to Agents for 1904-5-6 &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

Immigration Distributing Agents (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6747 (iv).

Immigration Policy of Govt. *re* French Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6167 (iv).

Insurance Commission's Evidence, Distribution of, Number of Copies, &c. (remarks) 4118 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) to print, 3723 (ii).

Interior Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 174, 658, (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7501 (iv).

Kittson, Mr. C. M., Resignation as Canadian Agent in S. Africa (Ques.) 1140 (i).

National Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. B. 29 (Mr. Pardee) on Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Moneys paid to Nov. 1, 1906, Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 239 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6751 (iv).

Preston, W. T. R., Agent under Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7096 (iv).

——— Evidence *re* Investigation, Apptmnt. by Govt., &c. (M. for copy) 576 (i).

——— Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa, on M. for Sup., 3728 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 178 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7800 (iv).

Shelburne Range Lights, Complaints *re* Location (Ques.) 2836 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s office) 2764 (ii); Post Office (contingencies) 6620 (iv).

Fisheries (protection service) 5964 (iii).

Immigration (agents, Ont.) 6713 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 7108 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Edmonton) 4036 (iii).

Public Works—B.C. (Vancouver) 4043 (iii)

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria) 4018; (Belleville) 4018; (Kingston barracks) 4022; (Toronto customs) 4030; (Toronto, drill hall) 4035; (Toronto, postal station 'F') 4035 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (eastern block) 3951 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle station) 4009; (immigrant buildings) 4011; (Montreal barracks) 4010; (Que. trachoma hospital) 4012 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Regina P.O.) 4040 (iii).

Trade and Commerce (agents' salaries) 7096 (iv).

Tariff—Boots and Shoes, in Com., 4587 (iii)

——— Chains, in Com., 4268 (iii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5018, 5675 (iii).

Worthington, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Annual Drill, Restrictions *re* Leave of Absence (Ques.) 4051 (iii).

Boer War Trophies, Distribution of, &c. (Ques.) 474 (i).

Eastern Townships Post Offices, Applications for, Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).

Eastern Townships, Expenditure of Public Money *re* Public Works, &c. (Ques.) 2581 (ii).

G.T. Ry., Collision at Richmond, Trial of Atkinson, Rep., &c. (M. for copy*) 2839 (ii).

Immigration Agents, Apptmnt. in Eastern Townships, &c. (Ques.) 1142, 1395 (i).

——— Record of Agents, &c., (Ques.) 2579 (ii).

I.C.R., Carpets supplied, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3633 (ii).

Magog Public Building, Construction of, &c. (Ques.) 2140 (ii).

Militia Headquarters Staff, Name of Oldest Officer (Ques.) 6634 (iv).

Worthington, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*
Militia Headquarters Staff, Names, Rank, Ages, &c. (Ques.) 7700 (iv).
Military Stores Inspection, Names of Officers, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 720 (i).
Permanent Force, Qualification of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 1050 (i).
Ross Rifle, Accidents in N.W. Mounted Police, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4051 (iii).
——— Accidents, &c. at St. John, N.B., Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4050 (iii).
——— Adoption of Bayonet, Pattern, &c. (Ques.) 2580 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt. and Customs Dept. (M. for copies*) 2147 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt. *re* Supplies, Dealings, &c. (M. for copies) 727 (i).
——— Contract with Messrs. Billings & Spencer, &c. (Ques.) 1395 (i).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects, on M. for Sup., 3759 (ii).
——— Imported Parts from U.S., &c. (Ques.) 2833 (ii).
——— Inspection Commissions, &c., Reps., &c. (M. for ret.) 1398 (i).
——— Pattern *re* Rep. of Commissioner, 1901 (Ques.) 4216 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).
——— Reports from Officers *re* Defects (Ques.) 4273 (iii).
——— Reps., &c., Inquiry for Ret., 3626 (ii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Proposed Erection of (Ques.) 2579 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Militia (customs duties) 5765 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec East) 4015; (St. Johns military) 4015; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 4015; (Three Rivers drill hall) 4015 (iii).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *South Renfrew.*
Adulteration Act (analysts) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6274 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 2419 (ii).
Committee, Sel. Standing, 4th Rep., (presented) 2286 (ii).
——— 5th Rep. (presented) 2414 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4886 (iii).
Electric Inspection B. 111 (Mr. Templeman) 7037 (iv).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2260 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7068
Private Bills Com., 5th Rep. *re* Petitions (presented) 2480 (ii).
Tariff—British Preferential applicable to Goods shipped to Canadian Ports on Amt. (Mr. Logan) 4291 (iii).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
Tariff, Berries, in Com., 1896 (i).
——— Cotton Fabrics, in Com., 2357 (ii).
——— Farm Products, in Com., 1275 (i).
Transportation Question, Mr. Ashdown's Rep. on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 4092 (iii).

Wright, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*
Bracebridge, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).
Cigarettes, Sale, &c., Prohibition of, on Ques. of Order, (M.) to adjn. debate, 4090 (iii).
Copper purchased for the Militia, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3883 (ii).
Electric Power Export B. 60 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 2267 (ii).
Georgian Bay Islands in Baxter Townships, Sale of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 492 (i).
I.C.R., Safety Valve Co., Adoption of Patent (Ques.) 2834 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 7513 (iv).
Muskoka Lakes Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5867 (iii).
Ottawa Post Office, Date of Fire, Total Cost of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1562 (i).
SUPPLY—
Customs (salaries) 5974 (iii).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 7296 (iv).
Indians—Ont. (roads, &c.) 7289 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 5867 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 4023; (Peterborough armoury) 4025; (Toronto customs) 4030 (iii)
Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (steel shelves) 4024 (iii); (Rideau Hall improvements) 3615 (ii).
Tariff—Com. on Ways and Means (agricultural implements) 4407 (iii); (beeswax) 1332 (i); (binders) 4428; (chains) 4269 (iii); (cheese) 1334 (i); (disinfectants) 4185 (iii); (iron or steel nuts, &c.) 2134 (ii); (malleable chains) 4391; (portable engines) 4413 (iii); (whips) 2404; (wire fencing) 2133; (wool) 2387 (ii).
Threshers, Total Value of Importations (Ques.) 3635 (ii).
Wharfingers, Apptmnt. of in Muskoka, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1063 (i).

Zimmerman, Mr. A., *West Hamilton.*
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 7318 (iv).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlements, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1173 (i).
SUPPLY—
Customs (salaries, &c.) 5974 (iii).
Militia (clothing) 5742; (properties) 5739
Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (Hamilton drill hall) 4021 (iii).
Tariff—in Com. on Ways and Means (britannia metal) 4206 (iii); (pickles, &c.) 1889 (i); (roofing slate) 4192 (iii); (tweeds) 1349 (i).

INDEX---PART II

SUBJECTS

Abitibi and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 142.'

Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'

Acetone, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).

Acland, Mr. A., Apptmnt. to Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6619 (iv).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne: moved (Mr. Pardee) 9; seconded (Mr. Demers, St. John and Iberville) 15 (i).

Debate:

(Mr. R. L. Borden) 21; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 33; (Mr. Foster) 43; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 61; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 69; (Mr. Sproule) 77; (Mr. Bourassa) 94; (Mr. E. B. Devlin) 108; (Mr. Cockshutt) 111; (Mr. Clements) 116; (Mr. Osler) 120; (Mr. Boyce) 123; (Mr. Alex. Johnston) 144; (Mr. Bergeron) Ques. of Order, 153; (Mr. Barker) 161; (Mr. Lake) 162; (Mr. Bergeron) 167; (Mr. Campbell) 175; (Mr. Broder) 194; (Mr. Tisdale) 199; (Mr. Stockton) 204; M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 218 (i).

——— Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1044 (i).

——— Debate, Ques. of Order (Mr. Bergeron) reading of documents, 153; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 153 (i).

Adjournment for Christmas: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 991, 1077 (i).

Administration of Justice in Alta. and Saskn.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'

Administration of Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1.'

Adulteration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'

AGRICULTURE:

Agricultural Com., Evidence *re:* Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 3001 (ii).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, for 1905-6: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 569 (i).

——— Total Value of Exports, 1894-6: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1553 (i).

Agricultural Implements: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352, 1376 (i), 4402 (iii).

Agricultural Products: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352 (i).

——— Imports and Exports from Can. to U. S., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1149 (i).

AGRICULTURE, &c.—*Con.*

Animals, Health of: in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii), 7810 (iv); Conc., 7988 (iv).

——— Deptl. Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1392 (i)

Barrels, Legal Size, Recommendation of Dom. Horticultural Council: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).

Benjamin, Mr. R. W., Compensation *re* Slaughter of Cow, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on Conc., 7988 (iv).

Bowmanville Poultry Station, Expenditure *re:* Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3369 (ii).

Butter Production and Exportation, Total Cost of, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1145 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo, Cor. with G. B. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1055 (i).

Cattle Tuberculosis, Compensation *re:* Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7990 (iv).

Central Experimental Farm, Stock, Implements, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 3189 (ii).

Cheese Arbitrations, Apptmnt. of Official Arbitrator at Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 1612 (i).

Cheese Curing Buildings, Number, Locations, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 947 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1148 (i).

Cheese for Exportation or Consumption in Can., Total Product, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1143 (i).

Cheese Hauling to Curing Rooms, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4211 (iii).

Cold Storage and Cool Curing Plants, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 710 (i).

Cold Storage Shipments *re* Atlantic Service, Five Years Past: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).

AGRICULTURE, &c.—*Con.*
Cold Storage Shipments, Regulations *re:* M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 3189 (ii).
Cold Storage System for Transportation of Food Products, on M. for Sup., 5122 (iii).
Cold Storage Warehouses: in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7810 (iv).
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4044 (iii).
Experimental Farms, Labourers' Wages, Working Hours, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2576 (ii).
Experimental Stations in P. E. I., Location of: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1391 (i).
Farm Products, &c.: in Com., 1256, 1260 (i).
Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
Kelly, Mr. John, Compensation for Slaughtered Animals: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Live Stock Products, Compensation *re* Slaughter of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on Conc., 7988 (iv).
Moore, Mr. W. W., Rep. *re* Packing Houses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 229 (i).
Poultry Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Discontinuation of Stations: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1139 (i).
P. E. I. Fruit Inspector, Applications *re:* Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
San José Scale, Suppression of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 2759 (ii).
Seeds Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1139 (i).
Thermograph Records, Ventilation, &c., on Steamships, Names, Dates of Sailing, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).
Tuberculosis Cattle from Nappan, N.S., Treatment of: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
Aids to Navigation on Pacific Coast, Rep. of Capt. Anderson: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 480 (i).
Alameda Land Office: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Alberta and Saskatchewan Representation Bill, Information *re* Census: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1471 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 1472 (i).
Alberta, Representation: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Alexandria Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4018 (iii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Algoma District, Indian Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 7283 (iv).
Algoma, Indian Lands, Sales, Terms and Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3371 (ii), 6015 (iv).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 3641 (ii).
Allandale Postmaster, Salary, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 2805 (ii).
Allegash River, Diversion of Water: Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 6635 (iv).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co. *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Alum Cake, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
American Bank Note Co., Payments to since 1897, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 885 (i).
American Silver exported by Banks, Commission paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 233 (i).
Amherst Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Analysts, Apptmnt. of: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Anderson and Kennedy Lakes, Clearing Outlets: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Animals, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1254 (i).
Animals for Breeding Purposes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4597 (iii).
Animals, Health of: in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Annapolis, Queen's Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6017 (iv).
Annual Drill, Restrictions *re* Leave of Absence: (Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4051 (iii).
Annual Drill; in Com. of Sup., 5735 (iii).
Annuity Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Anse à L'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6083 (iv).
Anse du Cap Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).
Ansley, Celina Kingan, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
Apples, Hay, Maple Syrup, &c., Total Exports for 1905-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 2581 (ii).
Apples, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1892 (i).
See 'Inspection Bills.'
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii).
Armstrong, Trooper, Compensation *re* Injuries at Laprairie Camp: Ques. (Mr. Hunt) 1050 (i).
Arsenal, Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Arthabaska Postmaster's Salary: Remarks (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6632 (iv).
Arthabaska Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii), 7810 (iv).
Arts, Agriculture, &c., on Conc., 7988 (iv).

Assets of Canada, Interest and Non-Interest bearing, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3882 (ii).
Ash Wednesday: M. for Adjournment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2728 (ii).
Associated Press Subsidy, Reps. in English Newspapers: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 3630 (ii).
Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Astronomical Surveys, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iv).
Athabaska Fish Co., Reps., Cor., Leases, Rentals, &c., with Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies*, 1066 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3844 (ii), 5864 (iii), 6259 (iv).
Athabasca Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Atlantic Fast SS. Subsidy: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7106 (iv).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2764 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Vol. i: Presented (Mr. Fielding 2480; 2727 (ii).
——— (Vol. ii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 4008 (iii).
——— (Vol. iii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1119 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 658, 703, 992, 1091, 1470 (i), 2069, 2344 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 514, 1044 (i), 1991, 3277 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (P.O. Dept. and N.W.M. Police): Presented (Mr. Fisher) 3546 (ii).
Australian and Canadian Export Trade, Applications *re* Subventions: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4271 (iii).
Australian and Canadian Tariff Preferences, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1699 (i).
Automobile Cars on Rivière Ouelle Branch I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3837 (ii).
Automobiles, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2398 (ii).
Axes, Scythes, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4418 (iii).
Aylmer, Mr. F. W., Apptmnt. as Engineer, Resignation, &c., Cor. *re:* M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 580 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iv).
Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 5859 (iii), 6009 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6136 (iv).
Babine Indians, Investigation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7286, 7293 (iv).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6019 (iv).
Baie St. Paul, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Bain, J. L. and Campbell, J. O., Apptmnt. as Scrutineers in Elections, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 236 (i).
Bain, Mr. John, Gratuity *re* Tariff Commission: in Com. of Sup., 5977 (iii).
Bait in Cold Storage Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 5910 (iii).
——— Statement: Read (Mr. Templeman) 5910 (iii).
Banff Park, Waterworks and Sewerage: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
Banks, Co-operative: *See* "B. No. 2".
Baptist Missionary Union: *See* 'B No. 105'.
Barachois de Malbaie Training Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Barges, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 35'.
Barley: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1362 (i).
Barrels, Legal Size, Recommendation of Dom. Horticultural Council: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
Batiscan River Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Battleford Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Baxter Island, No. 136, Sale to L. E. Embree, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2833 (ii).
Bay of Quinte Lights: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).
Bay St. Lawrence Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal, Charges *re* Investigation of 1906: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1389 (i).
——— South Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7668 (iv).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Valleyfield Banks: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal Water-Power, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk 1388 (i).
——— Lease, Guarantee *re* Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2999 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Rental or Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1118 (i).
——— O.C., *re* Alienation of: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 1473 (i).
Beaver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Beeswax: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1332 (i).
Beet Root Sugar Industry: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4153 (iii).
Beet Root Sugar: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4423 (iii).
Belle River Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Belle River Pier, P.E.I., Extension, &c., Rep. *re* Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 484 (i).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4018 (iii), 7820 (iv).

Belleville Armoury, Delays in Building: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1397 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Dredging, Contract *re* Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1398 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2288 (ii).
Belleville Harbour Revetment Wall, Contract *re*, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1398
——— Govt. Aid *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2632 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, and Civil Service Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2837 (ii).
——— Complaints *re*, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1989 (ii).
Bell Telephone Co., Investigation *re* Toronto Strike, Tel. from W. L. Mackenzie King: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 3276 (ii).
Bell Telephone Commission, Toronto *re* Labour Dept., Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
Benjamin, Mr. R. W., Compensation *re* Slaughter of Cow, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on Conc., 7988 (iv).
Berne Convention, Answer to Proclamation: Ques. (Mr. C. Devlin) 7700 (iv).
Berries: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1894 (i).
Bethany and Millbrook Post Office, Charges *re* Loss of Registered Letters: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ward) 1148 (i).
Bethany Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 723 (i).
——— Asst. Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 1147 (i).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6094 (iv).
Big Lorraine Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Bills, Royal Assent, 7993 (iv).
Bills, Royal Assent, Letter from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. Read (Mr. Speaker) 5176 (iii), 6518 (iv).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 5185 (iii), 6557 (iv).
Bills, Royal Assent: Mess. from His Ex. (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 2742 (ii).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)
1°*, 3 (i).

Bill (No. 2) Respecting Industrial and Co-operative Societies.—(Mr. Monk.)
1°, 89; 2°, 582; ref. to Sel. Com., 945 (i).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act, 1903. —(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°, 90; 2°, 594; in Com., 595; 3°*, 618 (i); Sen. Amts., 7012 (iv).

Bill (No. 4) In further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°, 91; on Order for 2°, 595; 2° m., 951; in Com., 961 (i).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°, 91; 2°, 595 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Maclean.)
1°, 274; 2°, 618 (i); M. for Com., 3674 (ii).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Act respecting the sale of Railway Passenger Tickets. —(Mr. Maclean.)
1°, 275; 2°, 961 (i).

Bill (No. 8) Respecting Patent of William A. Damen.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 707; in Com., 1750, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting a Patent of Edgar Webster Summers and Hadley Herbert Summers.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 707; in Com., and 3°*, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting a Patent of the George E. Smith Lumber Company.—(Mr. Parmelee.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 707; in Com., and 3°*, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 11) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Valley and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 708 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2452 (ii).

Bill (No. 12) To incorporate the Malone and Hopkins Point Railway Company. —(Mr. Walsh, Huntingdon.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 708 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting La Compagnie du chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord. —(Mr. Bureau.)
2°*, 708 (i); in Com., 2768; 3°*, 2769 (ii).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant.)
2°*, 708; in Com., and 3°*, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Joliette and Brandon Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)
2°*, 708 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 612 (i).

Bill (No. 17, from the Senate) To amend an Act respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada.—(Mr. Fisher.)
1°*, 657; 2°, 1552; in Com., and 3°*, 1553 (i).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)
1°*, 657 (i); 2°*, and ref. to Sel. Com., 4838 (iii).

Bill (No. 19, from the Senate) Respecting the Revised Statutes, 1906, and to provide for the French version thereof.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°*, 945; 2°, and in Com., 1502, 1510. 3° m., 1543; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) Neg. (Y. 31; N. 84) 1546 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 20) To encourage the Establishment of Cold Storage Warehouses for the Preservation of Perishable Food Products.—(Mr. Fisher.)

Res. prop., 515; M. for Com. on Res., 658; 1°* of B., 702 (i); 2°, 2416; in Com., 2449, 2460; 3°, 2476 (ii).

Bill (No. 21) To Consolidate and amend the Act respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°, 703 (i); 2° m., 4669; in Com., 4739, 4785, 4804, 4865 (iii).

Bill (No. 22, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, 803; 2°, 1092; in Com., 1094; 3°*, 1300 (i).

Bill (No. 23, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Treaty between Canada and Japan.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, 803; 2°, 1546; in Com., and 3°*, 1552 (i).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Parmelee.)

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1045 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 803; 2°, 1045 (i); in Com., 2110; ref. back to Ry. Com., 2525, 3172; 3°*, 3180 (ii).

Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Manufacturers Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Kemp).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1045 (i).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting La Banque Nationale.—(Mr. Lachance).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1045 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4008 (iii).

Bill (No. 28) To incorporate the Residential Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1046 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) To incorporate the National Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1046 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 30) To incorporate the Women's Art Association of Canada.—(Mr. Grant).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1046 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

Bill (No. 31) To incorporate the Northwestern Trusts Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Calgary).

1°*, 803; 2°*, 1046 (i); in Com., 4008; 3°*, 4008 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville.)

1°, 803 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill No. 33) To provide for the further supervision and inspection of Canned Food Products, Meats and Fish.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 523; in Com. on Res., 804; 1°* of B., 838; 2°, and in Com., 1300, 1615 (i), 1992; 3°*, 2229 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting Inland Navigation Companies.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny.)

1°, 884 (i).

Bill (No. 35) To provide for the Official Inspection of Barges.—(Mr. Laurence.)

1°, 1035 (i).

Bill (No. 36) To aid in the Prevention and Settlement of Strikes and Lockouts in Coal Mines, and Industries connected with Public Utilities.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 1036 (i); 2°m., 3002; in Com., 3278, 3802, 3844 (ii), 3978, 4458, 4616, 4772; 3°m., 4978; 3°*, 5015 (iii).

Bill (No. 37) Respecting the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., 2769; 3°*, 2769 (ii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. Thompson).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., 2769; 3°*, 2769 (ii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Derbyshire).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1329 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 42) To incorporate the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—(Mr. Lavergne, Drummond and Arthabaska).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Dominion Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall).

1°*, 1119; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford).

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Arthabaska Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona.)

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 46) To incorporate the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Bole).

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3587 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4976 (iii), 6204 (iv).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the London and St. Clair Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2109 (ii).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dugas).

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell, Glengarry.)

1°*, 1120; 2°*, 1330 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 50) To amend an Act to confirm an agreement entered into by Her late Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway System to the City of Montreal.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)

1°, 1120 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2476; 3°*, 2478 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) For the Representation in the House of Commons of the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°, 1120; 2°, 1614 (i); M. for Com., 5670; in Com., 5673 (iii), 6766; 3°*, 6766 (iv).

Bill (No. 52) To confirm certain Agreements between the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, and Richard B. Angus; and between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the British Columbia Electric Railway Company, Limited, the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company, Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, and Richard B. Angus.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4409 (iii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3587 (ii).

Bill (No 55) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Ratz.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Quinze and Blanche River Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., 2453 ; ref. back to Ry. Com., 2526; in Com., and 3°*, 3122 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4412 (iii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Perth.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2453 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) To incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo.)

1°*, 1293; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the Surveys of the Public Lands of the Dominion, and the Surveyors entitled to make such Surveys.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°*, 1293 (i); 2°, 3091; in Com., 3093, 3461; 3°*, 3464 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) To regulate the Exportation of Electric Power and certain Liquids and Gases.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)

1°*, 1293 (i); 2° and in Com., 2229 (ii); on Order for 3°, 4669; 3° m., 4946 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 61) To amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Lennox.)

1°, 1380 (i).

Bill (No. 62) To further amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Kennedy.)

1°, 1380 (i).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the Masonic Protective Association of Canada.—(Mr. Parmelee.)

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1798 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4008 (iii).

Bill (No. 64) To incorporate the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Thompson.)

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1798 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the Annuity Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1798 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 66) To incorporate the Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1879 (i); withdrawn, 3720 (ii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Vancouver and Coast - Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 1472; 2°*, 1798 (i).

Bill (No. 68) To establish the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Fund.—(Mr. Emmerson.)

Res. prop., 1297, 1473; in Com. on Res., 1500; 1°* of B., 1501 (i); 2°, and in Com., 2907, 2943; 3°*, 3002 (ii); Sen. Amts., 4865 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 69) Respecting the Quebec, Oriental Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)
1°*, 1553; 2°*, 1798 (i); in Com., 4969; 3°*, 4976 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6633 (iv).

Bill (No. 70) To amend the Supreme Court Act.—(Mr. Gervais.)
1°, 1608 (i).

Bill (No. 71) To incorporate the Burrard, Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 1794 (i); 2°*, 2109; in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee.)
1°*, 1794 (i); 2°*, 2110 (ii); in Com., 4410; in Com., and 3°*, 4557, 4850 (iii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting a Patent of the International Paper Company.—(Mr. Pardee.)
1°*, 1794 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 3763 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 1794 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 2768 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth)
1°, 1794 (i); 2°, and in Com., 7410; 3°, 7435 (iv).

Bill (No. 76) To amend the Northwest Territories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 1796 (i); 2°, and in Com., 2478; 3°*, 2479 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 1841 (i).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 1923 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Great West Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 1923 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 80) To incorporate the Prudential Savings Society.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 1923 (i); 2°*, 2110; in Com., and 3°*, 3588 (ii).

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 1923 (i); 2°*, 2138 (ii); on Order for Com., 4409; in Com., 4442, 4557; 3°*, 4558 (iii).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bureau.)
1°*, 1986; on Order for 2°, 2827; 2°*, 3122 (ii); on Order for Com., 4409; in Com., 4442; 3° m., 4794, 4844; in Com., 4844; 3°, 4844 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 83) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 1985 (ii).

Bill (No. 84) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—Mr. Porter.)
1°, 1985 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)
1°, 2068; 2°, and in Com., 3092; 3°*, 3091 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the National Transcontinental Railway.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 2137; 2°, and in Com., 2479; 3°*, 2479 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 2342 (ii).

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Railway Ferry Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)
1°*, 2415; 2°*, 2527 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4850 (iii).

Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2770 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 3122 (ii). in Com., 5204; ref. back to Sel. Com., 5205 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) Respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2770 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4850 (iii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Grand Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Oxford.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2943 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 93) To incorporate the Eastern Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2943 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5284 (iii).

Bill (No. 94) To incorporate the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2770 (ii); in Com., and 3°* 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 95) To incorporate the Yukon Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 2482; 2°*, 2770 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1907.—(Mr. Fielding.)
In Com. on Res., 2727; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 2727 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 97, from the Senate), To amend the Petroleum Bounty Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

1°*, 2728; 2°, 3890; in Com., 3890 (ii), 4656; 3°, 4657 (iii).

Bill (No. 98) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Macdonald.)

1°, 3424 (ii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting Proprietary and Patent Medicines.—(Mr. Templeman).

M. for Com. on Res., 3464; 1°* of B., 3465 (ii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Railway Act. —(Mr. Conmee).

1°, 3723 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) To amend the Criminal Code. —(Mr. Gervais.)

1°, 3725 (ii).

Bill (No. 102) To ratify an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia respecting the Western Boundary of the Railway Belt.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 3977; 2°, and in Com., 4655; 3°*, 4655 (iii).

Bill (No. 103, from the Senate) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 4045; 2°*, 4156; in Com., and 3°*, 4411 (iii).

Bill (No. 104, from the Senate) For the relief of Osprey George Valentine Spain.—(Mr. Campbell).

1°*, 4117; 2°*, 4413; in Com., and 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 105, from the Senate) To incorporate the United Baptist Woman's Missionary Union of the Maritime Provinces.—(Mr. Logan.)

1°* 4117; 2°*, 4413; in Com., and 3°*, 5590; Fees remitted, 5504 (iii).

Bill (No. 106, from the Senate) Respecting the Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada, and to change its name to the Royal Accident Company of Canada.—(Mr. Ames).

1°*, 4117; 2°*, 4413 (iii), in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 107, from the Senate) Respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)

1°*, 4117; 2°*, 4413; in Com., and 3°*, 4850 (iii).

Bill (No. 108) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 4209; 2°, and in Com., 4656; 3°*, 4656 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4440; 2°, 5016; in Com., 5016, 5674; 3°*, 5701 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) Respecting the Traders' Fire Insurance Company. —(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 4518; 2°*, 4850; in Com., 5285; ref. back to Sel. Com., 5285 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 111, from the Senate) Respecting the Inspection of Electricity.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 4610 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7030; 3°*, 7.52 (iv).

Bill (No. 112, from the Senate) Respecting the British American Assurance Company.—(Mr. Parmelee).

1°*, 4610; 2°*, 4850; in Com., and 3°*, 5284 (iii).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 4610 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7020; 3°*, 7030; Sen. Amts., 7839 (iv).

Bill (No. 114) To authorize the Exchange of certain Lands.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 4610; 2°, and in Com., 5701; 3°*, 5704 (iii).

Bill (No. 115, from the the Senate) To amalgamate the Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company and the Erie and Ontario Development Company, Limited, into one corporation, under the name of "The Jordan-Erie Power Company."—(Mr. Campbell).

1°*, 4664; 2°*, 4850 (iii); M. for Com., 7482, 7694; in Com., 7909; 3°*, 7911 (iv).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4664; 2°, and in Com., 5016; 3°*, 5016 (iii).

Bill (No. 117, from the Senate) For the relief of Celina Kingan Ansley.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 4771; 2°*, 4850; in Com., and 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 118, from the Senate) For the relief of George William Hadley.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 4771; 2°*, 4850; in Com., and 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate) To revive certain Patents of the Nichols Copper Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

1°*, 4927; M. for 2°, 4928; 2°*, 4977; in Com., 5589; 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate) To incorporate the Travellers' Indemnity Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 4927; 2°*, 4977; in Com., and 3°*, 5284 (iii).

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 4927; M. for 2°, 4928; 2°*, 4977 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 122, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turgeon.)
1°*, 4838; 2°*, 4977 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) Respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo.)
1°*, 4839; 2°*, 4977 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6010 (iv).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) Respecting the Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathona.)
1°*, 4839; 2°*, 4977 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6010 (iv).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Lake Superior Power Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 4839; M. for 2°, 4928; 2°*, 4977; in Com., and 3°*, 5590 (iii).

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To incorporate the Bonaventure and Gaspé Telephone Company, Limited.—(Mr. Marcil.)
1°*, 4928 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6010 (iv).

Bill (No. 127) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Templeman.)
1°, 4929 (iii); 2°*, 6259; in Com. 6260; 3°*, 6279 (iv).

Bill (No. 128) Respecting the Winnipeg Terminals of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Emmerson.)
1°, 4929; 2°, 5512; in Com., 5515; 3° m., 5670 (iii), 6259 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) To incorporate the Winnipeg and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney.)
1°*, 5084; 2°*, 5285 (iii); in Com., 6585. 3°*, 6585 (iv).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 5084; 2°*, 5285 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting the St. Mary River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 5084; M. for 2°, 5258; 2°*, 5441 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586; Sen. Amts., 7840 (iv).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 5084; 2°*, 5285 (iii); in Com. 6586; 3°°, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 5084; 2°*, 5285 (iii); in Com., 6585; 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 134) Respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. Fielding.)
Prop. Res., 4862; 1°, 5015; 2°, and in Com., 5510; in Com., 5562, 5590; 3° m., 5627; 3°*, 5643 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°, 5022; 2°, and in Com., 5704; 3°, 5717 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7544, 7578 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting the preservation of the Peace in the vicinity of Public Works.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°*, 5023 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7187; 3°*, 7189 (iv).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) To amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 5258 (iii); 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 6008; in Com., 7012; 3°*, 7014 (iv).

Bill (No. 138) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, York.)
1°*, 5175 (iii).

Bill (No. 139) To create a Department of Mines.—(Mr. Templeman.)
1°, 5258 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7189; in Com., 7212, 7213, 7252; 3°*, 7255 (iv).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate) To incorporate the St. Leon Railway Company.—(Mr. Finlayson.)
1°*, 5441; 2°*, 5590 (iii). in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 141) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding.)
M. for Com. on Res., 5395; in Com. on Res., 5397; 1° of B., 5397; 2°, 5561; in Com., 5561; 3°, 5561 (iii).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate) To incorporate the Abitibi and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)
1°*, 5504; 2°*, 5590 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°, 5504; 2°, and in Com., 5717; 3°*, 5721 (iii).

Bill (No. 144) To amend the Militia Pension Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)
Res. prop., 4612; in Com. on Res., 5643; 1°*, 2° of B., 5645; in Com., 5645; 3°*, 5646 (iii).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 5777; 2°, and in Com., 5778 (iii), 7014-15; 3°*, 7019 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) To make certain amendments to the Statute Law in its application to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°*, 5778 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7440; 2° and in Com., 7442, 7578; 3°, 7578 (iv).

Bill (No. 147) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 5778 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 7019; 3°*, 7020 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 148) To amend Schedule A to the Revised Statutes, 1906.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 5883; 2°, and in Com., 5884 (iii), 6766; 3*, 6770 (iv).

Bill (No. 149, from the Senate) To incorporate the Rock Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Parmelee.)
1°*, 6005; 2°*, 6205; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 150, from the Senate) To incorporate the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)
1°*, 6005; 2°*, 6205; in Com., and 3°*, 6586 (iv).

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) To incorporate the General Animals Insurance Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. Walsh, St. Ann's.)
1°*,6005: 2°*, 6205; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 152, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa Terminals Railway Company.—(Mr. Caldwell.)
1°*, 6005; M. for 2°, 6376; 2°*, 6587; in Com., 7203, 7311, 7483; 3°*, 7484 (iv).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) For the relief of Victor Harold Lyon.—(Mr. Wilson, Russell.)
1°*, 6005; 2°*, 6205; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona.)
1°*, 6376; 2°*, 6587; in Com., 7911; 3°*, 7912 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of Philp J. Green, Melvin Hunt and John D. McMurchy.—(Mr. Perley.)
1°*, 6135; 2°*, 6587; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°*, 6256; withdn., 7793 (iv).

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate), For the relief of Arthur Leon McPherson.—(Mr. Parmelee.)
1°*, 6256; M. for 2°, 6376; 2°*, 6587; in Com., and 3°*, 7203 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) Respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 6377; 2°*, 6587; in Com., 7484, 7912 (iv).

Bill (No. 159) To increase the Borrowing Powers of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°, 6518; 2°, and in Com., 7545; 3°*, 7569 (iv).

Bill (No. 160) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lanctot, Laprairie-Napierville.)
1°, 6518 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 161) To amend the Act of the present Session incorporating the Residential Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°*, 6519; 2°*, and in Com., 7014; 3°*, 7014 (iv).

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate), To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher.)
1°*, 6630; 2°, 6774; in Com., 6778; 3°*. 6781 (iv).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate) To incorporate the Prudential Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais.)
1°*, 6630; 2°*, 6836; in Com., 7312; 3°*, 7407 (iv).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) To incorporate the Fidelity Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Johnston.)
1°*, 6764; 2°*, 6836; in Com., 7312; 3°*, 7407 (iv).

Bill (No. 165) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson.)
In Com. on Res., 6781; 1°*, 6790; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 7517 (iv).

Bill (No. 166) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Fielding.)
Res. prop., 5781 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7054 1°* of B., 7091; 2°, and in Com., 7569; 3°*, 7575 (iv).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Port Arthur Power and Development Company.—(Mr. Conmee.)
1°*, 7123; 2° m., 7123; M. for 2°, 7482 (iv).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) Respecting the Erie-Ontario Power Company.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°*, 7213; M. for 2°, 7482 (iv.)

Bill (No. 169) To authorize a Loan to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding.)
Res. prop., 6906; in Com. on Res., 7230; 1°* of B., 7245; 2° m., 7939; in Com., 7955; 3°*, 7968 (iv).

Bill (No. 170) To amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°, 7246; 2°, and in Com., 7808 (iv).

Bill (No. 171) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
Res. prop., 6257; in Com. on Res., 7255; 1°*, 2°* of B., 7257; in Com., and 3°*, 7544 (iv).

Bill (No. 172) Respecting the Surveys of the Public Lands of the Dominion and the Surveyors entitled to make such Surveys.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 7308; 2°*, 7308; in Com., 7437; in Com., and 3°*, 7544 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 173) Respecting Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada (Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 4612, 5888 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7443, 7492; 1°* of B., 7514; 2° and in Com., 7515; 3°*, 7515 (iv).

Bill (No. 174) Respecting the manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada (Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 5887 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7515; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 7517; Sen. Amts., 7985 (iv).

Bill (No. 175) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.— (Mr. Fielding.)

1°, 7694; 2° m., 7694; in Com., and 3°*, 7696 (iv).

Bill (No. 176) To empower the Courts to declare certain marriages invalid.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)

1°, 7696; 2°*, and in Com., 7841 (iv).

Bill (No. 177) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)

Res. prop., 5781 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7781; 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 7792; 3°*, 7793 (iv).

Bill (No. 178) To authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 7126; in Com. on Res., 7799; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 7808 (iv).

Bill (No. 179) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the period of nine months ending the 31st March, 1907, and of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding.)

In Com. on Ways and Means, 7990; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 7993 (iv).

Binders for Harvesting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4427 (iii).

Binder Twine Manufacture: *See* 'B. No. 174.'

Binder Twine, Drawbacks *re* Duty, up to 1906: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1612 (i).

Binder Twine: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1208 (i), 4438 (iii).

——— Items dropped: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5777 (iii).

——— Machinery, Customs Valuation: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3629 (ii).

——— Materials: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2368 (ii).

——— Seizures, in 1906: Ques. (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 2140 (iii).

Biological Stations, Marine: in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).

Biscuits, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1865 (i).

Blackberries, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).

Blair, Mr. H. C., Emplmt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6014 (iv).

Blairmore Town Site, Patents cancelled, &c., Charges *re*: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lake) 6522, Neg. (Y. 27; N. 56) 6616 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 4615 (iii).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).

Blind River, Inspector of Weights and Measures, Apptmnt. of Asst. Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2292 (ii).

Blood and Piegan Indian Agencies, Purchase of Cattle, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1131 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Opening up for Sale: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).

Boer War Trophies, Distribution of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 474 (i).

Bonaventure and Gaspé Telephone Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'

Bone Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2983 (ii).

Bonuses, Immigration, British and Continental: in Com. of Sup., 7277 (iv).

Books: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).

Bookkeeping Reorganization: *See* 'Marine', &c.

Boots and Shoes and Tanners' Combine, Memorial to Tariff Commission: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4559 (iii).

Boots and Shoes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4558 (iii).

Boston, Robt., Apptmnt. as Inspector of Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2143 (ii).

Bounty on Binder Twine Manufacture: *See* 'B. No. 174'.

Bounties on Iron and Steel: *See* 'B. No. 173'.

Bourinot, John C., Emplymt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6013 (iv).

Bowmanville Poultry Station, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3369 (ii).

Bracebridge Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).

Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4035, 4599 (iii).

Brandon Post Office, Names of Employees, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2838 (ii).

——— Postmaster, Salary and Allowances, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1558 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).

Brantford Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 4599 (iii).

Brass Band Instruments: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).

Brass Bars, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2129 (ii).

Brass, Nickel, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4194 (iii).

Brass, Rolled, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Porter) 4554 (iii).
Breweries and Distilleries in Local Option Municipalities, Pet. *re* Prohibition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4452 (iii).
Brick, Mr. T. A., Emplymt. by Govt., *re* Census in Alberta: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1135 (i).
Bridging Material: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7523 (iv).
Brighton Postmaster, Vacancy, Cancellation of Appointments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3426 (ii).
Britannia Metal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4204 (iii).
British America Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 112'.
B.C. Appellate Court, Representations from Provincial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. D. Ross) 4945 (iii).
B.C. County Court Judge (salaries) Prop. Res. withdrawn (Mr. Aylesworth) 3841 (ii).
See 'Judges', &c.
B.C. Elections, and Election Money, Charges against Mr. D. Ross (Mr. Fowler) 3314 (ii).
B.C. Electric Co., &c., Agreements: *See* 'B. No. 52'.
B.C. Judges' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 177'.
B. C. Judgeships, Alleged Sale of, Reps. in Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 718 (i).
——— Statement *re* Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Aylesworth) 580; Members' remarks checked: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 580 (i).
British Columbia Mills, Timber and Trading Co., Applications *re* Cancellation of Leases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2145 (ii).
B.C. Railway Belt, Sales or Lease of Timber Lands from 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1149 (i).
British Glass Goods, Increase in Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1048 (i).
British Gum., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
British Periodicals, Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1134 (i).
British Preference Tariff: *See* 'Preferential Tariff'.
British Textile Goods, Total Increases in Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1047 (i).
Brockville Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 4020 (iii).
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39'.
Bronson and Ray Yukon Concessions, Transfer to Guggenheimers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3425 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Bronte Lighthouse, Allowance to Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
Bronze Works of Art: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4194 (ii).
Brooks, E. L. & Co., Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).
Brown, Beddingfield et al. Grazing Leases, O. Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).
Brunet, A., Remuneration *re* G.T.P. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
Brushes, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Buckingham Strike Riots: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bourassa) 240 (i).
Budget, The, (Financial Statement)—(Mr. Fielding) 278; Reply (Mr. Foster) 297 (Mr. Miller) 425; (Mr. Cockshutt) 441 (i).
See 'Financial Statement,' 'Tariff,' &c.
Budget Speech and Distribution of Pub. Accounts and Nav. Rets.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 92 (i).
——— Prop. Motion *re* Precedence in debate: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 237 (i).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
——— Generally, Clerks of Works, &c. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4043 (iii).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4035, 4599 (iii), 7822 (iv).
——— N.B., Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3974
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 4018, 4598 (iii).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup. 4009 (iii), 7820 (iv).
——— Sask., Alberta, and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii), 7823 (iv).
See 'Public Works'.
Burford Armoury, Contract *re* Coal Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1394 (i).
Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 71'.
Business of the House, Delays in Proceedings: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1110 (i).
——— Procedure: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3728 (ii).
Butter Production and Exportation, Total Cost of, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1145 (i).
Butter: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352 (i).
Button Blanks: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).
Cabinet Vacancy in N.B.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 6135 (iv).
See 'Hyman', 'London Election', 'Railways Minister of'.
Calcium Carbide, Purchase from Ottawa Carbide Co., Rates, Freight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 720 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 103'.
Calgary Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4036 (iii).
Campbelll, Mr. Narcisse, Application *re* Farm Crossing, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meigs) 565 (i).
Campbellton Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).
Canada and Australia SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7121 (iv).
Canada Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
'Canada,' Cruiser, Design *re* Flag: in Com. of Sup., 5972 (iii).
Canada and Mexico SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Canadian Sealers, Imprisoned at Montevideo, Representations *re:* Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1381 (i).
——— Release of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 229 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 108 & 175.'
Canada and South Africa SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Canada-United States Boundary Surveys, Extent, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1610 (i).
Canada and U. S. Negotiations by Mr. Bryce, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5508 (iii).
Canada and U. S. Treaty Commission, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 6258 (iv).
Canadian Cattle Embargo, Cor. with G. B. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1055 (i).
Canadian Coasting Trade, Countries admitted to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3369 (ii).
See 'Can. Mercantile Coasting,' &c.
Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 5908 (iii).
Canadian Fisheries, Licenses to Americans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1670, 1699 (i).
——— O.C., quoted by Member: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1856 (i).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Canadian Fog Signal Co, Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).
Canadian Mercantile Marine, Condition of, Vessels registered in Canada,&c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2146 (ii).
Canadian Naval Reserve, Establishment of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2147 (ii).
Canada Newspaper Syndicate, Tariff *re* Matrices, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).
See 'Matrices,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7807 (iv).

Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Can. Northern Quebec Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Can. Northern Winnipeg Terminals: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
Canadian Northern Ry., Land Reserve, Selection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6010 (iv).
——— Land Grants, Subsidies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2584 (ii).
C. P. R. and B. C. Electric Co., &c.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
C. P. R., Coal Lands, Selected by Govt., Conditions of Sale of Coal to Public: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3883 (ii).
——— Crow's Nest Line, Agreement *re* Carriage of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4666 (iii).
——— Gagetown Branch Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv).
——— Land Taxation, Appeals to Judicial Com. of Privy Council: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3368 (ii), 4665 (iii).
——— Mail Contracts, Landing at Halifax, N.S., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Stockton) 491 (i).
——— Subways at Calgary, Order from Ry. Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2289 (ii).
Can. Treaty with Japan: *See* 'B. No. 23.'
CANALS:
Beauharnois, Charges *re*, Investigation of 1906: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1389 (i).
——— South Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7668 (iv).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Valleyfield Banks: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
——— Valleyfield, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7668 (iv).
Beauharnois Water-Power, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1388 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Rental or Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1118 (i).
——— O.C., *re* Alienation of: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 1473 (i).
——— Power Lease, Guarantee *re* Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2999 (ii).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 7530, 7534 (iv).
——— Expenditure for 1907-8, Total Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 567 (i).
——— Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
Chambly, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— St. John's Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— St. John's Conduit: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*
Cornwall, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 5552 (iii).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Galops Canal, Final Estimate: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
——— Gilbert Settlement: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Retaining Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Upper Entrance Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal, Interim Rep., Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 230 (i).
——— Rep. of Speech by P. M. G., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 571 (i).
——— Surveys: Inquiry for (Mr. White) 3547 (ii).
Lachine, Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
Murray, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Quebec Canals, Purchase of Cement: in Com. of Sup., 5551 (iii).
Rideau, Mr. J. O'Toole's Claim: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Reserve at Jones' Falls, Lease of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6903 (iv).
——— Letters from farmers in district: Read (Mr. Taylor) 6912 (iv).
——— Tug-boat: in Com. of Sup., 7669 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Soulanges, Cascade Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Clement's Gully Bridge, Soulanges Canal: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Electric Staff Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7535, 7666 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Lockmen: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Manny's Gate Bars: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Water Powers, Leases, Transfers, &c., by Govt., Contracts, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 241 (i).
Trent, Coboconk to Gull River Waterways, Construction of Canal: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 493 (i).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7667 (iv).
——— Curtis Bros., Claims, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Lake Simcoe Section, ref. to on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Waterways (Mr. Bennett) 497 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent, McLaren's Creek Road: in Com. of Sup., 7669 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 468 (i).
——— Outlet, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Ward) 3627 (ii).
——— Rice Lake Section, Reps., &c.: M. (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1929 (i).
——— Severn Route, Par in Toronto 'Globe' Remarks (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4839 (iii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 713 (i).
——— Tow Boat: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Water Powers leased, owned, by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 565 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 802 (i).
Welland: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Port Colborne Improvements, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 484 (i).
——— Port Maitland Wall: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Water Power, Amount contracted for by Cataract Power Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1923 (i).
Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector and Customs Collector: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii).
Canned Food Products: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Cannington Postmaster, Retirement of Mr. Talbot: M. for Cor. (Mr. S. Hughes) 501 (i).
Cant Dogs: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4430 (iii).
Cap à la Roche, Plant. in Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
Cape Tormentine and Summerside Mail Contracts, Termination of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 573 (i).
Caraquet Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6074 (iv).
Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Carpets purchased, I.C.R., Canadian-made or Foreign, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3637 (ii).
——— Tenders *re:* Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3633 (ii).
Carroll, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Casket Trimmings, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4432 (iii).
Cattle, Contagious Diseases, Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) in Conc., 7989 (iv).
Cattle Insurance: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Cattle Tuberculosis, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7990 (iv).
See 'Animals,' &c.

Caustic Soda: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4552 (iii).
Cements, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
Census Forms distributed to Manufacturers, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4217 (iii).
Census of Man. and Sask. and Alberta: Rep. Presented (Mr. Fisher) 2727 (ii).
Census Population of N.W.T., Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 514 (i).
Census Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 2962 (ii), 7810 (iv).
Central Can. Mfrs. Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Central Counties Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Central Experimental Farm, Stock, Implements, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 3189 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Central Ontario Ry. Subsidy (Bancroft to C. A. Ry. near Whitney): in Com. on Res., 7802 (iv).
Centreville, N. B., Customs Collectorship Vacancy: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
Centreville, Ont., Postmaster, Absence of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
——— Removal from Belleville: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 7781 (iv).
Cereals, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1853 (i).
Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Chains, Sprockets and Coils: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Chambly Canal, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— St. John's Conduit: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iv).
Champlain Market Property and G. T. P. Station Building, Cor., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 276 (i).
See 'G. T. P.,' &c.
Champlain Memorial: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
Chapais, Mr. J. C., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 5504 (iii).
Charbonneau, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Charges against Conservative Members by Mr. Emmerson: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5666 (iii).
See 'Insurance Commission.'
Charing Cross Station, Closing of by Michigan Central Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 1107 (i).
Charlesville Breakwater, Reps. and Papers *re* Building: M. for Copies* (Mr. Blain) 2840
Charlo's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Charlottetown Accommodation, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
Charlottetown Exhibition, Amount contributed: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1393 (i).
Chartered Bank Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7780 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6095 (iv).
Chatham Armoury, Moneys due Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) 4020 (iii).
Chaudière Junction Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1133 (i).
Cheese Arbitrations, Apptmnt. of Official Arbitrator at Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 1612 (i).
Cheese Curing Buildings, Location, Cost, Amount of Transportation Charges, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1148 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 947 (i).
Cheese for Exportation or Consumption in Can., Total Product, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1143 (i).
Cheese Hauling to Curing Rooms, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4211 (iii).
Cheese, in Com. on Ways and Means, 1333 (i).
Chicago Drainage Canal, Diversion of Water from St. Lawrence Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 2577 (ii).
Chicory: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1360 (i).
Chicoutimi Pier Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6096 (iv).
Chinese Immigration: in Com. of Sup., 6903 (iv).
Chinese Immigration into B.C., Memorial *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7095 (iv).
Chockfish River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6075 (iv).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 991, 1077 (i).
Church Army and Immigration: *See* 'Immigration from Eastern Canada.'
Church Point Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Cigarettes, Sale and Manufacture of, Prohibition, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 4053; Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4083; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4085; Amt. (Mr. Barker) 4087: Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 4088 (iii).
——— Legislation *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1801 (i).
Civil Servants, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7686 (iv).
Civil Service Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Civil Service Commission, Apptmnt. of: Remarks on M. to dschg. Civil Service Bill, 7793 (iv).

Civil Service Commission, Names, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 7686.
Civil Service at Ottawa, Salaries, Wages, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2839 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2140, 2289, 2634 (ii).
Clam Point, Cape Sable Island Canal, Access to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3188 (ii).
——— Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2836 (ii).
Clarke City, Marconi Station: in Com. of Sup., 5875 (iii).
Clement's Gully Bridge, Soulanges Canal: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
Clements, Judge, Promotion to Supreme Court, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1056 (i).
Clifton (Stonehaven) Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
Coal in Com. on Ways and Means, 2397 (ii).
Coal, Bituminous, for Smelting Purposes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4434 (iii).
Coal Lands, Leases, Sales, &c., Areas, Dates of Purchases: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 4053 (iii).
Coal Lands in Western Provs., Control and Regulation by Govt. *re* preventing Strikes: Prop. Res. (Mr. Herron) 743; Amt. (Mr. Knowles) 766; Agreed to (Y. 80; N. 39) 800 (i).
Coal Mining Rights, Application of Mr. C. F. Caldwell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 486 (i).
Coal from Canadian Mines, Quantity transported in British or Foreign Vessels, to Montreal Port: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1388 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Govtl. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 8 (i).
——— Additional Information: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 7693 (iv).
——— Further Information: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7518, 7985 (iv).
——— Investigation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7309 (iv).
——— Location of Dep Min. of Labour: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 423 (i).
——— Meeting of Dep. Min. of Labour and Mr. Mitchell, Ques. (Mr. Monk) 488 (i).
——— Press Reports and Jurisdiction of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 219 (i).
——— Ref. to in Debate (Mr. Lake) 162 (i).
——— Shortage of Fuel: Remarks: M. (Mr. Bole) ta adjn. Hse., 7131 (iv).
——— Taber Mines, Cor. *re*: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 6144 (iv).
——— Tel. from Blairmore *re* Settlement: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7092 (iv).
——— Tel. from Calgary Board of Trade: Read (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 6908 (iv).
——— from C.P.R., &c.: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 424 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Tel. from Dep. Min. of Labour: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 514 (i).
——— Tel. from Mr. King: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 7543, 7838, 7871 (iv).
——— Terms of Settlement: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 616 (i).
——— statement *re:* (Mr. Lemieux) 174 (i).
——— information *re* settlement: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 276 (i).
——— inquiry *re* settlement (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).
Coal Strike in N.W.: *See* 'Crow's Nest, &c.,' 'Fuel Famine.'
Coal Supply, I.C.R., Reps. and Complaints, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Parker) 1810 (i).
Coal Supplies for Sorel, Form of Tenders, Procedure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 721 (i).
Coasting Trade, Canadian Legislation *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques, (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1051 (i).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1445 (i).
See 'Can. Coasting..
Coboconk to Gull River Waterways, Construction of Canal: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 493 (i).
Cobourg, Car Ferry to Charlotte: *See* 'Port Hope,' &c.
Cocoa Nibs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1359 (i).
Cochrane, Mr. E., late M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4367 (iii).
Colborne Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Cold Storage and Cool Curing Plants, Disposal of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 710 (i).
Cold Storage for Fishing Bait: in Com. of Sup., 5910 (iii).
Cold Storage Shipments *re* Atlantic Service, Five Years Past: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).
Cold Storage System for Transportation of Food Products, on M. for Sup., 5122 (iii).
Cold Storage *re* Trans-Atlantic SS, Regulations *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 3189 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses: in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Cold Storage Warehouses: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2143 (ii).
Collars, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Production of Papers at Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 3000 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston), Reference to Proceedings before Pub. Accts. (Mr. Bennett) 5843 (iii).
——— Sittings *re:* M. (Mr. Finlayson) to conc., 3840 (ii).

Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B No. 150.'
Colonial Conference, Absence of Prime Minister, Rumours *re*: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 5260 (iii), 6280 (iv).
——— Canadian Representatives, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 891 (i).
——— Cor. with Mr. Deakin or Sir Jos. Ward, *re* Imperial Council: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5525 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3001 (ii).
——— Provisions for Expenditure *re* Ministers: in Com. of Sup., 7982 (iv).
——— Subjects to be discussed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2634 (ii).
See 'Tariff,' 'Preferential,' &c.
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trusts Funds: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Ways and Means, 4543 (iii).
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Combines: *See* 'Lumber Combine.'
Commercial Agencies for 1905-6, Names of Agents, Salaries, Locations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 241 (i).
Commercial Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1127 (i).
Commercial Travellers Tax, Agreement with Provincial Premiers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4213 (iii).
Commercial Treaties: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
Committees: Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
——— Lists presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 558 (i).
——— M. to add Name (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4440 (iii).
Committees, Standing Orders, 4th Rep.: Presented (Mr. A. A. Wright) 2286 (ii).
——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. A. A. Wright) 2414 (ii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Condensed Milk: in Com., 1361 (i).
Confectionery Sugar, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).
Congdon, Mr. F., Inquiry for Rep. *re* Investigation into Charges, &c.: (Mr. Foster) 6765 (iv).
Connaught, Prince Arthur's Visit: *See* 'Royal Visit.'
Contractors' Deposits, Amounts paid in to Receiver Gen., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1564 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1386 (i).
Contracts let by Govt. to Ottawa Contractors: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
Cooke, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4858 (iii).
Co-operative Societies: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Copper Cliff Post Office, Instructions to P.O. Inspector, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 4458 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges against Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4049 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6697 (iv).
Copper purchased for the Militia, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3883 (ii).
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Cordage Co., Amount of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4047 (iii).
Cordage Lines, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).
Corks, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2136 (ii).
Cornwall Canal, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 5552 (iii).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Cotton Fabrics: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2347 (ii).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater: in Com., of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Crawford Bay and St. Marys Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Cream Separators: Remarks in Com., 1190 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. Bill (Mr. Gervais) M. to Introduce, 1608 (i).
——— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1608 (i).
Criminal Code Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Criminal Code Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Criminal Code (exclusive contract) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Criminal Code (offences) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Criminal Code (peace on Public Works) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4856 (iii).
Crossings of Railways at Level: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
Cross Point Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
——— Purchase of Lumber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Crow's Nest Coal, Assurance fo Govt. *re*: Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6905 (iv).
Crows Nest Pass Coal Strikes and Labour Bill: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6006 (iv).
See 'Coal,' &c.
Crucibles: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4190 (iii).
Culloden Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6023 (iv).
Curling Stones, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).
Curry, Mr. S. G., Payments as Architect *re* Toronto Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).

Customs Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 134, 'B. No. 165.' *See* 'Tariff.'

CUSTOMS :

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, for 1905-6: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 569 (i).

——— Total Value of Exports, 1894-6: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1553 (i).

Apples, Hay, Maple Syrup, &c., Total Exports for 1905-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 2581 (ii).

Australian and Canadian Tariff Preferences, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).

Blair, Mr. H. C., Emplymnt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6014 (iv).

British Glass Goods, Increase in Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1048 (i).

British Textile Goods, Total Increases in Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1047 (i).

Centreville, N.B.. Customs Collectorship Vacancy: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).

Customs Commission, Charges *re* Sending Official Fyles out of Canada (Mr. A. Johnston) 5721 (iii).

Customs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2765 (ii).

Customs Duties collected at Sydney, N.S., Sault Ste. Marie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1926 (i).

Emerson Customs Collector, &c. : Ques. (Mr. W. J Roche) 1562 (i)

Exports from Canadian Ports, Total Value for 1906: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3883 (ii).

Farm and Garden Products, Quantity entered at Sault Ste. Marie: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 483 (i).

Farming Implements, Total Amount of Duty collected for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 948, 1067 (i).

Farm Wagons, Duty, &c. collected *re* Dumping Clause: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2138 (ii).

Germany, Export Trade with Canada during years, 1900-6, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1124 (i).

Goods, Dutiable, Imported Free, Rebates, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 727 (i).

Horses imported, Minimum Tariff Value : Ques. (Mr. Elson) 1055 (i).

Importations from United Kingdom, Names of Ports for 1904-5-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 569 (i).

Imports via. Canadian Ports, Value for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 5085 (iii).

Knitted Goods, Value of Importations from Germany and G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 724 (i).

McCormick & Deering Harvesters, Customs Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 566 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Outside Ports, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).

Pig Iron imported from U.S., Names of, Ports of Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 708 (i).

Port Stanley, Customs Collections for 1900-6: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 1558 (i).

Pulp Wood, Cut and Made in Canada, Export Duty *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 888 (i).

Stoves imported from Western Canada, Number and Value of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2293 (ii).

Sugar Duties, above No. 16 Dutch Standard, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1049 (i).

Sugar Duties, Total Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1049 (i).

Sugar Imports from Fiji Islands, Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4455 (iii).

Sugar imported, Name of Countries, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 568 (i).

Sussex, N.B., Customs Port: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).

Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 423 (i).

See main heading.

Threshers, Total Value of Importations: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3635 (ii).

Timber and Lumber Importations free of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 570 (i).

Wilson, Mr. Wm., Emplmt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6013 (iv).

Wood, Dr. H. W., Transfer from St. Johns Customs Collectorship, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3636 (ii).

Wool Duties imposed in 1897, Quantities imported, Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1125 (i).

Cutlery and Foreign Goods, Surtax and British Preference: Par. in 'Citizen' (Mr. Armstrong) 4842 (iii).

Dalhousie Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).

Damen, Wm. A., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 8'.

Dates, Figs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).

Dauphin Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).

Dayley, Mr. R., Emplymt. by Govt., &c., Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1988 (ii).

Debates Committee, Meetings and Recommendations : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7008 (iv).

Debates of the House, French Translation Delay: Remarks (Mr. Beauparlant) 3543 (ii).

Debates, Officials, Reporting Staff and Translators' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).

Deep Sea Missions, Grant to Dr. Grenfell: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 5882

Demurrage on Cars: *See* 'B. No. 160'.
Denatured Alcohol, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2045 (ii).
Denaturated Alcohol, Manufacture of, &c., Legislation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 1956 (i).
——— Quantity made and sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1121 (i).
——— Ref. to in debate on Budget (Mr. Fielding) 304 (i).
Desks, Furniture, Purchases by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
Desks bought for House of Commons, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 4053 (iii).
Detroit River Tunnel: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Diamond Dust, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2130 (ii).
Digby Harbour Improvements, Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6024 (iv).
Dillinger, Mr., Investigation *re* Car Shortage: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7252, 7310 (iv).
Dion, Ulric, Emplymt. by Govt: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5904 (iii).
Disinfectants, Non-Alcoholic Liquids: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4185 (iii).
Disraeli Wharf: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7827 (iv).
Divorce of Celina Kingan Ansley: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Divorce of George William Hadley: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Divorce of Victor Harold Lyon: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Divorce of Arthur Leon MacPherson: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Divorce of O. G. V. Spain: *See* B. No. 104.'
Dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 490 (i).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Dogfish Extermination Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
Dolsen's Burying Ground, Cost of Protection Banks: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4456 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. to Canning Wharf, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.
Dom. Central Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
Dominion Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt.: *See* B. 'No. 16.'
Dom. Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Dom. Lands Bill, Legislation this Session: Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5864 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Homestead Inspectors, &c., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
Dom. Lands, in Man. &c., Sales for 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 1978 (i).
Dom. Lands Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).
See 'Interior,' 'Surveys,' &c.
Dom. Notes printed in French: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6015 (iv).
Dom. Police, Commissioner's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 1119 (i).
——— Retiring Allowances to A. McCuaig: in Com. of Sup., 6900 (iv).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6762 (iv).
Dom. Public Lands: *See* 'B. Nos. 21 and 59.'
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Completion of Survey: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 5024 (iii).
Dorchester Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6097 (iv).
Doukhobors, Alleged Importation of as Contract Labourers, Rep. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 888 (i).
Doukhobor Colonies in Sask., Cor., Papers, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Cash) 4458 (iii).
——— Dom. Lands Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5780 (iii).
——— Rep. of Mr. C. W. Speers *re* Inspection of: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 2146 (ii).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Draper, Mr. P. M., Apptmnt. in Printing Bureau: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6635 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 7247 (iv).
Drawbars on Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Drawbacks on Implements, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4423 (iii).
Dredging, Mar. Provinces: in Com. of Sup., 7000 (iv).
See 'Public Works.'
Drugs, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Drummond Branch, Outlay at Mitchell and St. Leonard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5086 (iii).
Drummond Counties Ry. Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
Drummondville Improvements, I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1133 (i).
Dubé, R. B., Dismissal of, from 'La Canadienne,' Reps. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 1978 (i).
Dufferin Rifles, Delay in Payments to Men: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 4045 (iii).
Dullman, Nolan and Walsh, Convicts in Kingston Penitentiary, Clemency *re*: Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 2577 (ii).
Dumping Clause: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1000; Amts. in Com., 1186 (i).
See 'Tariff.'
Dunnville Drill Hall, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 474 (i).

Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5177 (iii).
Eastern Can. Mfrs.' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
Eastern Township Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Eastern Townships, Public Works, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret* (Mr. Armstrong) 2838 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2581 (ii).
——— Post Offices, Applications for, Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2580 (ii).
Eclipse Furniture Co., Purchases from: in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii).
Edmonton Coal Strike: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6761 (iv).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B.C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Edmonton Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 4036 (iii).
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7805 (iv).
Elections Act: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Election Act, Amt. *re* Corruption and Frauds: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6791, Amt. neg. (Y. 44; N. 88) 6898 (iv).
Election Acts Amts.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2637 (ii).
Election Irregularities: *See* 'Queen's and Shelburne.'
Election of New Members, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Election Oaths, Form, &c., London Election Trial, on M. for Sup., (Mr. Barker) 7872 (iv).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Electric Bulbs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4192 (iii).
Electricity, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Electric Light Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
Electric Power Regulation: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Elgin Road Station, I.C.R., Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 718 (i).
Emerson, Customs Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1562 (i).
Emigration to Canada, Fraudulent Representations in G.B., Cor. with Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 3373 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
Emmerson:, Mr.: *See* 'Railways, Minister of.'
Employees in Interior Dept. in N.W. Ter., Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1804 (i).
'Empress of Britain' Arrival at Halifax, Montreal and St. John, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Roche) 950 (i).
'Empress of Ireland,' Delays in Canadian Fast Mails, *re* Halifax Route: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1059 (i).
Engineers of Steamboats: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Erie, Ontario Power Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 115 &
Escoumains Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6098 (iv).
Eskasoni Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Esquimalt Military Station, Establishment of Schools of Instruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3370 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
Estimates, 1907-8: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 278 (i).
——— Suppl. (1907): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5643 (iii).
——— Suppl. (1908): Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7213 (iv).
——— Further Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7837 (iv).
Exchange of Certain Lands: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Exchequer Court Act (registrar's salary) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Exchequer Court, Apptmnt. of French Judge: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3185 (ii).
Excise: in Com. of Sup., 6626, 7294 (iv).
——— Allowances to B.C. Officials: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
——— Duty, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1252 (i).
Exhibitions, Dublin and Milan: in Com. of Sup., 6900 (iv).
Exhibitions, General Vote: in Com. of Sup., 7818 (iv).
Exhibitions at Toronto and Sherbrooke, Conflicts of Dates, &c: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2589 (ii).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7810 (iv).
——— Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4044 (iii).
——— Electric Ry. Track: in Com. of Sup., 7818 (iv).
——— Labourers Wages, Working Hours, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2576 (ii).
See 'Central Canada,' &c.
Experimental Stations in P.E.I., Location of: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1391 (i).
Exports from Canadian Ports, Total Value for 1906: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3883 (ii).
Export of Electric Power, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Express Companies, Control of by Ry. Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 473 (i).
——— Revision of Rates: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 5861 (iii).
Famine in Coal in N.W.: *See* 'Coal Strike.'
Farm and Garden Products, Quantity entered at Sault Ste. Marie: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 483 (i).

Farming Implements, Total amount of Duty collected for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 948 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Henderson) 1067 (i).
Farm Products, &c.: in Com. 1256, 1260 (i). *See* 'Agriculture.'
Farm Wagons, Duty, &c., collected *re* Dumping Clause: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2138 (ii).
Father Point Wharf and Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6099 (iv).
'Favoured Nations' Treaties, between Can. and Foreign Countries, Names, &c., Commercial Arrangements with Italy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1123 (i).
Fellows of Hickory, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 1190 (i).
Fencing of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Fidelity Life Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
'Fielding, W. S.', Dredge, Construction and Cost of Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3187 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure at Pictou Harbour, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1798 (i).
Financial Situation—Public Expenditure, Criticism *re*: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7851, Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 7870 (iv).

FINANCE:
American Bank Note Co., Payments to since 1897, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 885 (i).
American Silver exported by Banks, Commission paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 233 (i).
Assets of Canada, Interest and non-interest bearing, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3882 (ii).
Chartered Bank Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7780 (iv).
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trusts Funds: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Ways and Means, 4543 (iii).
Contractors' Deposits, Amounts paid in to Receiver-Gen., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1564 (i).
Estimates, 1907-8: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 278 (i).
Finance, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7690 (iv).
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4211 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 4458 (iii).
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 6378, 7409 (iv).
Insurance (Fire) Cos., Chartered within five years, Capital subscribed, Location of Head Office, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 240 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govert., Amounts collected, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 503 (i).
Public Accounts Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 219 (i).
Temporary Loans since 1st Jan., 1906, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 234 (i).
Yukon Banks, Commission paid to Canadian Bank of Commerce: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4272 (iii).
Fire Brick: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4190 (iii).
Fire caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Fire Damage Claims, P.E.I. Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 7665 (iv).
Fish, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 33.'

FISHERIES:
Athabasca Fish Co., Reps., Cor., Leases, Rentals, &c., with Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies*, 1066 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 5864 (iii), 6259 (iv).
Bait in Cold Storage Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 5910; Statement: Read (Mr. Templeman) 5910 (iii).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 5908 (iii).
Dog Fish, Extermination Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
Fish Breeding, Amounts expended *re* Propagation: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1929 (i).
Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 5892 (iii).
Fish Curing Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 5923 (iii).
Fisheries Commission, Expenses, Messrs. Birnie and Noble, Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5941 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 723 (i).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Protection and Preservation, Expenditure of Moneys, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Copp) 277 (i).
Fishery Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5970 (iii).
Fish, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1919 (i).
Fishing Seasons in Ont., Special Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1928 (i).
Fish Transportation, I.C.R., Quantity and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4850 (iii).
Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).
Herring Nets *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).
Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5890 iii).
Jurisdiction of Provinces: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).
Lake Winnipeg, Fishing Restriction *re*, Cor. with Board of Trade, Winnipeg: M. for Copy* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1067 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lake Superior Fishing Grounds, Depletion of by American Fishermen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4049 (iii).
Lobster Hatchery at Egmont Bay, Application for: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 724 (i).
Meaford Fish Hatchery: Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5895 (iii).
Modus Vivendi and American Fishermen: Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1379 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1670, 1699 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1049 (i).
——— O.C., quoted by Member: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1856 (i).
North Saskatchewan Lakes, Concessions granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1394 (i).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
Poaching in Lake Superior, Patrol *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3372 (ii).
P. E. I. Fisheries, Negotiations with Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3883 (ii).
Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 5905, 5960 (iii).
Quahaug Fishing Regulations in P. E. I., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1143 (i).
Quinté Bass Pond, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3185, 3426 (ii).
Reduction Works, Experiments *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Sinclair) 802 (i).
St. Charles de Caplin Refrigerator Association, Rep. *re* Bait Freezing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6904 (iv).
Transhipment on Western Coast, O.C.: Inquiry for: (Mr. Foster) 3001 (ii).
Transportation and Conservation Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).
Wiarton Fish Hatchery: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).
Flax Seed: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1348 (i), 4143 (iii).
Floor Oil used in Govt. Buildings, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5024 (iii).
Florists' Stock: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1868 (i), 4148, 4421 (iii).
Food Products and Cold Storage: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Foreign Goods and British Preference, German Surtax, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4842 (iii).
See 'German,' 'Preferential,' &c.
Forestry Branch, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 7265 (iv).
Fraser River Improvements of Ship Channel and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Fredericton to Woodstock, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7806 (iv).
Freight Tariff Rates, Local and General, upon Canadian and Foreign Products: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 724 (i).
Freight Rates, I.C.R., Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Lévis, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 728 (i).
French Clergymen expelled from France: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) *re* Immigration Policy, 6150 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Paquet) on M. for Sup., 6379 (iv).
——— Par. in 'Le Canada': Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 7092 (iv).
——— Par. in Press *re* Criticisms: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6766 (iv).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6654; Reply, 6673 (iv).
French Immigration to Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1141 (i).
French Language, Use of in Coinage and Postal Notes: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3641 (ii).
French Language on Stamps, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6012, 6015 (iv).
French Language, *re* Time Tables of I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6014 (iv).
French Tariff: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) in Com., 1252 (i).
Fruit and Cold Storage: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Fruit Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Fruit, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1903 (i).
Fruits and Vegetables, Canned, Importation and Exportation, Quantities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 492 (i).
Fuel Famine in N. W.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Burrows) *re* Rep. in 'Telegram,' 2824 (ii).
See 'Coal,' &c.
Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
Fur Skins: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Galena Oil Co., Contracts *re* Oil Supplies to Govt. Rys.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Barker) 712 (i).
Galops Canal, Final Estimate: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
——— Gilbert Settlement: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Retaining Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Upper Entrance Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
Galt Post Office Building, Total Expenditure, Cost, Supervision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 719, 1124 (i).
Galvanized Iron: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).

'Galveston,' Dredge, Date of Purchase, Cost of Transference, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 574 (i).
Galway Horse and Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by H. P. Brown, &c., O.Cs., Leases and Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
Garden Indian Reserve, Representations *re* Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2830 (ii).
Garden Seeds: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4145, 4389 (iii).
Gas Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6627 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Campbellton SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7120 (iv).
General Animals Ins. Co. of Can., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Geological Specimens, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
Geological Survey, Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii).
See 'Mines Bill.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Interim Rep., Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 230 (i).
——— Rep. of Speech by P. M. G., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 571 (i).
——— Surveys: Inquiry for (Mr. White) 3547 (ii).
Georgian Bay Islands in Baxter Townships, Sale of, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Wm. Wright) 492 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. W. S. Pratt: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2833 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
German and Canadian Tariffs, Cor. between Govt. of Can. and German or British Govts.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1149 (i).
——— Cor. with J. B. Jackson: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 5863 (iii).
Germany Export Trade with Canada, during years 1900-6, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1124 (i).
German Maximum Tariff, Fiscal Relations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1128 (i).
German Silver: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4389 (iii).
German Silver, Nickel, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4204 (iii).
German Surtax: *See* 'Preferential Tariff,' &c.
German Treaties, and Tariff, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 845 (i).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5084 (iii).
Giant's Tomb Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Gibson Creek, P.E.I., Water Pipe Laying, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2575 (ii).
Gibson, N.B., Water Tank, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2983 (ii).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
Glass, Raw, &c., for Plate Glass: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4435 (iii).
Glassware, Cut, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4193 (iii).
'Globe' Newspaper Reports: Ques. of Order (Mr. Ward) 3278 (ii).
Gloves, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Glucose, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4181 (iii).
Glue, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2118 (ii).
Glycerine, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iv).
Gold and Silver Coins: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2130 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
'Golspie' or 'Osceola,' Str., Name of Port of Entry: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).
——— Total Amounts paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4048 (iii).
——— Wreck of, Investigation *re:* Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1097 (i), 2346 (ii).
Goods, Dutiable, Imported Free, Rebates, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 727 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 2763 (ii), 7685 (iv).
Govt. Bills, Distribution to Members, &c.: Remarks (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1092 (i).
Govt. Business, Bills wthdrn.: Statement (Mr. Fielding) 7438 (iv).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 2728 (ii).
——— Precedence on Mondays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4274 (iii).
See 'Business,' &c.
Govt. Deposits in Banks, Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4211 (iii).
——— M. for Ret* (Mr. Armstrong) 4458 (iii).
Govt. Dredging, for 1901-6, Names of Harbours, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Sinclair) 2584 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Meeting of Obligations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 6378, 7409 (iv).
See 'Loans.'
Govt. Land, Section 14, Twp. 24, &c., Application for Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1810 (i).
See 'Dom. Lands,' 'Interior,' &c.
Govt. Officials and Political Interference: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 6664, 6677; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 70) 6705 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Political Interference, Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* French Clergy, 6664, 6683 (iv).
Govtl. Printing, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4851 (iii).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Govt. Steamgers, Expenditure *re:* Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5961 (iii).
——— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5766
——— Repairs and Expenditure, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5946 (iii).
Gowan, Sir James, Resignation from Senate: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 3626 (ii).
Grain exported from Can. and U. S. Ports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 475 (i).
Grain Shipments to Montreal for Lake Ports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 570 (i).
Grain Standards, Evidence before Com., Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 231 (i).
Grain Trade Commission, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7983 (iv).
Grain in unbroken Bulk received at Montreal from Lake Ports, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1046 (i).
Grand Etang Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iv).
Grand Forks Cattle Co., Lands withdrawn for Watering of Stock, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 948 (i).
G.T.Ry., Accounts furnished to Inspector General: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 5027 (iii).
——— Car Ferry: *See* 'Port Hope', &c.
——— Collision at Richmond, Trial of Atkinson, Rep. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 2839 (ii).
——— Madoc-Eldorado Extension, Pet. to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 614 (i).
——— Payments to by Govt., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 1470 (i).
——— 2-cent a Mile Rate: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Ways and Means, 4371 (iii).
——— Use of Rolling Stock of G.T.P.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5656 (iii).
G.T.R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82'.
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:
Advertisement for Tenders in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3183 (ii).
Cars, Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5024 (iii).
See 'G.T.R.' &c.
Coal Lands Pre-emption, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 6256 (iv).
Commission, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 715, 885 (i).
Commissioners' Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 7010 (iv).
——— Delay in Presenting: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1045 (i).
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Contracts for Construction: Rumours *re* Signing: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3727 (ii).
Contracts *re* Steam Shovels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3182 (ii).
Contract *re* Ties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396, 1559 (i).
District 'F', Construction Contract, Specifications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Guarantee Bonds, Total Amount of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3635 (ii).
Investigation *re* Payments on Construction: Amt. (Mr. Barker) to M. to Conc. in Rep. of Public Accounts Com., 5027, 5086; Debate resumed, 5091 (iii).
Land Grant, B.C. Indian Reserve: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2069 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1792 (i).
Lands purchased at Moncton: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1130 (i).
La Tuque Branch, Construction Contract, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1068 (i).
Location of Line between Quebec and Edmonton and Lake Pohenegamook, Reps. Plans, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 240 (i).
Medical Health Officers, Apptmnt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 2633 (ii).
N.B. Section, Proposed Routes, Resurveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 469 (i).
Number of Miles constructed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5505 (iii).
Payette, Mr. Philias, Emplymnt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2984 (ii).
Quebec-Moncton Section, Progress of Work, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 468 (i).
Quebec-Moncton Section, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Crocket) 263 (i).
Quebec Station Site, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Copies, 1938 (i).
——— Purchase of Champlain Market Property: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 276 (i).
Route from Chipman to Grand Falls, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2837, 2980 (ii).
Route through N.B., Rep. of Commissioners: Inquiry for (Mr. O. S. Crocket) 7010 (iv).
——— Reps. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 4118 (iii).
Route from Quebec Bridge, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Morin) 1978 (i).
Route from Quebec to Lake Pohenegamook, Total Length and Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 3886 (ii).
Steel Rails, Tenders called for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7006 (iv).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Surveys and Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iv).
Surveys and Construction, N.B. Route: in Com. of Sup., 7670 (iv).
Surveys, Moncton Route, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 3117 (ii).
Surveys, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1394 (i).
Tax Exemption in N.W. Provs., Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1611 (i).
Total Yardage, Winnipeg Div., Govt. Policy *re* Labour, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tisdale) 1799 (i).
Western Division, Amounts expended, Verification of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4053 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3634 (ii).
Winnipeg Terminals: *See* 'B. No. 128'.
Granger, Mr. Magloire, Emplymt. as Civil Servant: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5288 (iii).
Grand Manan Life Saving Station, Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) 936 (i).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (iv).
Grande Riviere de Beaupre Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (iv).
Grand Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 92'.
Granite Ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Gratuities *re* Immigration to Mr. Young: in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).
Grazing Leases, Clause *re* 15 per cent over-due Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1557 (i).
Grazing Lease granted to J. R. Craig, Date of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1806 (i).
Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co.: Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3465; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 80) 3542 (ii).
Grazing Leases granted by Govt. of Twps. 32, 33, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 484 (i).
Grazing Leases granted to Messrs. Hitchcock and McGregor, Transfer to Grand Forks Cattle Co., Q.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
Grazing Leases, Sask., Original Applicants, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1061 (i).
——— Applications for Leases, 1905: M. for Copies* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1978 (i).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Union of the Empire: prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2585, 2840; wthdrwn., 2901 (ii).
G.B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7106 (iv).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Claims *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 3591 (ii).
——— Expenditure at Port Arthur and Fort William: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
Great Northern Ry and Mr. J. J. Hill, Insinuations *re* 'Journal' Rep.: Personal Explanation (Mr. D. Ross) 3457 (ii).
Great Salmon River Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Great West Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Greece's Point Wharf, Number of Steamers landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2574 (ii).
Green, Philip J., et al, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Grenfell, Lady Victoria, Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2480 (ii).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Building: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (iii).
——— Quarantine Station Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).
Grosse Isle Yacht, Tenders *re* Gasolene Engine: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 4046 (iii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4020 (iii).
Gunning Cove Wharf, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2837 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Gypsum, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).
Hadley, George William, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Half-breed Scrip, Apptmnt. of Commissioner for 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 4456 (iii).
Half-breed Scrip issued in 1906, Number and Name of Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 4456 (iii).
Halifax Barracks, Coal supplied, Quantity and Rate per Ton: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 713 (i).
Halifax Drill Hall Property: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1699 (i).
Halifax Election Protests: Personal Explanation (Mr. Wm. Roche) 7095 (iv).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 894, 1057 (i).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Halifax Naval Dockyards, Relinquishment of, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. C. Macdonnell) 241 (i).
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
Halifax, St. Johns, Newfoundland and Liverpool Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
Hall's Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6042 (iv).
Hall, Mr. Z., Postmaster at Hampton, N.S., Corrupt Practices *re* Elections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 231 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6257 (iv).
——— Penalties *re* N.S. Election Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1062 (i).

Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (iii).
Hamilton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
Hamilton Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Hampton, Postmaster, Mr. Z. Hall, Corrupt Practices *re* Elections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 231 (i).
See 'Hall,' &c.
Hansard, French Edition, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 582; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 582 (i).
See 'Debates of the Hse.'
Harbour au Bouche Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 486 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Public Works, for 1897-1906, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 2839 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6991, 7833 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6073, 7824 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6017 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 6932, 7833 (iv).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii), 6083 (iv).
Hay, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1867 (i).
Hay Permits in Prince Albert District, Conditions *re*: Ques.. (Mr. Bourassa) 7541 (iv).
——— Additional Answer (Mr. Oliver) 7701 (iv).
Hay Shipments, Claims for Refunds, by P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4854 (iii).
Henderson, Alex., Resignation as Judge in B.C. Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2145 (ii).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2147 (ii).
Henderson, Mr. J. B., Apptmnt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
Henderson, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3640 (ii).
Hepburn, Mr. W. H., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1558 (i).
Hepburn, W. H. Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1558 (i).
Heraldic Collection of Can., Item in 'Le Canada' *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1057 (i).
Herring Nets *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).
Higgin's Shore Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
High Commissioner's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii), 7692 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, I.C.R., Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 614 (i).
Hindoos, Arrival and Deportation from B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 234 (i).
Homestead Duties, N.W. Quarter-Section 22. Entries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 1924 (i).
Homestead Entries, issued on Quarter-Sections 20, &c: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4851 (iii).
——— Section 24, Twp. 21, Extension, &c. *re* Patents: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2141 (ii).
——— Township 51, Alberta, Action *re* Applications for: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).
——— Unpatented in Alameda, Battleford, &c., Inspectors *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2146 (ii).
Homestead Inspectors, Instructions *re* Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) [illegible] (iv).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
Homestead Rights on Quarter-Section 12, Twp. 30, Name of First Applicant, Date of Entry, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. S. Hughes) 802 (i).
Hope Island Lighthouse Reserve, Sale of Timber, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 490 (i).
Hops: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1360 (i).
Horses, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2414 (ii).
Horses imported, Minimum Tariff Value: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 1055 (i).
Horse Power Machines: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4419, 4549 (iii).
Hot Spring Reservation, Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7273 (iv).
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Ash Wednesday: M. for Adjournment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2728 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 991, 1077 (i).
Desks bought for House of Commons, Number, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Bergeron) 4053 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 4841 (iii).
Debates, Official, Staff and Translators' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5177 (iii).
Election of New Members, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
House of Commons, Additions to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 3608 (ii).
——— Employees, Salaries, Duties, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Bergeron) 2584 (ii).
——— Envelopes furnished to Members: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6900 (iv).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

House of Commons, Postal Facilities *re* Special Stamps and Postal Orders: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 1378 (i).

——— Post Office, Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

——— Legality of Form: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).

——— Resignation: Notification (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2728 (ii).

——— Warrant of Supersedeas *re* Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3276 (ii).

——— Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 7246 (iv).

See 'London.'

Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex. presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).

L'Assomption Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5022 (iii).

London Election Investigation, Govt. Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 225 (i).

London Electoral District, Resignation of Hon. C. S. Hyman: Remarks *re* Form (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

——— Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2943 (ii).

See 'Hyman, Hon. C. S.'

London, East Elgin and N. Bruce Elections for 1905-6, Forms of Writs, &c., issued: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 803 (i).

Montreal (St. Antoine) Electoral District, Pet. *re:* Notification (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 1470 (i).

Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5553 (iii).

Nicolet Vacancy: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 513 (i).

——— Issue of Writ (Mr. Speaker) 515 (i).

——— Certificate of Election, 1380 (i).

Papers taken from Members' Desks in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).

Porch in Entrance: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4604 (iii).

Private Bills, Rule respecting Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 717 (i).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7983 (iv).

——— Mess. from His Ex., 7993 (iv).

Queen's and Shelburne Election Petition, Rep. of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs., Amt. to B. N. A. Act: Prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2147 (ii).

Richelieu Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5083 (iii).

St. Mary's Electoral Division, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 468 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Saturday Sittings: M. (Mr. Fielding) 7125 (iv).

Three Rivers Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3101 (ii).

——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4044 (iii).

Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2977 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 582 (i).

——— Statement *re* Information asked: (Mr. Fisher) 617 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3605 (ii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (iii).

Voters' Lists, Printing and Distribution of: in Com. of Sup., 6763 (iv).

Whip's Rooms, H. of C., Better Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) on Conc., 7987 (iv).

Hudson Bay Co.'s Original Colony Register 'A,' Disappearance of: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 5287 (iii).

——— Recovery of: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 7540 (iv).

Hudson Bay Co.'s Pension Claims, Ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1141 (i), 6011 (iv).

Hudson Bay, Deep Water Harbour, Govt. Action *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2574 (ii).

Hudson Bay, Railway to, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3548 (ii).

Hull Wharf, Number of Steamers using in 1906: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2139 (ii).

Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).

Huron and Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'

Hutchinson, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).

Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cancellation by Govt., Cor. between Five Corporations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1119 (i).

Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cor. *re* Cancellation: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1068 (i).

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii).

——— Survey Steamer, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5879 (iii).

——— Survey Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 7685 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of: Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 7246 (iv).

——— Cor., &c.: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2735 (ii).

——— Original Letter and Witnesses: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3104 (ii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier *re* Resignation: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3627 (ii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Legality of Form: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).
——— Resignation as Minister of Pub. Works, and Status as Member of House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 839 (i).
——— Resignation as Minister and Member for London: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1796 (i).
——— M.(Mr. R. L. Borden) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 3170 (ii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i); (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2728 (ii).
——— Resignation of Portfolio of Public Works: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 92 (i).
——— Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4759 (iii).
——— Second Resignation: Remarks (Mr R. L. Borden) 6790; Tel. read (Mr. Fielding) 6790 (iv).
——— Warrant of Supersedeas *re* Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3276 (ii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Resignation of, Further Information *re:* Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 581, 1184, 1472 (i), 5086, 5560 (iii).
——— Resignation of, Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 514 (i).
See 'London Election Trial', &c.
Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'

IMMIGRATION:

Agents, Apptmnt. in Eastern Townships, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1142 (i).
Agents, Belgium, Number, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1805 (i).
Agents, Circulars issued *re* Bonuses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 478 (i).
Agents, Dismissal and Suspensions, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 714 (i).
Agents in Germany, Number and Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1988 (ii).
Agents in G.B., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).
——— Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1127 (i).
Agents, Messrs. Ward, Johnston, &c., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5655 (iii).
Agents in Ont., Number and Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 713 (i).
Agents in Quebec: Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).
Bonuses to Booking Agents: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 4615 (iii).
Bonuses to SS. Booking Agents, Par. in Montreal 'Star': Remarks (Mr. Lavergne) 4519 (iii).
Bonuses, Amounts paid to Agents for 1904-5-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1123 (i).
Boston, Robt., Apptmnt. as Inspector of Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2143 (ii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

B.C. Immigration Legislation, Assent to by Lt. Gov.: Remarks (Mr A. Lavergne) 7985 (iv).
British and Continental Bonuses: in Com. of Sup., 7277 (iv).
Chinese Immigration: in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
Chinese Immigration into B.C., Memorial *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7095 (iv).
Circulars issued *re* Bonuses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 478 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 580 (i).
Distribution Agents in Ont., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).
Doukhobors, Alleged Importation of as Contract Labourers, Rep. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 888 (i).
——— Dom. Lands Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5780 (iii).
Doukhobor Colonies, Rep. of Mr. C. W. Speers, *re* Inspection of: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 2146 (ii).
Doukhobor Colonies in Sask., Cor., Papers, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Cash) 4458 (iii).
Employment Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 4861 (iii).
Fraudulent Representations *re* Emigration to Canada in G. B., Cor. with Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 3373 (ii).
French Clergymen expelled from France: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne *re* Immigration Policy, 6150 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Paquet) on M. for Sup., 6379 (iv).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 6654; Reply, 6673 (iv).
——— Par. in Press *re* Criticisms: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6766 (iv).
——— Par. in 'Le Canada': Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 7092 (iv).
French Immigration to Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1141, 1556 (i).
——— Policy of Govt. *re*: Amt. (Mr. A. Lavergne) on M. for Sup., 6145. 6156 (iv).
Gratuities *re* Immigration, to Mr. Young: in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).
Henderson, Mr. J. B., Apptmnt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
Hindoos, Arrival and Deportation from B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 234 (i).
Homestead Entries unpatented in Alameda, Battleford, &c., Inspectors *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2146 (ii).
Homestead Duties, N.W. Quarter-Section 22: Entries, &c: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 1924 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Homestead Inspectors, Instructions *re* Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6245 (iv).

Homestead Inspectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).

Homestead Rights on Quarter-Section 12, Twp. 30, Name of First Applicant, Date of Entry, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 802 (i).

Immigration: in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).

Immigrants to Canada from 1901 to 1903, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1382 (i).

Immigrants entering Canadian Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Parent) 2633 (ii).

Immigrants, Number of Arrivals, 1906, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 571 (i).

Immigrants promoted in Militia Force, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Parent) 3189 (ii).

Immigrants, Total Number since 1904, Distribution , &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1053 (i).

Immigration, Deportation of, Expenditure *re:* in Com. of Sup., 7278 (iv).

Immigration to the Eastern Townships, Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1395 (i), 2579 (ii).

Immigration from Eastern Canada to N.W.: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) in Com. of Sup., 6725, 6729, 6737 (iv).

Immigration, Fuel, Provisions, &c. *re* Freight Blockade: in Com. of Sup., 7278 (iv).

Immigration, Promotion in Mar. Provs., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 716 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wilmot) in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).

Leopold, Mr. Louis, Rep. *re* Canadian Manufacturers' Association and Immigration of Skilled Labour: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4217 (iii).

New Ottawa, Sask., Lands held without performing Settlement Duties: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1046 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Additional Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1928 (i).

——— Audit of Books: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3884 (ii).

——— Claims, Amounts paid by Govt., Cor. *re*: M. for Ret., (Mr. Monk) 1068 (i).

——— Homestead Entries, Number of Immigrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 1147 (i).

——— Moneys paid to 1st Nov. 1906, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 239 (i).

——— Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse.: Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5788, 5835; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 99) 5857 (iii).

——— Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 5502 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6751 (iv).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Railway Fares to Northwest, Rate to Immigrants from Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).

Repatriation of Canadians, Agents' Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1058 (i).

St. Pierre and Miquelon Immigrants, Arrival of : Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4855 (iii).

Salvation Army Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 6749 (iv).

——— Circulars *re* : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 4453 (iii).

Settlement Duties in New Ottawa, Sask.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 236 (i).

Statement of Mr. Southworth: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 4661, 4667 (iii).

Walker, Mr. Bruce, Rep. *re* Remarks to Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 3630 (ii).

Imperial Council in G.B. for Colonies, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' *re* Cor. between Sir Wilfrid and Australian Premier: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 4667 (iii).

See 'Colonial Conference', &c.

Importations from United Kingdom, Names of Ports for 1904-5-6, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 569 (i).

Imports via Canadian Ports, Value for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 5085 (iii).

Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).

Indeterminate Sentences: *See* 'Probationary'.

Indian Corn : in Com. on Ways and Means, 1362 (i).

Indian River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40'.

INDIANS :

Agents and Teachers, Average Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3629 (ii).

Algoma, Land Sales of Indian Reserves, Terms and Conditions *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3371 (ii), 6015 (iv).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3373 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 7283 (iv).

Babine Indians, Investigation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7286, 7293 (iv).

Blood and Piegan Agencies, Purchase of Cattle, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1131 (i).

——— Opening up for Sale: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).

Crooked Lake Reserve, Sale of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4856 (iii).

Doncaster Reserve, Completion of Survey : Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 5024 (iii).

Garden Indian Reserve, Representations *re* Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2830 (ii).

Georgian Bay Indian Islands, Sale of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).

INDIANS—*Con.*

Giant's Tomb Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).

Half-Breed Scrip, Apptmnt. of Commissioner for 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 4456 (iii).

Homestead Entries, Issued on Quarter-Sections 20, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4851 (iii).

Hot Spring Reservation, Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7273 (iv).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2957 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 1699 (i), 2415 (ii).

Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).

——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv).

——— Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).

Lands, Nipissing District, Open for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7247 (iv).

Lands sold or leased, Number of Acres, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 492 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2835, 2980 (ii).

Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).

Metlakatla Reserve, Agreement with B.C., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2295 (ii).

Mississaguas Claims, Settlement of: in Com. of Sup., 7292 (iv).

Muscowequan Indian Boarding School, Govt. Grants, Treaty, Money, Names, Ages, &c. of Pupils: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 1068 (i).

Nipissing Reserve, Application for Water Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2144 (ii).

——— Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2832 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2585 (ii).

Oka Indians, Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).

Reserves, Maintenance of Roads and Bridges: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).

Schools at Fort Alexander, &c., Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4209 (iii).

Schools for Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).

Schools, Qualifications of Teachers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2582 (ii).

Seed Grain to Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).

Six Nation Reserve Schools, Change in Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 478 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).

Songhees Indian Reserves, Negotiations for, Instructions, &c. to Mr. Pedley *re* Investigation: M. for Papers* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*

Superintendent, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv).

Swan Lake Reserve, Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 946 (i).

Timber Limits, Indian Reserves, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).

Yukon, Indians, Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv).

Indiantown and Blackville Branch, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).

Industrial and Co-operative Societies Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7308 (iv).

See 'Co-operative'.

Industrial Schools for Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).

Inland Navigation Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'

INLAND REVENUE:

Blind River, Inspector of Weights and Measures, Apptmnt. of Asst. Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Br. Boyce) 2292 (ii).

Denatured Alcohol, Manufacture of, &c., Legislation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 1956 (i).

——— Quantity made and sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1121* (i).

——— Ref. to in debate on Budget (Mr. Fielding) 304 (i).

See 'Spirits.'

Excise: in Com. of Sup., 6626, 7294 (iv).

——— Allowance to B.C. Officials: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 1092 (i).

——— Dep. Collectors, Classification, Number, &c. employed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk 946 (i).

Spirits, Customs and Excise Duty in Can. and U.S.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1057 (i).

Spirits in Bond, Two-year Maturing, Amt. *re* Application and Consolidated Revenue Act of 1882, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Robitaille) 802 (i).

Spirits, Denatured for Power Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 223 (i).

Standard Chemical Co., O.C.'s, &c. with Govt.: M. for Copies (Mr. Robitaille) 725 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Change in Excise Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5861 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 6140 (iv).

Total Amount collected for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1612 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
Tobacco Manufacturers in Canada, Duties *re* Foreign Products: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1924 (i).
Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Amount imported from U.S., 1906: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 2141 (ii).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Weights and Measures, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 219 (i).
——— Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Wood Alcohol: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Inspection of Barges: *See* 'B. No. 35.
Inspection of Canned Food Products, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 33,' 'B. No. 20.'
Inspection of Electricity: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Inspection of Foods: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
Inspection and Sale Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 84, 162.'

INSURANCE COMMISSION, THE:
Bill, Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7251 (iv).
Charges against Cabinet Ministers: Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5397; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) ref. to previous debate, 5400; Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 5426; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5426 (iii).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5657; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5657; Ruling, 5665; Agreed to (Y. 104; N. 37) 5665 (iii); Debate resmd., 6379; Charges against Members *re* Investment Moneys (Mr. M. Martin) 6399; Ques. of Order (Mr. Aylesworth) 6400: Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 6400; M. (Mr. Foster) that words be taken down, 6402; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 6404 (iv).
Charges by Mr. Foster: Notice of Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 5509 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) to Com. for Ways and Means, 4378 (iii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Bourassa) 4771 (iii).
Cor. with Min. of Justice and Commissioners: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 3399,3903 (ii).
Cor. with Messrs. Shepley and Tilley *re* Methods of Investigation, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 241 (i).
Distribution of Printed Copies: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3844 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3889 (ii).
Evidence *re* Printing and Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr Foster) 93 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Porter) 2906 (ii).
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
——— Printing of: M. on 3rd Rep. of Printing Com. to consider, 5176 (iii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Fielding) 3881 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2997 (ii).

INSURANCE COMMISSION, THE—*Con.*
Evidence, French Translation and Printing: M. (Mr. Parmelee) to conc. in amended Rep. of Printing Com., 7124 (iv).
Evidence and Report laid on Table: M. to print, &c. (Mr. Fielding) 3722-3 (ii).
Evidence, Translation and Printing: on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Printing Com., 7001 (iv).
Exhibits, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4441; 4615 (iii).
French Translation: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7984 (iv).
Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4118 (iii).
Inquiry for further Cor., not in Return: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2345 (ii).
Mr. Shepley's Retainer: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3639 (ii).
M. for Senate Papers: M. (Mr. Fielding) 5258 (iii).
Notice of Discussion (Mr. Foster) 5859 (iii).
Remuneration to Mr. Shepley: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3631 (ii).
Rep.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 6913; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 92) 6931 (iv).
Report, in Com. of Sup.: Statement (Mr. Foster) 6280 (iv).
——— Remarks *re* Rep. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 992 (i).
Rep., Inquiry for (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2769 (ii), 4091 (iii).
Total Cost, Communications between Min. of Jus. and Counsel *re* Information supplied: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4214 (iii).
Insurance (Fire) Cos., Chartered within five years, Capital subscribed, Location of Head Office, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 240 (i).
I.C.R., Extension to Montreal: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
——— (fires, &c.): *See* 'B. No. 98.'
——— Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 68.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accidents and Compensation *re* Injured: Ques. (Mr. Laurence) 1055 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Laurence) 3396 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion *re* Question (Mr. Laurence): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1077 (i).
Amherst Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for Sup., 5177 (iii.)
——— Reply (Mr. Haggart) 5227 (iii).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Automobile Cars on Rivière Ouelle Branch: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3837 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7523 (iv).
——— Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 1469 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Carpets purchased, Canadian-made or Foreign, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3637 (ii).

——— Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3633 (ii).

Cars, &c., Exchanges with U. S. Rys., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 2578 (ii).

Cars used in U. S., Return of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7007, 7248 (iv).

Chaudière Junction Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1133 (i).

Coal Supply, Reps. and Complaints *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1810 (i).

Drawbars on Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).

Drummondville Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1133 (i).

Drummond Branch, Outlay at Mitchell and St. Leonard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5086 (iii).

Elgin Road Station, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 718 (i).

Facilities and Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).

Fire Damages, Claims at Manseau and Lemieux: Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 3632 (ii).

Fish Transportation, Quantity and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4850 (iii).

Freight Rates, Comparative Statement from Truro, Moncton and Lévis, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 728 (i).

French Language, *re* Time Tables of Rys.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6014 (iv).

Galena Oil Co., Contracts *re* Oil Supplies to Govt. Rys.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i)

——— Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 712 (i).

Gibson, N.B., Water Tank, Construction of, &c.; Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2983 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Chief Accountant, Apptmnt., Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 722 (i).

Halifax, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).

——— Purchase of Property at Halifax, O.C., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 241 (i).

——— Roundhouse, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 485 (i).

——— Roundhouse and Machine Shops at Halifax, Purchase of Property, &c., O.C.'s, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 241 (i).

Indiantown and Blackville Branch: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).

I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7297 (iv).

I.C.R. and Dom. Atlantic Ry., Windsor Branch Lease by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 615, 1141 (i).

I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Rentals, Betterments, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7009 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

I.C.R. and G.T.R., Running Rights, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2835 (ii).

McDougall and Bruce, Emplymt by Govt.; Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 711 (i).

McPhee Automatic Signalling Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2835 (ii).

Mail Service to Halifax and St. John: Remarks on M. to adjn., 2205 (ii).

Maintenance and Operation: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).

Matthews, Mr. John, Passenger Agent, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6904 (iv).

Midnight Train between Montreal and Lévis, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 3180 (ii).

Moncton, Car Shops and Land Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 7301, 7521 (iv).

——— Lands acquired by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3885 (ii).

——— M. for Reps.* (Mr. Ames) 1148 (i).

——— Purchase of Land at Moncton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1131 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2586 (ii).

Motor Cars, Investigation and Rep. of Mr. Joughins: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 722 (i).

Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Newcastle Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iv).

New Glasgow Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).

Officials, Alleged Misconduct, Rep. *re* Investigations: M. for Copy (Mr. Barker) 725 (i).

O'Rourke, Mr. John, Charges *re* Stolen Postage Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3181, 3425 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1130 (i).

Passenger Service from Nicolet: Ques. (Mr. C. Devlin) 3632 (ii).

Passenger Tariff in 1904, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1118 (i).

Passenger Tariffs from Truro, Moncton and Lévis: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 729 (i).

Pass issued to Sir Wm. Mulock, Use of by Strangers: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 712 (i).

Payments to Geo. Cochrane, *re* Supplies: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 725 (i).

Pensions to Employees, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1469 (i).

Pictou, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

——— Roundhouse, Dimensions, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 4854 (iii).

——— Station, Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4857 (iii).

Positions created, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1054 (i).

Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 7664 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Record Foundry Co., Purchases of Scrap Iron, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 802 (i).

Running Rights, &c., Proposals *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5780 (iii).

Rivière du Loup Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1132 (i).

Ste. Flavie Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1132 (i).

St. John, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).

Ste. Perpetue Station, Duties of Agent: Ques. (Mr. C. Devlin) 2344 (ii).

Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7522 (iv).

Ste. Rosalie Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1134 (i).

Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Safety Valve Co., Adoption of Patent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 2834 (ii).

Scrap Iron, Sale of to H. J. Garson, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3839 (ii).

Scrap Metal at Moncton Fire, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3838 (ii).

Servis Tie Plate Co., Amounts paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2835 (ii).

Stellarton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Sydney Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Train Service at Rimouski, Complaints *re* Delay in Mails, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 615 (i).

Truro, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).

——— Purchase of Land from H. W. Yuill, O.Cs., Valuation, Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 241 (i).

Wallberg, E. A., Contracts *re* Govt. Rys.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1051 (i).

Wallace Quarries Ballasting, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2839 (ii).

Intercolonial Conference, Imperial Defence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3182 (ii)

——— Printing of Ret.: M. (Mr. Foster) 3277 (ii).

See 'Colonial Conference.'

INTERIOR:

Brown, Beddingfield et al., Grazing Leases, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).

Employees in Interior Dept. in N.W. Ter., Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1804 (i).

Galway Horse and Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by H. P. Brown, &c., O.Cs., Leases and Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Govt. Land, Section 14, Twp. 24, &c.: Application for Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1810 (i).

Grand Forks Cattle Co., Lands withdrawn for Watering Stock, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 948 (i).

Grazing Lands in Sask., Applications for Leases, 1905: M. for Copies* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1978 (i).

Grazing Leases, Clause *re* 15 per cent overdue Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1557 (i).

Grazing Leases (closed) to Galway Horse and Cattle Co.: Amt. (Mr. Herron) to Com. of Sup., 3465; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 80) 3542 (ii).

Grazing Leases granted by Govt. of Twps. 32, 33, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 484 (i).

Grazing Lease granted to J. R. Craig, Date of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1806 (i).

Grazing Leases granted to Messrs. Hitchcock and McGregor, Transfer to Grand Forks Cattle Co., O.C.s., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).

Grazing Leases, Sask. Original Applicants, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1061 (i).

Homestead Entries, Sections 24, Twp. 21, Extension, &c., *re* Patents: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2141 (ii).

Homestead Entries of Township 51, Alberta, Action *re* Applications for: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).

Hydraulic Mining Leases, Cor. *re* Cancellation: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1068 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2957 (ii).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 1119 (i)

——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 992 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 174, 658 (i).

Irrigation Applications, Assignments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1806 (i).

Land Patents for Sections 3, 5, 7 and 13, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4857 (iii).

Land and Sub-Land Agents, Homestead Inspectors, &c., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 231 (i).

Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7274 (iv).

McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. in Interior Dept.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).

Milk River Cattle Co. Transfer of Grazing Leases by E. C. Hall &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i)

Peace River District, B. C., Selection and Location of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2633 (ii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Public Lands or Public Domains, Sale or Grant of to others than Settlers, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Instruction to Agents *re* Entries: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 223 (i).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Application for Lands, &c., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
——— Application by C.P.R. for Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1138 (i).
——— Application of E. H. Cuthbertson and G. T. Robbins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).
——— Constitution of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1139 (i).
——— Date of Authorization, Plans filed, Water Rights, Constitution of Incorporated Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1060 (i) .
——— Grants of Lands, &c., in Alberta, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
——— Plans, Open for Examination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).
——— Sale of Land to, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i)
——— J. Stewart's Rep. *re* Character of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2143 (ii).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co. and Section 2 of Twp. 25, Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 485 (i).
——— Date of Homestead Entries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2139 (ii).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers of Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 5287 (iii).
Southern Alberta Land Co. and Robbins Irrigation Co.: Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2491 (ii)
Swamp Lands, Man., Lease to Hon. Mr. Kirchhoffer: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1842 (i).
——— Leases to Sporting Clubs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Shaffner) 1388 (i).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Schaffner) 1564 (i).
Timber Lands sold or leased subsequent to 1906, Description, Area, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4458 (iii).
Townships 10, 11, 12 and 13. Topographical Surveys, &c.: Rets. M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 1066 (i).
Wagner, Philip, Emplymt. by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 229 (i).
Intermediate Tariff: in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
——— Extension to British or Foreign Countries: in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
Intermediate Tariff, *re* German Treaties, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
Intermediate Tariff *re* G.B. and Foreign Countries: in Com. on Ways and Means, 993 (i). *See* 'Tariff', &c.
Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex., Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
International Paper Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
International Relations, Canadian Representative at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2751 (ii).
International Waterways, Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 514 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6043 (iv).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7804 (iv).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6011 (iv).
Iron Angles for Bedsteads: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4434 (iii).
Iron Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 173'.
Iron or Steel Bars : in Com. on Ways and Means, 4208 (iii).
Iron or Steel Beams, Rolled, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Iron or Steel Billets: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties: in Com. of Sup., 6903 (iv).
——— Amounts paid to Companies: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2979 (ii).
——— Item dropped: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
Iron Piping, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2133 (ii).
Iron, Rolled or Rolled Steel: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526 (i).
——— Tubing, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2132 (ii), 4549 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Iron, Steel and Lead Manufactories, Quantity of Production: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4047 (iii).
Iron or Steel Scrap, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4206 (iii).
Iron or Steel Nuts, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Iron and Steel Ry. Bars, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2131 (ii).
Iron, Wrought, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).
Irrigation Applications, Assignments, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1806 (i).
Irrigation in Western Provinces, Investigation *re* Conservation of Water Supplies: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 4453 (iii).

Jamaica Disaster, Govt. Grant: Announcement (Mr. Fielding) 1698 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1879 (i).
——— Govt. Grant: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) 1613 (i).
——— Imperial Prestige, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1842 (i).
——— Jamaica Disaster, Relief B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 2727 (ii).
Japan, Treaty with : *See* 'B. No. 23'.
Jeannette's Wharf Creek, Cost of Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
See 'Thames River'.
Jersey Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iv).
Joliette and Brandon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15'.
Jordan—Erie Power Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 115, 168'.
Judges Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Judges acting as Directors of Stock Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2144 (ii).
Judges in Review, Que., Slection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4853 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts and Extra Judicial Work, Cor. &c.: M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies*, 1978 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3461 (ii).
Judges of Provl. Courts: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Judges, Retirement and Superannuation in Quebec Prov.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3640 (ii).
——— Retired, resuming Practice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3370 (ii).
——— Superior Court, Quebec, Number on Leave, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2978 (ii).
Judicial Appointments to Supreme Court, N.S.: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse. 2206, 2225 (ii).
Justice, Admn. of in Sask. and Alta.: *See* 'B. No. 146'.
JUSTICE :
B.C. Appellate Court, Representation from Provincial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. D. Ross) 4945 (iii).
B.C. Judgeships, Alleged Sale of, Reps. in Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 718 (i).
——— Statement *re* Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Aylesworth) 580; Members remarks checked: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 580 (i).
Carroll, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Charbonneau, Judge, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Clements, Judge, Promotion to Supreme Court, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1056 (i).
Cooke, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4858 (iii).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Dom. and Ontario, &c., Litigated Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 1119 (i).
Dullman, Nolan and Walsh, Convicts in Kingston Penitentiary, Clemency *re:* Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 2577 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Apptmnt of French Judge: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3185 (ii).
Henderson, Alex., Resignation as Judge in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2145 (ii); M. for Cor. &c.: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2147 (ii).
Hutchinson, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4859 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts and Extra Judicial Work, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies*, 1978 (i).
Judges Retirement and Superannuation in Quebec Prov.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3640 (ii).
Judges, Retired, resuming Practice, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3370 (ii).
Judges in Review, Que., Selection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4853 (iii).
Judges of Superior Court, Quebec, Number on Leave, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2978 (ii).
Justice, Administration of by Dom. Govt.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 4119 (iii).
Justice, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7689 (iv).
Lemieux, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4860 (iii).
MacIlwraith, T. R., Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2144, 2292 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2585; Amt. (Mr. A. Johnston) 2587 (ii).
——— Verdict *re* Charges against Halifax Papers: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Complaints *re* Delays in Judgments: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 884, 1927 (i).
Manitoba King's Bench, Apptmnt. of Mr. Henderson: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4858 (iii).
N.S. Supreme Court Vacancy, Apptmnt. of D. C. Fraser as Lt. Governor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
N.S. Supreme Court Judgeship, Vacancy *re:* Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1300 (i), 5508 (iii), 7009 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 2206, 2225 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6765 (iv).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Superannuation, and State of Health: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4046 (iii).
Paradis, Judge, Travelling Expenses *re:* Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4858 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Penitentiaries, General Vote: in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2828 (ii).
Revised Statutes B., Copy laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 1470 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1382 (i).
——— Distribution to Members: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 481 (i).
Rochon, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4860 (iii).
Routhier, Mr. Justice, Retirement of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4856 (iii).
St. Hyacinthe Judgeship, Apptmnt. *re:* Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1300 (i), 1991, 2229 (ii).
Simcoe County Judge, Complaints *re:* Ques. (Mr. Conmee) 3638 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Northern Advance': Personal Explanation (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4368 (iii).
Sol. Gen.'s Office, Delay in Apptmnt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 841 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1796 (i).
Sunday Legislation, Legal Expenses of R. U. Macpherson: in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).
Supreme Court, Apptmnt. of Judge from Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2978 (ii).
Supreme Court Library: in Com. of Sup., 7693 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.B., Apptmnt. of Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6765 (iv).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 3641 (ii).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy *re:* Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2981 (ii).
——— Complaint from Chief Justice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2998 (ii).
——— Cor., &c., *re* Vacancy, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 241 (i).
——— Cor., &c., read: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3916; Neg. (Y. 50, N. 83) 3949 (iii).
——— Delay in Apptmnt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 840 (i).
Tellier, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4860 (iii), 6635 (iv).
Yukon, Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).
——— Judges' Living Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).
Just, Mr. C. F., Causes for Suspension: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 489 (i).
——— Suspension and Re-instatement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 228 (i).
——— Remarks: in Com. of Sup., 6242 (iv).
Kaien Island Land Grant, O.C.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1699 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3977 (iii).
Kelly, Mr. John, Compensation for Slaughtered Animals: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7815 (iv).
Kentville Rifle Range, Number of Acres, Cost, Awards &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1385 (i).
'Kestrel,' Str., Cor., &c., *re* Provisioning for Year 1905: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 580 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Kennedy) in Com. of Sup., 5969 (iii).
——— Supplies purchased, Cor., &c., with Agents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1470 (i).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredges: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
King, and H. E. Lyon, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Oliver) 4839 (iii).
Kingston Barracks, Repairs to Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
Kittson, Mr. C. M., Resignation as Canadian Agent in S. Africa: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1140 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Knitted Goods, Value of Importations from Germany and G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 724 (i).
La Banque Nationale: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
Labour Dept., Printing 'Gazette': in Com. of Sup., 3579 (ii).
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
——— Private Secretary's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
——— Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2958 (ii).
Labour Disputes, Legislation *re* Settlements, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 1150 (i), 2590. Neg. (Y. 40; N. 78) 3696; Amt. (Mr. R. Smith) agreed to (Y. 78; N. 40) 3697 (ii).
Labour Dispute Bill, Distribution of: Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 1378 (i).
——— Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Stockton) 1299, 1330 (i).
——— N.S. Coal Strikes: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 6005 (iv).
Labour on Public Works, Hours: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Labour Strikes Prevention: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Labour Troubles: *See* 'Coal Strikes,' 'Strikes and Lockouts.'
Lachine Canal, Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
——— Delay *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1124 (i).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

Lake St. François, Beauce: Wharfs in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
Lake St. John Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6110 (iv).
Lake Superior Fishing Grounds, Depletion of by American Fishermen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4049 (iii).
Lake Superior Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Lakeville Post Office, P.E.I., Change in Location: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7250 (iv).
Lake Winnipeg Fishing Restriction, Cor. *re* with Board of Trade, Winnipeg: M. for Copy* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1067 (i).
Lamontagne and 'Le Soleil' Cos., Amounts paid to for 1906-7: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3631 (ii).
——— Ans. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3727 (ii).
Lamp Black, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2120 (ii).
Lamp Springs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4391 (iii).
Land and Sub-Land Agents, Homestead Inspectors, &s., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) 231 (i).
Landsdowne, Mail Service from Night Trains: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2581 (ii).
Land Patents for Sections 3, 5, 7, and 13, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4857 (iii).
Lands, Public: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
See 'Interior,' 'Immigration,' &c.
Land Sales in N.W. and Insurance Investigation, Charges against Conservative Members: Remarks (Mr. D. Ross) 3314 (ii).
See 'Insurance Commission,' &c.
Lands taken for Ry. Purposes: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Lands for Schools: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
L'Assomption Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5022 (iii).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
Laurier Tower, Collapse, Cost of Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4665 (iii).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
Lead Bounties, Amounts paid, Names of Companies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 4053 (iii).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Leather Combine: *See* 'Boots and Shoes.'
Leather Goods, Increase in Shipments to Canada: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1048 (i).
'Le Canada,' Attack on Dr. Sproule, &c., *re* French Clergy: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7092 (iv).
Leech, Mr. R. E., McLean, and Others, Emplymnt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 2985 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4452 (iii).
Lees, Mr. W. A. D., Contracts, Agreements, Cor., &c. *re* Fencing Contracts: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 802 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 710 (i).
Legal Expenses, Indians: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Legislative Union, &c., Correction in Hansard: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 5509 (iii).
Lemieux, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4860 (iii).
'Lena M.', Schr., Wreck of, Plans, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sinclair) 3189 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5870 (iii).
'Le Nationaliste,' Rep. *re* Abuse of Mr. Fielding: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4052 (iii).
——— Rep. *re* Speech: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Dubeau) 3843 (ii).
Leopold, Mr. Louis, Rep. *re* Canadian Manufacturers Association and Immigration of Skilled Labour: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4217 (iii).
Lethbridge District Water Reserves Lands, Sale of, Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4216 (iii).
Lethbridge Coal Strike: *See* 'Coal Famine.'
Letter Carriers, Quebec City, Increase in Number: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Letter Carrier Service, N.W.T. Extension to Calgary and Edmonton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 615 (i).
Level Crossings of Railways: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
Levis Military Forts, Clearing of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5655 (iii).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
Library Bureau Headquarters: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3837 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 611 (i).
——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).
——— Purchase of Books: in Com. of Sup., 6763 (iv).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Life Saving Stations on Great Lakes, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).
——— maintained in Canada, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2295 (ii).
Life-Saving Station on Pacific Coast, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 479 (i).
Life-Saving Stations, P. E. I., Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 898 (i).
See 'Marine.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 5864, 5947 (iii), 7678 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5867 (iii).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5869 (iii).
——— Repairs, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).
——— Total Expenditure from 1892 to 1896 and from 1902 to 1906: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 471 (i). *See* 'Marine.'
Lime Juices: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2044 (ii).
Lime Kiln Channel, Lake Erie, Regulations *re* Boats passing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4045 (iii).
Lindsay Drill Shed, Erection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 223 (i).
Lion's Head Life Saving Apparatus, Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 942 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii).
Liquid Fillers for Varnishes, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4186 (iii).
Liquor Permits granted by J. D. McGregor in Yukon, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4211 (iii).
L'Isle d'Alma, Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Litigated Expenses, Dom. and Ontario, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
Litigation Expenses, Interior: in Com. of Sup., 7274 (iv).
Little Beausoleil Island, Sale to Mr. W. S. Pratt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2833, 2984 (ii).
Little Current, North Channel, Georgian Bay Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
Live Stock Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Live Stock Products Compensation *re* Slaughter of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) on conc., 7988 (iv).
Lloyd, T. H., Imprisonment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 2983 (ii).
Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'
Lobster Hatchery at Egmont Bay, Application for: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 724 (i).
Lockouts, &c.: *See* 'Strikes.'
Locomotives, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Loggie, W. S. & Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4048 (iii).
London, East Elgin and N. Bruce Elections for 1905-6, Forms of Writs &c., Issued: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 803 (i).
London Election Investigation, Govt. Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 225 (i).
——— *See* 'Election Oaths.'
London Electoral District, Resignation of Hon. C. S. Hyman: Remarks *re* Form (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
London Election, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2943 (ii).
London, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
——— Post Office Improvements, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 7251 (iv).
London and St. Clair Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Long Sault Rapids and International Waterways: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 7544 (iv).
Lord's Day Act, Prohibition of Cut Flowers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4611 (iii).
——— Prohibition of Sunday School Papers: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5023 (iii).
Lotbinière and Portneuf Counties, Wharfs, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 6114 (iv).
'Lowrey's Claim,' Cor. *re* Prohibition through Mails: M. for Copies* (Mr. Galliher) 490 (i).
Lumber Combine in N.W.T., Charges *re*: M. (Mr. Herron) for Sel. Com., 1816 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2586 (ii); M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add name, 4117 (iii).
Lurcher Lightship, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).
Lyon, H. E. v. Malcolm McKenzie, &c., Cor. *re* Exchequer Court Suit: M. for Copies* (Mr. Herron) 2838 (ii).
Lyon, Victor Harold, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Mackenzie Avenue Properties, Purchase by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Morin) 490 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Morin) 235 (i).
Mackintosh Clothing: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4432 (iii).
McCallum, Duncan, Claims *re* Drowning in Trent Canal: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5023
——— Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 3884 (ii).
McCormick and Deering Harvesters, Customs Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 566 (i).
McCracken and McCann, Messrs., Application for Lands, Papers, &c. *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. Barr) 578 (i).
McDonald, Mr. Angus, Dismissal from Pisquid Post Office, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 896 (i).
McDougald, Mr. J., Gratuity *re* Tariff Commission: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
McDougald and Bruce, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt., I.C.R., Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 711 (i).
McGee, Thos. D'Arcy, Monument, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7700 (iv).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. in Interior Dept: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).

McGregor, Mr. J. D. ,Yukon License Inspector, Number of Permits granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4211 (iii).

MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services: M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2585; Amt. (Mr. A. Johnston) 2587 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2144, 2292 (ii).

——— Verdict *re* Charges against Halifax Papers: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).

McInnes, Hon. Wm., Charges *re* Administration of Yukon: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2978 (ii).

'McKeen, G. A.'' Loss of on Cascumpec Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

McLaren's Creek Roadway, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 468 (i).

McNiven, Mr. J. A., Apptmnt. to Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6619 (iv).

McPhee Automatic Signalling Co., I.C.R., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2835 (ii).

McPherson, Arthur Leon, Relief of: *See* 'B. 157.'

Mabou Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iv).

Macaroni: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1866 (i).

Machinery for Sugar Refining, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2135 (ii).

Machinery, Packed, &c. from G.B., Preferential Duty, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).

Madoc-Eldorado Ry. Subsidy, Payments to G.T. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 950, 1064, 1130 (i).
See 'Railways.'

Magazines: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).

——— Tariff Rates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).

Magdalen Islands Breakwater and Piers: in Com. on Sup., 6114 (iv).

Magdalen Islands and Mainland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Complaints *re* Delays in Judgments: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 884 (i), 1927 (i).
See 'Justice.'

Magog Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2140 (ii).

Mail Carriers, Increases in Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).

Mail Service, Country Post Offices, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

Mail Service, I.C.R., to Halifax and St. John: Remarks on M. to adjn., 2205 (ii).

Mail Service to St. Damase, Ste. Perpetue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 718 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7106 (iv).

'Maisonneuve,' Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 3633 (ii).

Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).

Malleable Chains, Sprockets, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4390 (iii).

Malley, Mr. John, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3370 (ii).

Malloy, John P., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6012 (iv).

Malone and Hopkins Point Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 12.'

Malt Flour, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).

Manilla Rope, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Agreement with Mr. Brown: Ques. (Mr. Bole) 3839 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Cor., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2295 (ii).

——— Govt. Policy: Ques. (Mr. Greenway) 1803 (i).

——— Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4857 (iii).
See 'Provincial Subsidies, &c.

Man. Court of Appeal: *See* 'B. No. 116.'

Man. Franchise Act, Frauds *re* Elections: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner), 7934 (iv).

Man. Judges' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 177.'

Manitoba King's Bench, Apptmnt. of Mr. Henderson: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4858 (iii).

Manitoba (Western) Mail Service, Complaints *re* Condition: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2982 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'

Man. Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'

Manufacturers' Bank of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 26.'

Maple Syrup, Adulteration of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2634 (ii).

Maps, Engraving, &c., Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).

Maps, Printing and Lithographing: in Com. of Sup., 7275 (iv).

Marble, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).

Marble Mountain Wharf: in Com of Sup., 6050 (iv).

Marbles, Tombstones, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4191 (iii).

Marconi Stations: in Conc., 7987 (iv).

Marconi Stations *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii).

Marconi Tel. Co. and Contract with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1299 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1299 (i).

Marier, Mr. J. A., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7541 (iv).
Marieville Post Office Building, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5085 (iii).
Marine Engineers' Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Marine and Fisheries Portfolio, Apptmnt. of an English Minister: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 5860 (iii).

MARINE:
Aids to Navigation on Pacific Coast, Rep. of Capt. Anderson: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 480 (i).
Bay of Quinte Lights: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).
Bronte Lighthouse, Allowances to Keeper: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
'Canada,' Design *re* Flag: in Com. of Sup., 5972 (iii).
Canadian Fog Signal Co., Amount of Goods purchased by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).
Canadian Mercantile Marine, Condition of, Vessels registered in Canada, &c.: M. for Ret.*. (Mr. Macdonell) 2146 (ii).
Clarke City, Marconi Station: in Com. of Sup., 5875 (iii).
Coasting Trade, Canadian Legislation *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1051 (i).
Coasting Trade, Countries admitted to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3369 (ii).
Coasting Trade Treaties, Abrogation of, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 1445 (i).
'Golspie' Str., Wreck of, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1097 (i).
——— Name of Port of Entry: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).
——— Rep. of Commissioner: Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2346, 2590 (ii).
——— Total Amounts paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4048 (iii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 5766, 5946 (iii).
——— Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5961 (iii).
Grand Manan Life Saving Station, Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) 936 (i).
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii).
——— Steamer, B.C.,: in Com. of Sup., 5879 (iii).
Kestrel, Str., Cor., &c. *re* Provisioning for year 1905: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 580 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Kennedy) 5969 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
'Kestrel,' Str., Supplies purchased, Cor., &c., with Agents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1470 (i).
'Lena M.' Schr., Wreck of, Plans, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sinclair) 3189 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 5870 (iii).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5767 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Life Saving Stations, maintained in Canada, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2295 (ii).
——— Pacific Coast, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 479 (i).
——— P. E. I. Complaints *re* Wrecked Vessels: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 898 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Total Expenditure from 1892 to 1896 and from 1902 to 1906: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 471 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 5864, 5947 (iii), 7678 (iv).
——— Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5867 (iii).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5869 (iii).
——— Repairs, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).
Lion's Head Life Saving Apparatus, Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 942 (i), 5767 (iii).
Lurcher Lightship, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5868 (iii).
'McKeen, G. A.,' Loss of on Cascumpec Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
'Maisonneuve' Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 3633 (ii).
Marconi Stations *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii); Conc., 7987 (iv).
Marine Biological Stations: in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 219 (i), 4518 (iii).
——— Book-keeping Re-organization, Expenditure *re:* in Com. of Sup., 5947 (iii), 7678
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Auditing of Purchases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 709 (i).
Marine Hospitals, Seamen's Fund: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii).
Marine Medical Inspector at Canso, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).
Marine Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
Marine Road on Vancouver Island, Cor. with Premier McBride, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 481 (i).
See 'Vancouver.'

MARINE—*Con.*
Marine Supplies, Purchases of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5874 (iii).
'Monarch,' SS., Rep. *re* Investigation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).
Muskoka Lakes Lighthouses: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) 5867 (iii).
'Neptune,' Str., Repairs, Supplies, &c., Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3637 (ii).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5946 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Patrol Boats for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5772 (iii).
Pictou Harbour Dues, Collection of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1808 (i).
Pilots of Montreal, Invitation *re* Inspection of St. Lawrence Route: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3885 (ii).
——— Tour de Role System: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4857 (iii).
Point Pelee Life Saving Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. *re* Life Saving Stations, P.E.I., 931 (i).
Port Credit Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5770 (iii).
Port Stanley Lightkeeper: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Jackson) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
P.E.I. Life Saving, &c., Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) Remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 993 (i).
Provincial Wrecking Co., Amounts paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2836 (ii).
Red Island Light, near Riviere du Loup, Loss of Sailors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 941 (i).
'Resolute' Wreck and Life Saving Apparatus, Complaints *re:* Remarks (Mr. Kemp) on M. *re* Life Saving Stations, &c., P.E.I., 934 (i).
Riley, James, Supt. of Pilots, Certificate and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3641 (ii).
St. John Harbour Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5769 (iii).
St. Lawrence Pilots, Number in Ocean SS. Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4456 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
——— Cap Charles, Pet. from Pilots *re* Widening, and Grounding of SS. 'Victorian': Ques. (Mr. Monk) 573 (i).
——— Dredging at Cap a la Roche, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 575 (i).
Shelburne Range Lights, Complaints *re* Location: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2836 (ii).
Signal Service between Montreal and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
'Sovinto,' Ship, Wreck of, Rep. *re* Special Train *re* Life-Boats: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1064 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
'Sovinto,' Wreck of, Request to Govt. for Life-Boats of Govt. Strs.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 711 (i).
'Strathmore,' Str., Wreck of, Investigation into: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1383 (i).
Sub-Marine Signals for Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).
Swim's Wharf Wharfinger, Remuneration and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2830 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Life Saving Stations, *re* Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 487 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 5768 (iii).
Vancouver Island Marine Road, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 579 (i).
See 'Marine Road.'
Waubaushene Light: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5968 (iii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 5771 (iii).
Wrecks on Great Lakes, Number and Causes, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. Boyce) 2295 (ii).
Maritime Winter Fair, Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1392 (i).
Marriages of Minors: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Martin, Thos., late M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4518 (iii).
Maskinongé River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Masonic Protective Assen.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Masters and Mates Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Masters and Mates Certificates Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 7517 (iv).
——— Evidence and Papers of Sel. Com.: M. to lay on Table (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1985 (ii).
Matchadash Bay, Dredging Contract: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
Matrices for Printing Newspapers, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).
Matrices, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4548 (iii).
See 'Tariff,' &c.
Matthews, Mr. John, I. C. R. Passenger Agent, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6904
Meaford Fish Hatchery: Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5895 (iii).
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6961 (iv).
Meats, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Medals Claims Board, Duties, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 6633 (iv).
Medals for Nile Voyageurs, Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 224 (i).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4039 (iii).
Medicines, Patent, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2116 (ii).
See 'Patent Medicines.'

Melons, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1909 (i).
Members introduced: 3, 515 (i).
Members occupying Seats on Govt. Side: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) 5890 (iii).
Merwin, Geo. T., Purchases of Goods, &c.: by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 471 (i).
Mess from His Ex., Estimates, 1907-8: Read (Mr. Speaker) 278 (i), 2294 (ii)
Mess from His Ex., Reply to Address: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1044 (i).
——— Estimates, Suppl.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 5643 (iii).
See 'Estimates.'
Metallic Trading Checks: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2413 (ii), 4438 (iii).
Metals, Tariff Changes: Read in Budget Speech (Mr. Fielding) 313 (i).
Meteorological Service, Allowance to Mr. A. W. Found: in Com. of Sup., 7684 (iv).
——— Gratuity to Mrs. Harrison: in Com. of Sup., 5960 (iii).
Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Agreement with B.C., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2295 (ii).
Michipicoten Mail Service, Complaints *re* Irregularity of: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2831 (ii).
Midland Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).
Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 123'.
Militia Pension Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 144'.
Militia Stores, Marking: *See* 'B. No. 85'.

MILITIA:

Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5735 (iii).
——— Restrictions *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4051 (iii).
Armstrong, Trooper, Compensation *re* Injuries at Laprairie Camp: Ques. (Mr. Hunt) 1050 (i).
Arsenal: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Aylmer, Lord, Inspector General, Retirement of: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 5859 (iii), 6009 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6136 (iv).
Boer War Trophies, Distribution of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 474 (i).
British Soldiers, Honourably Discharged, as Settlers in Canada: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 736 (i).
Clothing, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
Copper purchased for the Militia, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3883 (ii).
Dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 490 (i).
Dufferin Rifles, Delay in Payments to Men: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 4045 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Esquimalt Military Station, Establishment of Schools of Instruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3370 (ii).
Halifax Barracks, Coal supplied, Quantity and Rate per Ton: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 713 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 894, 1057 (i).
Headquarters Staff, Names, Rank, Ages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6634, 7700 (iv).
Immigrants entering Canadian Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Parent) 2633 (ii).
Immigrants promoted in Militia Force, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Parent) 3189 (ii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Number of Acres, Cost, Awards, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1385 (i).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4452 (iii).
Levis Military Forts, Clearing of Land: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5655 (iii).
Medals Claims Board, Duties, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 6633, 7248 (iv).
Medals for Nile Voyageurs, Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 224 (i).
Military Forts, Repairs, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
Military Stores, Inspection, Names of Officers, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 720 (i).
Military Stores, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2408 (ii).
Militia, Cost *re* aiding Civil Power, Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 895 (i).
Militia Customs Duties: in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iii).
Militia, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2822 (ii), 7686 (iv).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 5084 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7780 (iv).
Militia Drill Sheds: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4615 (iii).
Militia Estimates, Annual Statement (Sir Frederick Borden) 5647 (iii).
Militia Properties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii), 7981 (iv).
Montreal Military School Site, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1799 (i).
Mulloy, Mr., Relief to: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
Naval Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
Naval Reserve, Establishment of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2147 (ii).
Northwest Rebellion, Graves of Soldiers, Care of: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6746 (iv).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Officers and Provisional Courses Allowance: M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 1072 (i).
Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 5647 (iii).
Permanent Forces, Tactical Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1050 (i).
Petewawa Militia Camp, Confiscation of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. S. Hughes) 6765 (iv).
——— Compensation to Townships *re* Taxation: Remarks (Mr. White) 6519 (iv).
——— on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7610 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6910 (iv).
Quebec Garrison, Permanent Force, Recruits from England: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).
Rifle Matches, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 739 (i).
Rifle Ranges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Contract *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 485 (i).
Rifle Ranges, Victoria County, Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 224 (i).
Ross Rifles, Abandonment by N.W. Mounted Police, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 614 (i).
——— Accidents in N. W. Mounted Police, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4051 (iii).
——— Accidents, &c., at St. Johns, N.B., Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4050 (iii).
——— Adoption of Bayonet, Pattern, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2580 (ii).
——— Amounts paid for Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4213 (iii).
——— Amounts paid to Sir Charles Ross and Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 5025 (iii).
——— Contract with Messrs. Billings & Spencer &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1395 (i).
——— Contracts with Govt. and Customs Dept.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 2147 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt. *re* Supplies, Dealings, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Worthington) 727 (i).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects: on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 3732 (ii).
——— Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4452 (iii).
——— Defects *re:* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. S. Hughes) 5026 (iii).
——— Defects, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).
——— Factory, Erection of, Cor., &c.: M for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1977 (i).
——— Imported Parts from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2833 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, Inspection Commissions, &c., Reps., &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Worthington) 1398 (i).
——— Mounted Police, Question *re*: Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 572 (i).
——— Number delivered, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1126 (i).
——— Number purchased and Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 222 (i).
——— Pattern inspected by Commissioners of 1901: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4216 (iii).
——— Reports from Officers *re* Defects: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4273 (iii).
——— Snider-Enfield, &c., Chief Differences, Reps. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 4053 (iii).
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Royal Scots Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iii).
St. Joseph de Levis, Military Cabins, Burning of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5656 (iii).
Schools of Instruction, Number and Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 476 (i).
Smith, Lt. Col. H., and Medals Board, Payment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7248 (iv).
S.A. Veterans, Land Grants Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7311 (iv).
S.A. War Veterans, Land Grants, &c: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 730 (i)
——— Terms and Conditions, &c: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4665 (iii).
South African War, and B.C. Soldiers, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ross) 3373 (ii).
S.A. War, P.E.I. Volunteers, Memorial *re* Land Grants: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7542 (iv).
Sub-Target Gun Co., Cor., O.Cs. with Militia Dept., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 726 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).
——— M. to ref. Papers to Pub Accots. Com., (Mr. Foster) 3887, 3977 (ii).
Sub-Target Machine Guns, Purchase and Distribution, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 225 (i).
Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5723 (iii).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Purchase by Govt., Quantity, &c., Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 719 (i).
13th Haldimand Battalion, Militia Arms, Amounts paid for Storage: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 2828 (ii).
Toronto Fort, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).
Training Schools: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
Vaux, Major F. L., Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4046 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Warburton Property, P.E.I., Purchase of for Rifle Range, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2584 (ii).
Milk Inspection: *See* 'Inspection and Sale B. No. 84.'
Milk River Cattle Co., Transfer of Grazing Leases by E. C. Hall, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
Miminegash Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
Mines, Dept. of: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Mines Dept., Apptmnt. of Mr. McInnes: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5688 (iii).
See 'Geological Survey.'
Mining Machinery: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4420 (iii).
Ministers of the Crown, Charges *re* Graft, &c.: *See* 'Insurance Commission.'
Minors' Marriages: *See* 'B. No. 176.
Mispec Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
Mississaguas Claims, Settlement of: in Com. of Sup., 7292 (iv).
Modus Vivendi and American Fishermen: Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1379 (i).
Modus Vivendi, Licenses and Fines on U.S. Vessels, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1049 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Molasses: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4180 (iii).
'Monarch', SS, Rep. *re* Investigation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1384 (i).
Moncton Car Shops, Land Purchase, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7301, 7521 (iv).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2586 (ii).
——— Location, Equipment, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Ames) 1148 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3885 (ii).
Moncton Park, N.B., Expropriation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2985 (ii).
Monotypes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4401 (iii).
'Montague', Dredge, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3189 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2980 (ii).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry., Tracks on Mill St., Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7984 (iv).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
Montreal, (St. Antoine) Electoral District, Pet. *re* Notification (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 1470 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *Se* 'B. No. 166.'
Montreal Harbour Commission, Apptmnt. of Chairman, as per Statute 6, Edward VII, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233 (i).
——— Nominations and Apptmnts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 236 (i).
Montreal Harbour Dry Dock, Plans, Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2581 (ii).
Montreal Harbour, Erection of Sheds, Contract *re* Change of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 237 (i).
——— Lower Division, St. Mary's Current: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii).
Montreal and Manchester SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
Montreal Military School Site, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1799 (i).
Montreal Pilots, Tour de Role, System, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4857 (iii).
Montreal Port, Inspectors of Perishable Goods, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1989 (ii).
Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site, Reps. in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2228 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt., Amounts collected, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 503 (i).
Moore, Mr. W. W., Rep. *re* Packing Houses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 229 (i).
Moose Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Morgan, Henry J., Cor. *re* Superannuation, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Stewart) 239 (i).
Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5553 (iii).
Mortgages of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Mossy River, Man., Dredging, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Motor Cars, I.C.R., Investigation and Rep. of Mr. Joughins: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 722 (i).
Mould Boards, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Mulgrave Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Mulloy, Mr., Relief to: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Murray Canal, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
See 'Railways, P.E.I.', &c.
Muscowequan Indian Boarding School, Govt. Grants, Treaty Money, Names, Ages, &c. of Pupils: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 1068 (i).
Muskoka Lakes Lighthouses: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) 5867 (iii).
National Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 29.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
See 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Naturalization Act: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Naval Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).

Neepawa Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (iii).
'Neptune,' Str., Repairs, Supplies, &c., Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3637 (ii).
N. B. Petroleum Co. and Memramcook and Dover Oil Co., Quantities purchased and prices paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 802 (i).
New Brunswick Supply Co., Purchases by Govt. Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1052 (i).
New Campbellton Wharf, Kelly's Cove: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).
New Carlisle Wharf Extension, Damage to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1395 (i).
Newcastle Improvements, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7299 (iv).
New Glasgow Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).
New Ottawa, Sask., Lands held without performing Settlement Duties: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1046 (i).
Newspaper Articles, Objectionable Reading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stockton) 2757 (ii).
New Westminster, Marine and Indian Agencies Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
New Zealand Flax, Experiments in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5286 (iii).
Niagara Falls, Map of Dr. Spencer *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 487 (i).
Niagara Falls Water Power, and International Waterways Commission, Apportionment to Can. and U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 567 (i).
——— International Waterways Commission, Reps., O.Cs. &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lancaster) 1426 (i).
Nichols Copper Co's Patents: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7805 (iv).
Nicolas, Mr. F., Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
Nicolet Electoral District: Certificate of Election, 1380 (i).
——— Vacancy: Issue of Writ (Mr. Speaker) 515 (i).
——— Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 513 (i).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Contract *re* Construction, Supervisor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1386 (i).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Co.'s subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7808 (iv).
Nicolet and St. Gregoire Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1386 (i).
Nipissing Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Nipissing Indian Reserve, Application for Water Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2144 (ii)
——— Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2832
——— Surrender of, O.Cs. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 2585 (ii).
Nominingue Lakes Wharfs, Construction and Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2139 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Additional Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1928 (i).
——— Audit of Books: Ques. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3884 (ii).
——— Claims, Amount paid by Govt., Cor. *re*: M. for Ret., (Mr. Monk) 1038 (i).
——— Homestead Entries, Number of Immigrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 1147 (i).
——— Moneys paid to 1st Nov. 1906, Cor. &c.: for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 239 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6751 (iv).
——— Summons of Mr. Beddoe to Bar of Hse: Amt. (Mr. Monk) 5835; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 99) 5857 (iii).
——— notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 5502 (iii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4023 (iii).
Northern Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13'.
North East Harbour, N.S., Wharf, Letters, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 2340 (ii).
North Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
North Lake Post Office, P.E.I, Change in Location: Ques (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7249 (iv).
North Rustico Harbour Breakwater, Rep. *re* Extension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 475 (i).
Northwest Land Deals and Insurance Commission, Charges (Mr. Fowler) *re* Members and Minister, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bourassa) 3428 (ii).
N.W. Mounted Police, Compensation *re* Accidents: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iv).
——— Patrol Boats in Hudson's Bay: in Com. of Sup., 5946 (ii).
——— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 7834 (iv).
——— Rep. Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3546 (ii).
Northwest Rebellion, Graves of Soldiers, Care of: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6746 (iv).
N.W.T. Govt., Commissioner White's Salary, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iv).
N.W.T. Act (powers of commissioner, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 76'.
Northwestern Trusts Co.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Notre Dame du Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
N.S. Bench, Resignations and Apptmnts.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1300 (i), 7009 (iv).
N.S. Chief Justice, Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5508 (iii).
N.S. Judiciary, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6765 (iv).

N.S. Judiciary, Apptmnt. of D. C. Fraser, as Lt. Governor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Nouvelle Wharf, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Nuts, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1919 (i).
Oak Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1'.
Oatmeal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1374 (i).
Oats: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1372 (i).
Observatory at Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5766, 5946 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Office Specialty Co., Purchases from: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Oil and Gas Borings, Experiments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii).
Oils, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
Oils, for Paints, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).
Oka Indians, Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Old Age Pensions: Prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 3374 (ii).
Old Man's River, Stream Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 7834 (iv).
Ontario Development Power Co.: Par. in Toronto 'News' *re* Committee (Mr. Bennett) 6910 (iv).
Ont. Hudson's Bay and Western Rys. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 133'.
Ont. and Que. Ry. Ferry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 88'.
Ophir Postmaster, Reduction of Salary, Increased Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4219 (iii).
Opium, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).
Orangeville Post Office, Vacancy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 7249 (iv).
Orders-in-Council, Commission *re* Codifying: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4657 (iii).
—— Consolidation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4946 (iii).
Orders of the Day, Printing in English: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 7838 (iv).
Order, Ques. of *re* Motion (Mr. Robitaille) 2588 (ii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24'.
O'Rourke, John, Arrest by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1130 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3181, 3425 (ii).
Otonabee River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
Otonabee River Water Power, Leasing of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4612 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Architect's Plans *re* New Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
—— Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
—— Eastern Block: in Com. of Sup., 3950 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Elevators, Attendance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4609 iii).
—— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup.., 3585 (ii).
—— Gas and Electric Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
—— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4608 (iii).
—— H. of C. Ventilation: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
—— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4602 (iii).
—— Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 3603 (ii).
—— Museum: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).
—— Post Office, Date of Erection, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1799 (i).
—— Post Office, Date of Fire, Total Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 1562 (i).
—— Post Office Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4608 (iii).
—— Post Office, Total Expenditure *re* Damage by Fire: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1557 (i).
—— Properties purchased by Govt., Amounts of Commission and Legal Expenses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 4053 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3839 (ii).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4605 (iii).
—— Supreme Court Building: in Com. of Sup., 3625 (ii).
—— Sussex St. and Mackenzie Avenue Properties: in Com. of Sup., 3617, 3951 (ii).
—— Sussex St. Property, Mr. Riopelle's Commission: Explanation (Mr. Fisher) 3627 (ii).
See 'Properties'.
—— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Balance Sheet *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3002 (ii).
—— Inquiry for O.C. (Mr. Foster) 1991 (ii).
—— Number of Meetings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 6905 (iv).
Ottawa Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Ottawa Terminals Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Superannuation and State of Health: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4046 (iii).
Owen Sound Bridge and Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Owen Sound Harbour Dredging and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).
Owen Sound Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4025 (iii).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
Pacific Cable, Compensation *re* Losses: in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
Panmure Island Wharf, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1559 (i).
Paper, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).
Paper Combines, Investigation into, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. on Ways and Means, 2052 (ii).

Papers taken from Members' Desks in H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).
Paradis, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4858 (iii).
Parcel Post, C.O.D. System, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2344 (ii).
Paris Green, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2120 (ii).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Parkhill Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Parliament Buildings, Covering for Steps: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 174 (i).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from His Ex. Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Parrsboro Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Paspebiac and Gaspé SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Paspebiac Wharf, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Passenger Tickets on Rys. Sale Bill, Change in Rev. Statutes: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7309 (iv).
Passes to Members on SS. Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Patent Medicines, Inspection Act: Prop. Res., M. (Mr. Templeman) 2637 (ii).
Patent Medicines Bill, Legislation this Session: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 5863 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* proceeding with (Mr. Fielding) 7439 (iv).
Patent Medicines: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Patent of 'Damen, Wm. A.': *See* 'B. No. 8.'
Patent of International Paper Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Patents of Nichols Copper Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Patent of Philip J. Green, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Patent of Geo. E. Smith Co.: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
Patent of Summers, E. W., &c.: *See* B. No. 9.'
Patrick, Mr. J. A. M., Emplymt. by Govt: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 569 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question, 576 (i).
Patrol Boats for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5772 (iii).
Patterson, Rev. G. C., Emplymt. by Govt: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4046 (iii).
Peace River District, B.C., Selection and Location of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2633 (ii).
——— Exploratory Survey, Rep. Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3189 (ii).
Pease: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1361 (i).
Penitentiaries in Canada, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 2828 (ii).
Penitentiaries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 1292 (i).
——— General Vote; in Com. of Sup., 7971 (iv).
See 'Justice.'
Percé Wharf, North Cove: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Pere Marquette Ry., Litigation *re* Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
Peribonka River Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Perishable Food Products: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Permanent Forces, Tactical Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1050 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Montmagny Patronage (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2482 (ii).
Personal Explanation (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Relationship to Mr. Sifton, 7131 (iv).
See 'Privilege,' &c.
Petawawa Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6910 (iv).
——— Compensation *re* Timber Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5656 (iii).
——— Compensation to Townships *re* Taxation: Remarks (Mr. White) 6519 (iv).
——— Confiscation of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. S. Hughes) 6765 (iv).
——— Provincial Rights: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7610 (iv).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4025 (iii), 7822 (iv).
Petites Bergeronnes, Removal of Boulders: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Petite Riviere Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).
Petit Rocher Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6077, 7825 (iv).
Petroleum Bounty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Petroleum, Bounties *re*, Total Amounts: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4052 (iii).
Phinney's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Pickles, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1886 (i).
Pictou Harbour Dredging, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1613 (i).
Pictou Harbour Dues, Collection of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1808 (i).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Pictou Roundhouse, Dimensions, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 4854 (iii).
Pictou Station, Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4857 (iiii).
Picture Frames in Govt. Buildings, Repairing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 3971 (ii).
Pig Iron used in Agricultural Implements: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4427 (iii).

Pig Iron imported from U. S., Names of Ports of Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 708 (i).
Pilots of Montreal, Invitation *re* Inspection of St. Lawrence Route: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3885 (ii).
——— Tour de Role System: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4857 (iii).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Engineers, Rep., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 230 (i).
Pisquid East, Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. McDonald, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 897 (i).
Plums, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).
Poaching in Lake Superior, Patrol *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3372 (ii).
Postmaster General's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 219 (i).
Point Pelee Life Saving Crew: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. *re* Life Saving Stations, P.E.I., 931 (i).
Point Prim Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5023 (iii).
Pointes aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6116 (iv).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Political Partisanship: *See* 'Govt. Officials,' &c.
Portable Engines *re* Agricultural Implements, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4407, 4414 (iii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges by (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Conmee) 7898, 7919 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) referring to past debate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 7901, 7922 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbours: in Com. of Sup., 5982 (iii).
Port Arthur Power and Development Co.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Port Bruce Harbour, Contracts, Apptmnts., Material purchased, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 490 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 4666 (iii).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6965 (iv).
——— Material purchased, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Marshall) 490 (i).
Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 483 (i).
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 484 (i).
Port Credit Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5770 (iii).
Port Daniel Pier, Contract *re* Construction, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 726 (i).
Porter's Lake Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Junction Ry. Station, Cor. with Ry. Dept., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McLennan) 3373 (ii).
Port Hood Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3181 (ii).
Port Hope and Charlotte Car Ferry Service: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Ward) 7579 (iv).
Port Maitland Pier, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 474, 489 (i).
Port Maitland, Dredging at Port Dalhousie Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Cheticamp SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7120 (iv).
Port Stanley, Customs Collection for 1900-6: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 1558 (i).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).
——— Dock, Car Ferry Slip, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 1558 (i).
——— Burwell and Port Bruce Harbours: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Marshall) 3277 (ii).
Port Stanley Lightkeeper: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Jackson) in Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'

POST OFFICE:

Allandale Postmaster, Salary, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 2805 (ii).
Arthabaska Postmaster's Salary: Remarks (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6632 (iv).
Ass't Dep. P. M. G.: in Com. of Sup., 7691 (iv).
Belleville Post Office, Complaints *re*, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1989 (ii).
Belleville Post Office and Civil Service Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2837 (ii).
Bethany Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 723 (i).
Bethany Ass't Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 1147 (i).
Bethany and Millbrook Post Office, Charges *re* Loss of Registered Letters: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ward) 1148 (i).
Brandon Postmaster, Salary and Allowances, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1558 (i).
Brandon Post Office, Man.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2795 (ii).
——— Names of Employees, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2838 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Brighton Postmaster, Vacancy, Cancellation of Appointments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3426 (ii).

British Periodicals, Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1134 (i).

Cannington Postmaster, Retirement of Mr. Talbot: M. for Cor. (Mr. S. Hughes) 501 (i).

C.P.R. Mail Contracts, Landing at Halifax, N.S., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Stockton) 491 (i).

Centreville Postmaster, Absence of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

——— Removal from Belleville: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 7781 (iv).

Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2143 (ii).

Copper Cliff Post Office, Investigation *re* Charges against Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4049 (iii).

——— Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 4458 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6697 (iv).

Eastern Townships Post Offices, Applications for, Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2580 (ii).

'Empress of Britain' Arrival at Halifax, Montreal and St. John, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Roche) 950 (i).

'Empress of Ireland', Delays in Canadian Fast Mails, *re* Halifax Route: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1059 (i).

Galt Post Office Repairs, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1124 (i).

Hall, Mr. Z., Postmaster at Hampton, N.S., Corrupt Practices, *re* Elections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 231 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6257 (iv).

Harbour au Bouche Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 486 (i).

Post Office, House of Commons, Promotion: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).

Lakeville Post Office, P.E.I., Change in Location: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7250 (iv).

Lansdowne Mail Service from Night Trains: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2581 (ii).

Letter Carrier System in Charlottetown, P.E.I., Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 723 (i).

Letter Carrier Service, N.W.T. Extension to Calgary and Edmonton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 615 (i).

Letter Carriers, Quebec City, Increase in Number: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).

'Lowrey's Claim' Cor. *re* Prohibition through Mails: M. for Copies* (Mr. Galliher) 490 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

McDonald, Mr. Angus, Dismissal from Pisquid Post Office, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 896 (i).

Mail Carriers, Increases in Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).

Mail Service, Country Post Offices, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).

Mail Service to St. Damase, Ste. Perpetue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 718 (i).

Manitoba (Western) Mail Service, Complaints *re* Condition: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2982 (ii).

Michipicoten Mail Service, Complaints *re* Irregularity of: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2831 (ii).

Nicolet and St. Gregoire Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1386 (i).

North Lake Post Office, P.E.I., Change in Location, Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7249 (iv).

Ophir Postmaster, Reduction of Salary, Increased Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4219 (iii).

Orangeville Post Office, Vacancy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 7249 (iv).

Parcel Post, C.O.D. System, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2344 (ii).

Pisquid East, Post Office, Dismissal of Mr. A. McDonald, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 896 (i).

Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cancellation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 473 (i).

Postal Cards coated with Isinglass, Prohibition of: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 5284 (iii).

Postal Cards and Stamps, Complaints *re* Quality of Papers: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 572 (i).

Postal Delivery, Charlottetown, P.E.I., Inauguration of: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3425 (ii).

Postal Delivery, Free, Names of Places, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2636 (ii).

Postal Express, Legislation *re*, Ref. to in Speech on Address, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 613 (i).

Postal Parcel System, Protest *re* Extension in Man.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2829 (ii).

Postal Rates between G.B. and Canada, Reduction of: Announcement (Mr. Lemieux) 6630; Explanation, 6636 (iv).

Postal Station, Pointe St. Charles: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).

Postal System, C.O.D., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2575 (ii).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected and Due: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1134 (i).

Postmaster General's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 219 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Postmasters in Rural District, Increases in Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii), 6621 (iv).
——— Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5779 (iii).
——— Increases to: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5779 (iii).
——— Ref. to in Com. on P.O. Bill, 7022 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7780 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7982 (iv).
Post Office, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii), 6620 (iv).
Post Offices in Cities, Civil Service Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2583 (ii).
——— Employees' Salaries, Increases to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5779 (iii).
Post Office Employees, Ottawa, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2289 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 6519 (iv).
Post Office Inspectors, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3158 (ii).
Post Office, Outside Service, Post Offices, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3141 (ii).
Prince Albert Post Office, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1555 (i).
Qu'Appelle Post Office, Change of Name, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup. 6623 (iv).
Regina Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1555 (i).
Registered Letters, Number carred during 1907: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3186 (ii).
——— System *re:* Ques. (Mr. Ward) 2829 (ii).
Registration Fees on Letters, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3185 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, between Can. and U.S., Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2840 (ii).
St. Charles Post Office, Compensation to Postmistress, *re* Fire Losses: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 1612 (i).
St. Timothy Post Office, Investigation *re* Mismanagement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2828 (ii).
Salmon River and Hectanooga Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4611 (iii).
Southport Postmaster, P.E.I., Age, &c., Loss of Registered Letters: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7250 (iv).
Stanley, N.B., Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Rogers: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7542 (iv).
Stonefield Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1125 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in debate on Govt. Officials, &c., 6096 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Toronto Mails from East, Cost of Carrying, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1121 (i).
Vaulvagnas Beach Post Office, Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1066 (i).
Victoria Harbour and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2144 (ii).
Wellburn Post Office, Pet. *re* Daily Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 896 (i).
Yukon Officials, Absence of Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 888 (i).
Yukon Winter Mail Service, Complaints *re:* Ques. (Mr. Blain) 889 (i).
Potash: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Poultry Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Discontinuation of Stations: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1139 (i).
Praught, Ed., Claims for Compensation *re* Damage on P. E. I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4456 (iii).
Preferential Tariff, British: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526-7 (i).
——— *re* British Goods applicable to goods shipped to Canadian Ports: Amt. (Mr. Logan) 4276, 4291 (iii).
——— Distinction between G. B. and other Colonies or the Empire: in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
Preferential Tariff and German Surtax: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 6640 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Logan) in Com. on Ways and Means, 1252 (i).
See 'Tariff,' 'German.'
Prescott Wharf, Govt. Assistance to: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 229 (i).
——— Evidence *re* Charges against, and Apptmnt. by Govt.: M. for Copy (Mr. U. Wilson) 576 (i).
——— Letter *re* Immigration to S. Africa: Inquiry for Paper (Mr. Lennox) 3728 (ii).
——— delay in answering question *re:* Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5506 (iii).
——— Rep. to English Press *re* Immigration to S. Africa: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2984 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Sproule) 2958 (ii).
Prince Albert District, Hay Permits, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 7541 (iv).
See 'Interior.'
Prince Albert Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1555 (i).
Prince Arthur's Visit: *See* 'Royal Visit.'
P.E.I., Claims for Refund *re* Hay Shipments: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4854 (iii).
——— Dredging, Schedule, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 481 (i).

P.E.I. Fisheries, Negotiations with Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3883 (ii).
——— Fruit Inspector, Applications *re:* Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
P.E.I. Life Savings, &c., Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) Remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 993 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Freight Service: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1078 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Freight Service: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1089 (i).
——— Telegraph Communication: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1297 (i).
P.E.I., Provincial Subsidy, Basis of Arrangement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5084 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7665 (iv).
——— Changes *re*, Protest *re* Winter Timetable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1807 (i).
——— Claims *re* Additional Subsidy, Delegates' Memo *re:* Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1800 (i).
——— Claims of Mrs. Wiggins and Mr. C. Malley *re* Fire Losses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1808 (i).
——— Coal Supply, Inferior Quality, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1144 (i).
——— Freight Rates, Res. of Board of Trade, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 717 (i).
——— Kitchen, Mr. W., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 7984 (iv).
——— Motor Cars, Experiments *re:* Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1382 (i).
——— Murray Harbour and Montague Bridge Branches, Expropriation of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 470 (i).
——— Officials, Investigation *re* Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
——— O'Leary and West Cape Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lefurgey) 1811 (i).
——— Summerside Freight Shed, Rebuilding of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1136 (i).
——— Terms *re* Mail Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1388 (i).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication, Information *re:* (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1991 (ii).
——— Marconi Co.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1858 (i).
——— Rep. *re:* Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3547 (ii).
P.E.I. Telegraph Service, Anglo-American Tel. Co., Negotiations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1809 (i).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Investigation, Reports, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 945 (i).
——— Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6377 (iv).
P.E.I. and Winter Communication, Cor., Tels, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 3189; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Seconder, 3206 (ii).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Condition of Boats: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4667 (iii).
——— Communication with N. S., Tests *re* Open Route, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1048 (i).
——— Construction of Ice-breakers: Ques. (Mr J. J. Hughes) 3636 (ii).
——— Empress' and Stanley', Strs. Laying off for Season: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 703; Ruling *re* Discussion (Mr. Speaker) 703 (i).
——— Ice-bound Steamers. Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 4841 (iii).
——— Inefficient Service, &c: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 4929 (iii).
——— Location of Govt. Steamers: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3186 (ii).
——— Mail Service, Contract *re* carrying Mails, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 947 (i).
——— Mail Service, Negligence of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3887 (ii).
——— Names of Steamers, Through Freight Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 612 (i).
——— Prime Minister's Remarks *re* Tunnel: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4370 (iii).
——— Res. of Board of Trade *re* Tunnel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 716 (i).
——— Steamers, Total Cost and Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1986 (ii).
——— Tel. read *re* Closing of Channel (Mr. Lefurgey) 512 (i).
——— Terms of Union, *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1927 (i).
Printing Bureau, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 3886 (ii).
——— Rules and Regulations Governing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Verville) 2147 (ii).
Printing Committee, 3rd Rep.: Translation and Printing of Insurance Rep. and Evidence: M. (Mr. Parmelee) to conc., 7001 (iv).
——— M. to conc. in amended Rep., (Mr. Parmelee) 7124 (iv).
Printing Materials, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4548 (iii).
Printing Paper: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2052 (ii).
Printing of Parlt.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5176 (iii).
——— Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 611 (i).
Private Bills Com.: M. (Mr. D. Ross) to sit concurrently with Hse, 7246 (iv).
——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. A. A. Wright) 2480 (ii).
——— Bills from the Senate: M. (Mr. Talbot) to place on Order Paper, 4927 (iii).
——— Pets., Expiration of Time for Receiving: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 1981 (ii).

Private Bills, Pets.: M. to receive (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 2068; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2068 (ii).
——— Pets. *re*: M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 1920 (i).
——— Rule respecting Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 717 (i).
——— Translation of : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 708 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Charges of Graft, &c. against Ministers (Mr. Bourassa) 3428 (ii). *See* 'Insurance Commission.'
——— *re* Correction in Hansard: (Mr. Wm. Roche) 6544 (iv).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Star,' *re* Collusion with Militia Dept. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6907 (iv).
Privy Council, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2764 (ii).
Probationary System and Indeterminate Sentences, Observation of Mr. Justice McMahon: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3841 (ii).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7983; Mess. from His Ex., 7993 (iv).
Prorogation and Govt. Business, Bills withdrawn: Statement (Mr. Fielding) 7438 (iv).
Protective Association of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Provincial Boundaries Extension, &c., Cor. Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sifton) 240 (i).
——— Additions since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5285 (iii).
Provincial Premiers Conference: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 703 (i).
——— Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 486 (i).
Provl. Rights, Encroachment on: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
——— *See* 'Petawawa Military Camp.'
Provincial Subsidies, Amt. to B. N. A. Act: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Res. 5177; Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5343, Neg. (Y. 34; N. 96) 5373; Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5345; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5346; Ques. of Order on Amt. (Mr. A. Martin) Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5358; Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 5378; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 5382; Amt. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5385 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, Address to His Maj.: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4861; M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5288 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5086 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies and Quebec Resolutions, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2584 (ii).
Provincial Wrecking Co., Amounts paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2836 (ii).
Prudential Life Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Prudential Savings Society :*See* 'B. No. 80.'
Public Accounts Com.: M. to add Name (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4440 (iii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Sittings, 5561 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Finlayson) to conc. *re* Collingwood Dock, 3840 (ii).
——— G. T. P. Payments, 6th Rep.: M. to consider (Mr. Barker) 4771 ; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 5027 (iii).
——— 11th-24th Reps.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 6764 (iv).
Public Accounts Com. *re* Collingwood Ship Building Co.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) *re* Sittings: Objection (Mr. Lennox) 3721 (ii).
——— Delayed Returns: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2907 (ii).
——— Delay in bringing down Papers: Remarks (Mr. L. L. Borden) 3459 (ii).
——— Documents produced at next Session's Sittings : M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7125 (iv).
——— Production of Deptl. Documents: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 2999 (ii).
Public Accounts Rep., Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).
——— Presented (Mr. Fielding) 219 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Precedence on Monday: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3545 (ii).
Public Buildings in Ont., Total Cost and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1387 (i).
Public Expenditure, Criticism, on Financial Situation: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7851; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 7870 (i).
Public Lands or Public Domains, Sale or grant of to others than Settlers, O.C.'s, Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
Public Works and Hours of Labour: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Public Works, Preservation of Peace: *See* 'B. No. 136.'

PUBLIC WORKS :

Alexandra Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4018 (iii).
Allegash River, Diversion of Water : Ques. (Mr. Michaud) 6635 (iv).
Anderson and Kennedy Lakes, Clearing Outlets: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Annapolis, Queen's Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6017 (iv).
Anse du Cap Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).
Anse a L'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6083 (iv).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6019 (iv).
Baie St. Paul Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie Training Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Battleford Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Bay St. Lawrence Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Beaver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Belle River Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Belle River Pier, P.E.I., Extension, &c., Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 484 (i).
Belleville Drill Hall and Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4018 (iii), 7820 (iv).
——— Delays in Building: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1397 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1398 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2288 (ii).
——— Revetment Wall, Contract *re*, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1398 (i), 2632 (ii).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6094 (iv).
Big Lorraine Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Blance River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Bracebridge Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4035, 4599 (iii).
Brockville Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 4020 (iii).
Bronte Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
——— Generally, Clerks of Works, &c., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4043 (iii).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4035, 4599 (iii), 7822 (iv).
——— N.B., Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 4018, 4598 (iii).
——— Ont., Total Cost and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1387 (i).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (iii), 7820 (iv).
——— Sask., Alberta, and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii), 7823 (iv).
Burford Armoury, Contract *re* Coal Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1394 (i).
Calgary Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4036 (iii).
Campbellton Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Cap a la Roche, Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
Caraquet Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6074 (iv).
Champlain Market Property and G.T.P. Station, Building, Cor. &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 276 (i).
Charlesville Breakwater, Reps. and Papers *re* Building: M. for Copies* (Mr. Blain) 2840 (ii).
Charlo's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6020 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6095 (iv).
Chatham Armoury, Moneys due Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4048 (iii).
Chicago Drainage Canada, Diversion of Water from St. Lawrence Routes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 2577 (ii).
Chicoutimi Pier Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6096 (iv).
Chockfish River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6075 (iv).
Church Point Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Clam Point, Cape Sable Islands Canal, Access to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3188 (ii).
——— Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2836 (ii).
Clifton (Stonehaven) Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
Coal Supplies for Sorel, Form of Tenders, Procedure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 721 (i).
Colborne Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Contracts let by Govt. to Ottawa Contractors: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Cross Point Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6096 (iv).
——— Purchase of Lumber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Culloden Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6023 (iv).
Dalhousie Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Digby Harbour Improvements, Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6024 (iv).
Disraeli Wharf: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7827 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dominion Coal Co.'s Contract *re* Glace Bay Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
Dorchester Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6097 (iv).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Dredging, Mar. Provinces: in Com. of Sup., 7000 (iv).
Dredging for 1901-6, Names of Harbours, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2584 (ii).
Dunnville Drill Hall, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 474 (i).
Eastern Townships Counties, Public Works, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2838 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr Worthington) 2581 (ii).
Edmonton, Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 4036 (iii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Escoumains Pier Extension :in Com. of Sup., 6098 (iv).
Eskasoni Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Father Point Wharf and Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6099 (iv).
Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
'Fielding, W. S.,' Dredge, Construction and Cost of Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3187 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure at Pictou Harbour, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McLean, A. A.) 1798 (i).
Floor Oil used in Govt. Buildings, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5024 (iii).
Fraser River Improvements of Ship Channel and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Galt Post Office Building, Total Expenditure, Cost, Supervision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 719 (i).
'Galveston' Dredge, Date of Purchase, Cost of Transferrence, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 574 (i).
Gibson Creek, P.E.I., Water Pipe Laying, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2575 (ii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3973 (ii).
Glace Bay Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6032 (iv).
See 'Dom. Coal,' &c.
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup.: 6950 (iv).
Grand Etang Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iv).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (iv).
Grande Riviere de Beaupre Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Great Lake Dredging Co., Expenditure at Port Arthur and Fort William: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).
See 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Great Salmon River Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Greece's Point Wharf, Number of Steamers landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2574 (ii).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Building: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (iii).
——— Quarantine Station Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6109 (iv).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4020 (iii).
Gunning Cove Wharf, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2837 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Halifax Drill Hall Property : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1699 (i).
Hall's Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6042 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (iii).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6991, 7833 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6073, 7824 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6017 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 6932, 7833 (iv).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers; Public Works, for 1897-1906, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 2839 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii), 6083 (iv).
Higgin's Shore Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
Hudson's Bay, Deep Water Harbour, Govt. Action *re* Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2574 (ii).
Hull Wharf, Number of Steamers using in 1906: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2139 (ii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7823 (iv).
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6043 (iv).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6011 (iv).
Jeannette's Creek Wharf, Cost of Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
Jersey Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iv).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredges: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Kingston Barracks, Repairs to Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Kingston Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
Lachute Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
——— Delay *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1124 (i).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).
Lake St. François, Beauce, Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
Lake St. John Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6110 (iv).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6111 (iv).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Levis Military Forts, Clearing of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5655 (iii).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
Lindsay Drill Shed, Erection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 223 (i).
L'Isle d'Alma, Removal of Rocks; in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Little Current, North Channel, Georgian Bay Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6954 (iv).
London Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
London Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4022 (iii).
——— Improvements, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 7251 (iv).
Lotbiniere and Portneuf Counties, Wharfs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6114 (iv).
Mabou Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6114 (iv).
Magog Public Building, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2140 (ii).
Marble Mountain Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iv).
Marconi Tel. Co. and Contract with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1299 (i).
Marieville Post Office Building, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5085 (iii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Matchadash Bay, Dredging Contract: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6961 (iv).
Medicine Hat, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4039 (iii).
Midland Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).
Militia Drill Sheds: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4615 (iii).
Military Forts, Repairs, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
Miminegash Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
Mispec Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
'Montague', Dredge, Total Cost of Repairing: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2980 (ii).
——— Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3189 (ii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 4010 (iii).
Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site, Reps. in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2228 (ii).
Moose Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Mossy River, Man., Dredging: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (iii).
New Campbellton Wharf, Kelly's Cove: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).
New Carlisle Wharf Extension, Damage to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1395 (i).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Contract *re* Construction, Supervisor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1386 (i).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Nominingue Lakes Wharfs, Construction and Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2139 (ii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4023 (iii).
North East Harbour, N.S., Wharf, Letters, Reps. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 2840 (ii).
North Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).
North Rustico Harbour Breakwater, Rep. *re* Extension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 475 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Nouvelle Wharf, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Oak Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Old Man's River, Stream Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 7834 (iv).
Otonabee River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
——— Water Power, Leasing of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4612 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
——— Architects Plans *re* New Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
——— Eastern Block: in Com. of Sup., 3950 (ii).
——— Elevators, Attendance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
——— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3585 (ii).
——— Gas and Electric Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4608 (iii).
——— H. of C. Ventilation: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
——— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4602 (iii).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4605 (iii).
——— Steel Shelves and Fittings: in Com. of Sup., 4024 (iii).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
Ottawa, Mackenzie Avenue Properties, Purchase by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 235.
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Morin) 490 (i).
——— Purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 3617, 3951 (ii).
Ottawa, Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 4609 (iii).
Ottawa Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 3603 (ii).
Ottawa Museum: in Com. of Sup., 3616 (ii).
Ottawa Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 3581 (ii).
Ottawa Post Office, Date of Erection, Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1799 (i).
——— Date of Fire, Total Cost of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 1562 (i).
——— Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4608 (iii).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Damage by Fire: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1557 (i).
Ottawa Properties purchased by Govt., Amounts of Commission and Legal Expenses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 4053 (iii).
Ottawa, Rideau Hall, Conservatory: in Com. of Sup., 4607 (iii).
——— Conservatory, Collapse of Dome: Remarks (Mr. Ward) 1091 (i).
——— Expenditure on Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1554 (i).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa, Supreme Court Building: in Com. of Sup., 3625 (ii).
Owen Sound, Harbour Dredging and Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iv).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4025 (iii).
Panmure Island Wharf, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1559 (i).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Parkhill Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Parrsboro' Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Paspebiac Wharf, Damage to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1396 (i).
Percé Wharf, North Cove: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Peribonka River, Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 4025 (iii), 7822 (iv).
Petites Bergeronnes, Removal of Boulders: in Com. of Sup., 6115 (iv).
Petite Riviere Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).
Petit Rocher Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6077, 7825 (iv).
Phinney's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Pictou Harbour Dredging, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
——— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1613 (i).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, Engineer's Rep., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 230 (i).
Point Prim Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5023 (iii).
Pointes aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6116 (iv).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbours: in Com. of Sup., 5982 (iii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contracts, Charges by (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Conmee) 7898, 7919 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) referring to past debate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 7901, 7922 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour, Cor. *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 4666 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 490 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6965 (iv).
——— Contracts, Material purchased, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Marshall) 490 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
Port Daniel Pier, Contract *re* Construction, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 726 (i).
Porter's Lake Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Port Hood Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).
——— Breakwater, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3181 (ii).
Port Maitland Pier, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 474, 489 (i).
——— Dredging at Port Dalhousie Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Port Stanley Dock, Car Ferry Slip, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 1558 (i).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).
Postal Station, Pointe St. Charles: in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep : Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1841 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2824 (ii).
P.E.I. Dredging, Schedule, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 481 (i).
Quaco Harbour Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
Quebec East, Building: in Com. of Sup., 4012 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
——— Improvements *re* Ry. Terminus, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Robitaille) 2584 (ii).
Quebec Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4009, 4011 (iii).
——— Military Buildings, Arsenal: in Com. of Sup., 4012 (iii).
Rainy River Navigation, Obstructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1142 (i).
Red Head, N.S., Channel Cutting, Reps. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Gunn) 2840 (ii).
Red Island Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1927, 1987 (i).
Red River Bank Protection, West Selkirk: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
Red River, St. Andrews' Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iii).
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4040 (iii).
Renfrew Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Richibucto Harbour, Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Richibucto Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Richmond County Wharf, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1928 (i).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6120 (iv).
Riviere du Loup Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Riviere Ouelle Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Riviere a la Pipe, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Riviere aux Renards Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iv).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Rustico Harbour, Emplymt. of Tug Boat in 1904-5-6, Owner's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 571 (i).
St. Andrew's N.B., Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iv).
St. Anne des Monts Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 6128 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
St. Catharines Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4026 (iii).
St. Charles de Limoilou Wharf Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6130 (iv).
St. Clair River Dredging, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1927 (i).
St. Fulgence Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).
St. John River, Extension of Lincoln Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
——— Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6634 (iv).
St. John Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6081 (iv).
——— Recommendation of Transportation Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 233 (i).
St. John River, Tidal Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6079 (iv).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
St. Johns, Que., Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4015 (iii).
——— Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 4215 (iii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
St. Lawrence River Improvements, Total Expenditure, &c. Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2294 (ii).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4026 (iii).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3371 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Maurice River Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
St. Thomas Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4027 (iii).
St. Timothee and Grand Isle Road, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3838 (ii).
Sackville Wharf, N.B., Site and Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 2576 (ii).
Saguenay River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Saskatoon Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Dredging Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (iv).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4451 (iii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii.)
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4014 (iii).
——— Proposed Erection: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2579 (ii).
Shippigan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).
Stratford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Strathcona Horse Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Tatamagouche Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (iv).
Thames River, Deepening Channel, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
——— Wharfs at Mouth: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
See 'Jeannette's.'
Three Rivers, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4015 (iii).
——— Harbour, Deep Water Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 6134 (iv).
Toronto Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4031, 4598 (iii).
Toronto Harbour, Breakwater, (eastern entrance): in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
——— Commissioners and City of Toronto, Cor. *re* Dredging, Breakwater, Piers, &c., M. for Copies* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 240 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Toronto Harbour, Complaints and Pets. *re* Depth of Water: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897.
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
——— Works, Govtl. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 7 (i).
Toronto Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 224 (i).
Toronto Postal Branch, in Centre Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 4861 (iii).
Toronto Postal Station 'F': in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).
Trachoma Hospital, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Vancouver Post Office Building, Terms of Contract, Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 894 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1066 (i).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Victoria Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, P.E.I., Extent and Total Cost of Work done: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2979 (ii).
West Head, Cape Sable, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6067 (iv).
Westville Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
Wharfs and Docks, Ont., Govt. Assistance to Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Williams Head Quarantine Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6999 (iv).
Wingham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
——— O. Cs., Specifications, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1067 (i).
Winnipeg Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 4601 (iii).
——— O. Cs., Tenders, Specifications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6134 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com of Sup., 6067 (iv).
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4605 (iii).
Yukon Commissioner's Residence: in Com of Sup., 7824 (iv).
Yukon Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 714 (i).
Pullman Cars, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4208 (iii).
Pulp Wood: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2063 (ii).

Pulp Wood cut and made in Canada, Export Duty *re:* Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 888 (i).
Quaco Harbour Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
Quahaug Fishing Regulations in P.E.I., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1143 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Sask. Ry. &c. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Qu'Appelle Post Office, Change of Name, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6623 (iv).
Quebec and Rivière Ouelle SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7121 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co., Procedure *re* Business of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7008 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Quebec Canals, Purchase of Cement: in Com. of Sup., 5551 (iii).
Quebec Coal Co.'s Claim *re* Quebec Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 5947 (iii).
Quebec County Election and Speech of Mr. Aylesworth at Wiarton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 470 (i).
Quebec East Building: in Com. of Sup., 4012 (iii).
Quebec Garrison, Permanent Force, Recruits from England: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Quebec Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
——— Improvements *re* Ry. Terminals, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Robitaille) 2584 (ii).
Quebec Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (iii).
——— Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
Quebec-Levis Ferry Service, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6256 (iv).
Quebec Military Buildings, Arsenal: in Com. of Sup., 4012 (iii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'
Quebec Oriental Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Quebraco: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Queens-Shelburne Election, Apptmnt. of Lighthouse Keepers as Scrutineers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 236 (i).
Queens and Shelburne Election Petition, Rep. of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in debate on Govt. Officials, &c., 6677 (iv).
——— Ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Stockton) 207 (i).
Quibell, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt., Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2832 (ii).
Quinte Bass Pond, Expenditures for 1904-6, Amounts paid to J. Hurley: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3426 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re:* Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3185 (ii).
Quinze and Blanche River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Rys. and Canals Act (damages to canal property) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Ry. Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, 62, 75, 100.'
Railway Act Amt. Bill (Mr. W. F. Maclean) Remarks, 222 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Ry. Act (fencing) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Ry. Belt in B.C., Boundary of: *See* 'B. No. 102.'
Ry. Commission and Counsel: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Railway Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Railway Committee Meetings, Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Shirking Vote: Personal Explanation (Mr. Clements) 4387 (iii).
Railways, Minister of (Hon. H. R. Emmerson) Resignation: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5554 (iii).

RAILWAYS:

B.C. Railway Belt, Sales or Lease of Timber Lands from 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1149 (i).
Brunet, A., Remuneration *re* G. T. P. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Land Grants, Subsidies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2584 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Reserve, Selection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6010 (iv).
C.P.R., Coal Lands, selected by Govt., Conditions of Sale of Coal to Public: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3883 (ii).
——— Crow's Nest Line, Agreement *re* Carriage of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4666 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Appeal to Judicial Com., Refusal of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3368 (ii), 4665 (iii).
——— Subways at Calgary, Order from Ry. Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2289 (ii).
Charing Cross Station, Closing of by Michigan Central Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 1107 (i).
Dillinger, Mr., Investigation *re* Car Shortage: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7252, 7310 (iv).
Drummond Counties Ry., Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iv).
Express Companies, Control of by Ry. Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 473 (i).
Freight Tariff Rates, Local and General, upon Canadian and Foreign Products: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 724 (i).
Govt. Rys., Running Rights, &c., Proposals *re:* Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5780 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry.: *See* main heading.
G. T. Ry., Accounts furnished to Inspector General: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 5027 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

G. T. Ry., Collision at Richmond, Trial of Atkinson, Rep., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 2839 (ii).

——— Payments to by Govt., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 1470 (i).

——— 2-cent a Mile Rate: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Ways and Means, 4371 (iii).

——— Use and Conditions of Rolling Stock of G. T. P.: Ques.(Mr. Lennox) 5656 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Knowles) 3548 (ii).

Madoc-Eldorado Ry. Subsidy, Payments to G. T. Ry., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 614, 950, 1064, 1130 (i).

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Tracks on Mill St., Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7984 (iv).

N. T. Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P.'

Passenger Tickets on Rys. Sale Bill, Change in Rev. Statutes: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7309 (iv).

Pere Marquette Ry., Litigation *re* Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Port Hawkesbury Junction Ry. Station, Cor. with Ry. Dept., &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. McLennan) 3373 (ii).

Port Hope and Charlotte Car Ferry Service: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Ward) 7579 (iv).

Praught, Ed., Claims for Compensation *re* Damage on P. E. I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4456 (iii).

P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 7665 (iv).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 614 (i).

See main heading.

Railways: in Com. of Sup., 7521 (iv).

Railway Blockade in Northwest: Letters read (Mr. McCraney) 6521 (iv).

Railway Commission, Staff and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 1119 (i).

——— Deptl. Printing and Advertising, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1563 (i).

Railway Fares to Northwest, Rate to Immigrants from Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).

Railway Grievances: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4847 (iii).

Railway Rates on Commodities through Canada or to Foreign Countries, or G. B., on all Transportation Lines: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 742 (i).

Railway Strikes, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 3188 (ii).

Railway Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 7126 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Railway Tariffs, upon Commodities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 503 (i).

Sparks Estate, Settlement *re* Ry. Terminals: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 710 (i).

Subsidies to Railways: Res. proposed, 7126 (iv).

Temiscaming and North Ontario Ry., Cor. *re* Subsidy Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 239 (i).

Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2295; Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2324 (ii).

Wallace Quarries, Branch Ry., Govt. Aid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2582 (ii).

Rainy River Navigation, Obstructions *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1142 (i).

Reardon, Mr. F., Wages paid to Painters in Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4218 (iii).

Record Foundry Co., Purchases of Scrap Iron from I.C.R., Amounts paid. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 802 (i).

Red Head, N.S., Channel Cutting, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Gunn) 2840 (ii).

Red Island, Dredging Sand Bar, Coal Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1927, 1987 (ii).

Red Island, near Rivière du Loup, Loss of Sailors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gauvreau) 941 (i)

Red River, Bank Protection, West Selkirk: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).

——— St. Andrews' Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iii).

Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4040 (iii).

Regina Post Office, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 1555 (i).

Registered Letters, Number carried during 1907: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3186 (ii).

Registration Fees on Letters, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 3185 (ii).

Renfrew Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).

Repatriation of Canadians, Agents' Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1058 (i).

Reports: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1091, 1184 (i).

Representation of Alberta and Saskn.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'

Representation in H. of C. from Mar. Provs. Amt. to B.N.A. Act: Prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 2147 (ii).

Residential Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 28 and 161.'

'Resolute' Str., Wreck and Life Saving Apparatus, Complaints *re:* Remarks (Mr. Kemp) on M. *re* Life Saving, &c., P.E.I., 934 (i).

Returns, Delay in bringing down, *re* Public Accounts: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 2762 (ii).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1856 (i), 2479, 3625 (ii) 5890 (iii) 7519, 7985 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 4119 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2206, 3461 (ii).
——— Inquiry for *re* Pub. Accounts Com. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3889 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 582 (i).
Returns, Preparation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1091 (i).
Revised Statutes: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Revised Statutes, Schedule 'A': *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Revised Statutes, Advance Copies sent to Persons, Corporations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2578 (ii).
Revised Statutes, Copy laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 1470 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1382 (i).
Revised Statutes, Distribution to Members: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 481 (i).
——— Distribution of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1614 (i).
——— Distribution to P.E.I. Libraries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2138 (ii).
——— French Edition, Delay in Distribution: Ques. (Mr. C. R. Devlin) 2577 (ii).
——— French Translation, Delay, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3183 (ii).
——— Names of Persons entitled to Copies: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1801 (i).
——— Translation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7972 (iv).
——— Typographical Errors: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5287 (iii).
Rice, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1858 (i).
Rice, Sago, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4143 (iii).
Richelieu Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5083 (iii).
Richibucto Harbour, Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Richibucto Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Richmond County Wharf, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1928 (i).
Rideau Canal, Reserve from Jones' Falls to Kingston, Lease of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6903 (iv).
——— Letters from Farmers in District: Read (Mr. Taylor) 6912 (iv).
——— Mr. J. O'Toole's Claim: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Tug-Boat: in Com. of Sup., 7669 (iv).
Rideau Hall, Conservatory: in Com. of Sup., 4607 (iii).
——— Collapse of Dome: Remarks (Mr. Ward) 1091 (i).
Rideau Hall, Expenditure on Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1554 (i).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Entries: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 223 (i).
Rifle Matches, Payment of Ry. Fares by Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 739 (i).
Rifle Ranges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Contract *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 485 (i).
Rifle Ranges, Victoria County, Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 224 (i).
Riley, James, Supt. of Pilots, Certificate and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3641 (ii).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6120 (iv).
Rivière du Loup, I.C.R., Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1132 (i).
Rivière du Loup Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Rivière à la Pipe Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Rivière aux Renards Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6121 (iv).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Application by C.P.R. for Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1138 (i).
——— Application for Lands, &c., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 491 (i).
——— Application of E. H. Cuthbertson and G. T. Robbins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).
——— Constitution of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1139 (i).
——— Date of Authorization, Plans filed, Water Rights, Constitution of Incorporated Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1060 (i).
——— Grants of Lands, &c., in Alberta, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
——— Plans, Open for Examination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).
——— Sale of Land to, O.Cs., Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 240 (i).
——— J. Stewart's Rep. *re* Character of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2143 (ii).
See 'Southern Alberta.'
Rochon, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4860 (iii).
Rock Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7664 (iv).
——— Number used in U.S. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7007 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iv).
Roofing, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2127 (ii).
Roofing Slate, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4192 (iii).
Ross Rifles, Abandonment by N. W. Mounted Police, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 614 (i).
——— Accidents in N.W. Mounted Police, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4051 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Accidents, &c., at St. John, N.B., Rep. *re:* Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4050 (iii).
——— Adoption of Bayonet, Pattern, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2580 (ii).
——— Amounts paid for Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4213 (iii).
——— Amounts paid to Sir Chas. Ross and Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 5025 (iii).
——— Contracts with Govt. and Customs Dept.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 2147 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt. *re* Supplies, Dealings, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Worthington) 727 (i).
——— Contract with Messrs Billings & Spencer &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1395 (i).
——— Criticisms *re* Defects: on M. for Sup., (Mr. S. Hughes) 3732 (ii).
——— Date of First Issue to Canadian Militia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4452 (iii).
——— Defects, Reports from Officers *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4273 (iii).
——— Defects *re*: Ques. of Privilege, (Mr. Sam. Hughes) 5026 (iii).
——— Defects, &c.: Remarks Mr. J. D. Reid, &c., in Com. of Sup., 5748 (iii).
——— Factory, Erection of, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1977 (i).
——— Imported Parts from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2833 (ii).
——— Inspection Commissions, &c., Reps. &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Worthington) 1398 (i).
——— and Mounted Police, Question *re*: Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 572 (i).
——— Number delivered, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1126 (i).
——— Number purchased and Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 222 (i).
——— Pattern inspected by Commissioners of 1901: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4216 (iii).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3277 3546 (ii).
——— Ret., Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 3626 (ii).
——— Snider-Enfield, &c., Chief Differences, Reps. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 4053 (iii).
Rougemont Senatorial Apptmnt. Cor. *re*: M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies*, 6010 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) 7011 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Ames) 7518 (iv).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Routhier, Mr. Justice, Retirement of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 4856 (iii).
Royal Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 5764 (iii).
Royal Scots Armoury. in Com. of Sup., 5765 (iii).
Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Royal Visit of Prince Arthur of Connaught, Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6901 (iv).
Rubenstein Bros., Contracts *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3588 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, between Can. and U.S., Cor. Reps. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2840 (ii).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Rustico Harbour, Emplymt. of Tug Boat in 1904-5-6, Owner's Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 571 (i).
Rye, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1859 (i).
St. Andrews, N.B., Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6080 (iv).
St. Andrews Rapids, Tenders, Specifications, Plans, &c.: for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1067 (i).
St. Anne des Monts Harbour, in Com. of Sup., 6128 (iv).
St. Ann's Island, St. Clair District, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 6016 (iv).
St. Antoine's Island, Lease, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
St. Catharines Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4026 (iii).
St. Charles Post Office, Compensation to Postmistress, *re* Fire Losses: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 1612 (i).
St. Charles de Limoilou Wharf Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6130 (iv).
St. Charles de Caplin Refrigerator Association, Rep. *re* Bait Freezing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6904 (iv).
St. Clair River Dredging, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1927 (i).
Ste. Flavie Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1132 (i).
St. François Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 6130 (iv).
St. Fulgence Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Judgeship. Apptmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1300 (i), 1991, 2229 (ii).
St. John, N.B., and Digby SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
St. John, &c. and Yarmouth SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7118 (iv).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7116 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6081 (iv).
——— Improvements, Recommendation of Transportation Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 233 (i).

St. John, N.B., Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5769 (iii).
——— Increased Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7663 (iv).
St. John River, N.B., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6634 (iv).
——— Extension of Lincoln Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
St. John River Sewerage, Pollution at Fredericton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6017 (iv).
St. John River, Tidal Waters Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6079 (iv).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).
St. John, W. Indies and S. America, SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7117 (iv).
St. Johns, Que., Conduit, Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iv).
——— Customs Collector, Transfer of Dr. H. W. Woods: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3636 (ii).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Military Barracks, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 4215 (iii).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 4015 (iii).
St. Joseph de Lévis, Military Cabins, Burning of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 5656 (iii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
——— at Cap Charles, Pet. from Pilots *re* Widening and grounding of SS. 'Victorian': Ques. (Mr. Monk) 573 (i).
——— Dredging at Cap à la Roche, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 575 (i).
——— Pilots, Number in Ocean SS. Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4456 (iii).
——— River Improvements, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2294 (ii).
St. Leon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
St. Louis, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3639 (ii).
St. Mary's and Western Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
St. Mary's Electoral Division, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 468 (i).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4926 (iii).
St. Mary River Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
St. Mary's River Dredging, Tenders *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3371 (ii).
St. Maurice River Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Ste. Perpetue Station, I.C.R., Duties of Agent: Ques. (Mr. C. Devlin) 2344 (ii).
St. Pierre and Miquelon Immigrants, Arrival of: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 4855 (iii).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1134 (i).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7522 (iv).
St. Thomas Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4027 (iii).
St. Timothée and Grand Isle Road, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3838 (ii).
St. Timothée Post Office, Investigation *re* Mismangament: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2828 (ii).
Sackville Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Sackville Wharf, N.B., Site and Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 2576 (ii).
Safety Valve Co., Adoption of Patent, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 2834 (ii).
Sago: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1859 (i).
Saguenay River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Salmon River and Hectanooga Mail Service, Tenders *re:* Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4611 (iii).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Circulars *re:* Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 4453 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 6749 (iv).
See 'Immigration from Eastern Canada.'
San José Scale, Suppression of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 2759 (ii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Representation B. No. 51 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier): M. to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 4928 (iii).
Saskatchewan, Representation: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Saskatchewan Valley and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Complaints *re* Taxation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3368 (ii).
——— Date of Homestead Entries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2139 (ii).
——— and Section 2 of Twp. 25, Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 485 (i).
Saskatoon Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (iii).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Mr. Fielding) 7125 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, Dredging Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
Saunders, Mr. B. J., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 482 (i).
Scalping of Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
School Lands Exchange: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 5960 (iii), 7684 (iv).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (iv).
Scrap Iron, Sale of to H. J. Garson, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3839 (ii).
Scrap Metal at Moncton Fire, Sale of, I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3838 (ii).
Sea Weed Industry at Isle Verte, Tax collected *re:* Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5655 (iii).

Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7780 (iv).
Seeds, Branch of Dept. of Agriculture, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1139 (i).
Seed Grain to Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iv).
Seedsmen Reports from Govt., Complaints *re:* Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1140 (i).
Seeds, Timothy and Clover: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4144 (iii).
Selkirk, Lord, Estate and Hudson Bay Co.'s Land Deeds, in Possession of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5505 (iii).
——— Land Registers of Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 5287 (iii).
See 'Hudson's Bay,' &c.
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
Senate Appointment, Par. in 'L'Evenement': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Gauvreau) 5889 (iii).
Senate Reform, Res. of Liberals in 1893: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3184 (ii).
Senators, New, Appmnt. of: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1564 (i).
Senators, Appmnt. of from N.B., Residential Qualifications, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) on M. for Ways and Means, 1645 (i).
Senators, Appointment of, Rumour *re:* Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 1381, 1473 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 708 (i).
Senatorship for Rougemont, Apptmnt. of Mr. Dessaulles, Rep. *re* Stmnt. of Mr. Girard: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4657; Par. in Montreal 'Gazette': Read (Mr. Taylor) 4662 (iii).
Servis Tie Plate Co., I.C.R., Amounts paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2835 (ii).
Settlement Duties in New Ottawa, Sask., &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 236 (i).
Settlers' Effects: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4451 (iii).
Shelburne, N.S., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
——— Range Lights, Complaints *re* Location: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2836 (ii).
Shephard, Mr. Arthur, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3369 (ii).
Shepard, C. A., Rentals *re* Engine and Pile driver, Cor. &c. (read): in Com. of Sup., 6967 (iv).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4014 (iii).
——— Proposed Erection: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2579 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).
Shipping Act: *See* 'B. No. 175'.
Signal Service between Montreal and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
Simcoe County Judge, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Conmee) 3638 (ii).
Simcoe County Judge, Par. in 'Northern Advance': Personal Explanation (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4368 (iii).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4028
Six Nation Reserve Schools, Change in Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 478 (i).
Slate Quarries and Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1053 (i).
Sleeping Car Cos. and Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 6'.
Smith, Geo. E., Co's Patent: *See* 'B. No. 10'.
Smith, Lt. Col. H., and Medals Board, Payment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7248 (iv).
Smith, Mr. Obed, Charges *re* Land Sales and Fraudulent Representations: on M. for Ways and Means (Mr. Northrup) 4219; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 4240; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 94) 4262 (iii).
Sol. Gen., Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1796 (i).
——— Delay in Apptmnt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 841 (i).
——— Inconvenience *re* Vacancy: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2981 (ii).
Songhees Indian Reserves, Negotiations for, Instructions, &c. to Mr. Pedley *re* Investigation: M. for Papers* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6132 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Cascade Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Electrical Staff Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7535, 7666 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
——— Lockmen: in Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).
——— Manny's Gate Bars: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii).
South African War, and B.C. Soldiers, Names, &c.: (M. for Ret.*) 3373 (ii).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7311 (iv).
——— Land Grants, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 730 (i).
——— Land Grants, Terms and Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4665 (iii).
S. A. War, P.E.I. Volunteers, Memorial *re* Land Grants: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7542 (iv).
Southern Alberta Land Co.: and Robbins Irrigation Co.: Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to Com. of Sup., 2941; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2638, Neg. (Y. 53; N. 86) 2725 (ii).
See 'Robbins,'' &c.
Southport Postmaster, P.E.I., Age, &c., Loss of Registered Letters: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7250 (iv).

'Sovinto' Ship, Wreck of, Rep. *re* Special Train *re* Life-Boats: Ques. (Mr. J J. Hughes) 1064 (i).
——— Request to Govt. for Life-Boats of Govt. Strs.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 711 (i).
Spain, O. G. V., Relief of: *See* 'B. 104.'
Sparks Estate, Settlement *re* Ry. Terminals: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 710 (i).
Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3: M. for Considn. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
——— Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6 (i).
Spirits, Customs and Excise Duty in Can. and U.S.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1057 (i).
Spirits, Denatured for Power Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 223 (i).
See 'Denatured,' &c.
Spirits in Bond, Two-Year Maturing, Amt. *re* Application and Consolidated Revenue Act of 1882, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Robitaille) 802 (i).
Spirits, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2106 (ii).
Spohn, Dr., Apptmnt. to Senate, Promise *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4659 (iii).
Springs and Axles for Vehicles: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4429 (iii).
Springhill Coal Strike: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5863 (iii).
Stallions, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2413 (ii).
Standard Chemical Co., O.Cs., &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies (Mr. Robitaille) 725 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 7520 (iv).
Standing Orders, Sel. Com., 7th Rep.: M. (Mr. Grant) to conc., 6376 (iv).
See 'Committees,' &c.
'Stanley' and 'Minto' Strs., Instructions *re* P.E.I. Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2293 (ii).
Stanley, N.B., Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. J. Rogers: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7542 (iv).
Starch: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1361 (i).
Starch, Potato Flour, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4143 (iii).
Statute Law in Saskn. and Alta.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Steamship Contracts, Bonuses paid in 1906, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Steel Bowls, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2135 (ii).
Steel Shafting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4209 (iii).
Steel Shelves, and Fittings, Ottawa Building: in Com. of Sup., 4024 (iii).
Steel used in Cutlery, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4430 (iii).
Steel Wire: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation: I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Stockton, Mr. A. A., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4757 (iii).
Stonefield Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1125 (i).
Stoves imported from Western Canada, Number and Value of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2293 (ii).
Stove Urns: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4419 (iii).
Stratford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Strathcona Horse Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).
'Strathmore,' Str., Wreck of, Investigation into: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1383 (i).
Stratton, Ira, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6012 (iv).
Strikes in Coal Mines and Public Utilities: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Strikes in Industrial Concerns, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5862 (iii).
See 'Labour.'
Strubb, Chas., Amount purchased by Marine Dept., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).
Structural Steel for Cars, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Sub-Marine Signals for Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).
Subsidies, &c.: *See* 'Provincial.'
Subsidies to Railways: Res. proposed, 7126 (iv).
Subsidies to Railways: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Sub-Target Gun Co., Cor., O.Cs., with Militia Dept., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 726 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).
——— M. to ref. Papers to Pub. Accounts Com., (Mr. Foster) 3887 (ii), 3977 (iii).
Sub-Target Machine Guns, Purchase and Distribution, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 225 (i).
Sugar, 16 Dutch Standard: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4149 (iii).
Sugar Duties, above No. 16 Dutch Standard, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1049 (i).
Sugar Duties, Total Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1049 (i).
Sugar Imports from Fiji Islands, Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4455 (iii).
Sugar imported, Names of Countries, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 568 (i).
Summers, E. W., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Sunday Legislation, Legal Expenses of R. U. Macpherson: in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 96, 141 and 179.'
Supply (Interim) Bill, Announcement (Mr. Fielding) 5284 (iii).
Supply: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 218 (i).

SUPPLY:
Committee:
Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice'.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Animals, Health, 7815 (iv).
Archives, 2958 (ii).
Census and Statistics, 2962 (ii), 7810 (iv).
Cold Storage, 7815 (iv).
Electric Ry. Track, Ottawa Farm, 7818.
Exhibitions, 6900, 7818 (iv).
Experimental Farms, 7810 (iv).
Fumigating Stations, 2974 (ii).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 2977 (ii).
Year Book, 2971 (ii).
Civil Government:
Auditor General's Office, 2764 (ii).
Contingencies:
Post Office, 6620 (iv).
Customs, 2765 (ii).
Finance, 7690 (iv).
Gov. Gen's. Sec.'s Office, 2763 (ii), 7685 (iv).
High Commissioner's Office, 2958 (ii), 7692 (iv).
Indian Affairs, 2957 (ii).
Inland Revenue, 2822 (ii).
Interior, 2957 (ii).
Justice, 7689 (iv).
Labour, 2958 (ii), 6619, 7692 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries, 2822 (ii), 5765 (iii). 7678 (iv).
Militia and Defence, 7686 (iv).
Post Office, 2770 (ii), 7691 (iv).
Privy Council Office, 2764 (ii).
Public Works, 2824 (ii).
Customs :
Gratuity to John Bain, 5977 (iii).
Gratuity to John McDougald, 5979 (iii).
Salaries, Contingent Expenses, &c., 5973 (iii).
Dominion Lands:
Gratuity to Mrs. Thomas Young, 6245 (iv).
Salaries, Outside Service, 6244 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 6243, 7257 (iv).
Timber Protection, 7265 (iv).
Dominion Police, 6761, 6900 (iv).
Excise :
Methylated Spirits, 6626 (iv).
Provisional Allowances, 6626 (iv).
Stamps for Tobacco, 6630, 7294 (iv).
Weights and Measures :
Inspectors' Salaries, &c., 6626 (iv).
Salaries *re* Light Inspection, 6627 (iv).
Fisheries :
Can. Fisheries Exhibit, 5908 (iii).
Cold Storage for Bait, 5910 (iii).
Dog-fish, Reduction Work *re*, 5920 (iii).
Expenses of Fishery Commissions, 5941, 5971 (iii).
Fish-breeding Establishments, 5892 (iii).
Fish Curing Establishments, 5923 (iii).
Fish Transportation, &c., 5932 (iii).
Legal Services *re* Provl. Claims, 5970 (iii).
Marine Biological Stations, 5932 (iii).
Oyster Culture, 5909 (iii).
Protection Service, 5905, 5960 (iii).
Cruiser for B.C., 5906 (iii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 5890 (iii).
Geological Survey :
Boring for Minerals, &c., 3159 (ii).
Engraving Maps, &c., 3163 (ii).
General Vote, 3159 (ii).
Nicolas, F., Salary, 3163 (ii).
Translation, &c., 3166 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 3167 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Govt. of Northwest Territories :
General Vote, 7272 (iv).
Salary, F. W. White, 7273 (iv).
Govt. of the Yukon Territory :
General Vote, 6249, 7278 (iv).
Immigration :
Agents' Salaries, &c., 6706, 7277 (iv).
C. F. Just's Salary, 6242 (iv).
Deporting Immigrants, 7278 (iv).
Freight Blockade in N.W., Relief, 7278 (iv)
Indians :
British Columbia :
Babine Investigation, 7286, 7293 (iv).
Industrial Schools, 7291 (iv).
Generally :
Supt. N.S., 7293 (iv).
Timber Inspector, Georgian Bay, 7294 (iv).
New Brunswick:
Relief, &c., 7291 (iv).
Ontario and Quebec:
General Vote, 7286 (iv).
Grant to Mississaguas, 7292 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 7291 (iv).
Relief, &c., 7279, 7288 (iv).
Yukon:
Grant to Godefrey Madore, M.D., 7293.
Justice:
Supreme Court, 7693 (iv).
Yukon:
Judges' Allowances, 7968 (iv).
Legislation:
Generally, Printing, &c., 6763 (iv).
House of Commons:
Generally, 6900 (iv).
Promotion of Third Class Clerk, 7972 (iv).
Translators, 7972 (iv).
Library, 6763 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 5867 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, 5869 (iii).
Bookkeeping Reorganization, 5947 (iii), 7678 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5867 (iii).
Marconi Telegraph Stations, 5874 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 5864 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:
Can. and Australia, 7121 (iv).
Can. and G. B., 7106 (iv).
Can. and Mexico, 7122 (iv).
Can. and South Africa, 7119 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Campbellton, &c., 7120 (iv).
Halifax and Nfld., 7118 (iv).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 7116 (iv).
Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 7118 (iv).
Montreal to Manchester, 7118 (iv).
Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin, 7122 (iv).
P. E. I. and G. B., 7118 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 7118 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Canso, &c, 7120 (iv).
Quebec and River Ouelle, &c., 7121 (iv).
St. John and Digby, 7116 (iv).
St. John and Dublin and Belfast, 7116 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow, 7116 (iv).
St. John and Halifax, 7118 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and London, 7116 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies, &c.—*Con.*
St. John, Hfx., and W. I. and South America, 7117 (iv).
Sydney and Whycocomagh, 7120 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco, 7117 (iv).
Marine Hospitals:
Care of Sick Seamen, 5880 (iii).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 5735, 5765 (iii).
Clothing, &c., 5740 (iii).
Contingencies, 5763 (iii).
Customs Dues, 5765 (iii).
Dom. Arsenal, 5764 (iii).
General Vote, 7981 (iv).
Military Properties, 5736, 5765 (iii).
Ordnance, &c., 5764 (iii).
Pay and Allowance, 5647 (iii).
Provisions and Supplies, 5763 (iii).
Royal Military College, 5763 (iii).
Salaries and Wages, 5736 (iii).
Surveys, 5723 (iii).
Miscellaneous:
Banff Park, 7273, 7279 (iv).
Bell Telephone Dispute, Toronto, 6620 (iv).
Colonial Conference, Expenses, 7982 (iv).
Compensation to R. Wainwright, 6901 (iv).
Insurance Commission, 6280, 6379 (iv).
Printing of Evidence, 7972 (iv).
Jamaica Earthquake, Relief, 2726 (ii).
Labour Dept., 3579 (ii).
'Labour Gazette,' 6618 (iv).
Litigation *re* Pere Marquette Ry., Alien Labour Act, 6620 (iv).
Litigation, 7274 (iv).
Litigation, Dom. and Ont. and Quebec, 7971 (iv).
Maps, Engraving, &c., 7275 (iv).
Pacific Cable, 7971 (iv).
Revised Statutes, 7972 (iv).
Sunday Legislation, Expenses *re*, 6902 (iv).
Visit of Prince Arthur of Connaught, 6901 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, &c., 7274 (iv).
Mounted Police:
Compensation for Injuries, 7837 (iv).
General Vote, 7834 (iv).
Ocean and River Service:
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, 5766, 5946.
Naval Militia, 5773 (iii).
Patrol Boat, Northern Canada, 5772, 5946 (iii).
Quebec Coal Co.'s Claim, 5946 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, &c., 5767 (iii) 7678 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, 5771 (iii).
Penitentiaries:
General Vote, 7971 (iv).
Post Office:
Mail Service, 3141 (ii).
Miscellaneous, 3158 (ii), 7982 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances, 3141 (ii).
Yukon Territory, 3158 (ii).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Astronomical Observatory, 3580, 3588 (ii).
Eastern Deptl. Block, Addition, 3616, 3950 (ii).
New Deptl. Buildings, Site, 3617, 3951 (ii).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 3605 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Capital—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Rideau Hall, Improvements, 3615 (ii).
Royal Mint, 3603 (ii).
Supreme Court Library, 3625 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 3616 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Manitoba:
St. Andrew's Rapids, 6000 (iii).
Ontario:
Port Arthur, &c., 5982 (iii).
Quebec:
Cap à la Roche, Plant, 5776 (iii).
Quebec Harbour, 5979 (iii).
River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5773 (iii).
Signal Service, Montreal and Quebec, 5776 (iii).
Transportation Facilities:
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, &c., 6001 (iii); 7819 (iv).
Port Colborne, 6004 (iii).
St. Mary's Current, 6001 (iii).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Fernie, Public Building, 4042 (iii).
Ladysmith, Public Building, 4042 (iii).
New Westminster, 4042 (iii).
Vancouver, Public Building, 4042 (iii).
Generally:
Experimental Farms, Buildings, &c., 4044 (iii).
Salaries, Resident Clerks of Works, 4043 (iii).
Manitoba:
Brandon Drill Hall, 4035 (iii).
Dauphin, Public Buildings, 7822 (iv).
Neepawa, Public Buildings, 4599 (iii).
St. Boniface, Public Buildings, 4600.
Selkirk, Public Buildings, 4600 (iii).
Winnipeg, New Immigration Building, 4600 (iii).
——— New Post Office, 4601 (iii).
——— Postal Station, 4602 (iii).
New Brunswick:
General Vote, 3974 (ii).
Nova Scotia:
Antigonish, Public Building, 3973 (ii).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 3973 (ii).
Inverness, Public Building, 3974 (ii).
Shelburne, Public Building, 3974 (ii).
Westville, Public Building, 3974 (ii).
Ontario:
Alexandria, Public Building, 4018 (iii).
Belleville Armoury, 4018 (iii), 7820 (iv)
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 4019 (iii).
Guelph Armoury, 4020 (iii).
Hamilton, Drill Hall, 4021 (iii).
——— Post Office, 4021 (iii).
Kingston Military Buildings, 4022 (iii), 7820 (iv).
Leamington, Public Building, 7820 (iv).
London, Military Buildings, 4022 (iii).
——— Post Office, 4022 (iii).
North Bay, Public Building, 4023 (iii).
Ottawa, Deptl. Buildings, 4023 (iii, 7820 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 4025 (iii)
Parkhill, Building, 7822 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Peterborough, Armoury, 4025 (iii), 7822 (iv).
Renfrew, Public Building, 7822 (iv).
St. Catharines, Public Building, 4026 (iii).
St. Mary's Public Building, 4026 (iii).
St. Thomas, Drill Hall, 4027 (iii).
Simcoe, Public Building, 4028 (iii).
Stratford Armoury, 4028 (iii).
Toronto, Customs House, 4028 (iii).
——— Drill Hall, 4031, 4598 (iii).
——— Military Buildings, 4031 (iii).
——— Post Office, 4035 (iii).
Wingham, Public Building, 7822 (iv).
Quebec :
Grosse Isle, 4009 (iii).
Immigrant Buildings, 4009 (iii).
Lachute, Public Building, 4010 (iii).
Levis, Public Building, 4010 (iii).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 4010 (iii).
——— Post Office, 7820 (iv).
——— Postal Station, 4011 (iii).
——— Postal Station, Pt. St. Charles, 7820 (iv).
Nicolet, Public Building, 4011 (iii).
Quebec, Immigration Buildings, &c., 4011 (iii).
——— Military Buildings, 4012 (iii).
St. John's Military Buildings, 4012, 4015 (iii).
Sherbrooke, Drill Hall, 4014 (iii).
Three Rivers, Drill Hall, 4015 (iii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta :
Alameda Land Office, 4035 (iii).
Barracks for Permanent Corps, 4035 (iii).
Battleford, Public Building, 7823 (iv).
Calgary, Public Building, 4036 (iii).
Edmonton, Public Buildings, 4036 (iii), 7823 (iv).
Humboldt, Public Building, 7823 (iv).
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 4039.
Regina, Post Office, &c., 4040 (iii).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 4041 (iii).
Yukon :
Commissioner's Residence, Dawson, 7824 (iv).
Rents, repairs, &c.:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, &c., 4605 (iii).
Ottawa, Public Buildings:
——— Elevators, 4609 (iii).
——— Gas and Electric Light, 4609 (iii).
——— Heating, 4608 (iii).
——— Repairs, Ventilation, &c., 4602 (iii).
——— Telephones, 4609 (iii).
——— Major's Hill Park, 4609 (iii).
——— Post Office, 4608 (iii).
——— Rideau Hall, 4607 (iii).
Yukon, Buildings, Rents, &c., 4605 (iii)
Dredging :
Maritime Provs., 7000 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Anderson, &c., Lakes, 6996 (iv).
Columbia River, 6996 (iv).
Coquitlam River, 6996 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
British Columbia—*Con.*
Fraser River, 6997 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, 6997 (iv).
Williams Head Station, 6999 (iv).
Manitoba:
General Vote, 6991 (iv).
Red River, Bank Protection, 7833 (iv).
New Brunswick:
Campbellton, Wharf Extension, 6073.
Caraquet Wharf, 6074 (iv).
Chockfish, Improvement, 6075 (iv).
Clifton, Breakwater, 6076 (iv).
Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, 6076 (iv).
Dorchester, Wharf, 7824 (iv).
Dover, Wharf, 7824 (iv).
Great Salmon River, 7824 (iv).
Lincoln, Wharf, 7824 (iv).
Mispec, Breakwater, 6076 (iv).
North Head Breakwater, 6076 (iv).
Oak Point, Wharf, 6077 (iv).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 6077, 7825 (iv).
Quaco Harbour, 6077 (iv).
Richibucto, 7825 (iv).
River St. John, including tributaries, 6077 (iv).
River St. John, Wharfs, 6079 (iv).
St. Andrews, Dredging, 6080 (iv).
St John Harbour, 6081 (iv).
Shippegan Harbour, 6082 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
Annapolis, Repairs, 6017 (iv).
Baddeck, Wharf, 6019 (iv).
Bay St. Lawrence Boat Harbour, 6020 (iv).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging, 6020 (iv).
Charlo's Cove, Breakwater, 6020 (iv).
Church Point, Extension of Groyne, 6021 (iv).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Repairs, 6022 (iv).
Culloden, Breakwater, 6023 (iv).
Digby, Harbour Improvements, 6024 (iv).
Eskasoni, Wharf, 6029 (iv).
Glass Bay, Assistance towards Harbour Improvements, 6032 (iv).
Grand Etang, Repairs, Protection Works, 6037 (iv).
Half Island Cove, Breakwater, 6041 (iv).
Hall's Harbour, 6042 (iv).
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines, Harbour, 6043 (iv).
Jersey Cove, Wharf, 6048 (iv).
Mabou, Repairs, 6050 (iv).
Marble Mountain, Wharf, 6050 (iv).
Middle Country Harbour, Wharf, 6051 (iv).
Moose Harbour, Breakwater, 6052 (iv).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 6053 (iv).
Parker's Cove, Improvements, 6054 (iv).
Parrsboro', Harbour, 6054 (iv).
Petite Rivière, Improvements, 6056 (iv).
Pinney's Cove, Breakwater, 6057 (iv).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 6057 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel, 6057 (iv).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 6059 (iv).
Port Hood Harbour, 6063 (iv).
Round Hill Wharf, 6065 (iv).
Scotch Cove, Breakwater, 6066 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Wharf, 6066 (iv).
West Head, Wharf, 6067 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour, Improvements, 6067 (iv).
Ontario:
Beaverton, Harbour, 6933 (iv).
Belle River, Dredging Entrance, &c., 6932 (iv).
Blanche River, Improvements, 6933.
Bronté, Dredging, 6933 (iv).
Colborne Harbour, Wharf, 6933 (iv).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 6933 (iv).
Goderich Harbour, Improvements, 6950 (iv).
Harbours, Generally, 7833 (iv).
Hamilton Harbour, 6954 (iv).
Kincardine Harbour, 6954 (iv).
Little Current, 6954 (iv).
Meaford Harbour, 6961 (iv).
Midland Harbour, 6963 (iv).
Owen Sound Harbour, 6964 (iv).
Point Edward, 6964 (iv).
Port Burwell, 6965 (iv).
Port Stanley, Harbour, 6967 (iv).
River Otonabee, Dredging, 6980 (iv).
River Thames, Wharfs at Mouth, 6980 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour, 6984 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf, 6985 (iv).
Toronto Harbour, 6986 (iv).
Prince Edward Island:
Higgins' Shore Pier, 6070 (iv).
Miminegash Harbour, 6070 (iv).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 6071 (iv).
Rustico Harbour, 6071 (iv).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 6071 (iv).
Quebec:
Anse à l'Ilot, Landing Pier, 6083 (iv).
Anse du Cap, Breakwater, 6092 (iv).
Baie St. Paul, Improvements to Wharf, 6093 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie, Training Piers, &c., 6093 (iv).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 6094 (iv).
Chateauguay, Wharf, 6095 (iv).
Chicoutimi Pier, 6096 (iv).
Cross Point Wharf, 6096 (iv).
Doucet's Landing, Pile Wharf, 6097 (iv).
Escoumains Pier, 6098 (iv).
Father Point, Wharf, 6099 (iv).
Grande Rivière de Beaupré, Wharf, 6101 (iv).
Grands Méchins, Breakwater, 6101 (iv).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 6109 (iv).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf, 7825 (iv).
Lake Megantic Piers, 7826 (iv).
Lake St. John, Wharfs, 6110 (iv).
Lake St. Francis, Wharfs, 6111 (iv).
Lavaltrie, Wharf, 6111 (iv).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rock, 6113 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Lotbinière, Wharf, 6114 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, &c., 6114 (iv).
Murray Bay Wharf, 6115 (iv).
Notre Dame du Portage Wharf, 6115.
Percé Wharf, 6115 (iv).
Petites Bergeronnes, Removal of Boulders, 6115 (iv).
Pointe aux Trembles, Wharf, 6116 (iv)
Rimouski, Wharf, 6120 (iv).
Rivers Ashouapmouchouan, &c., 6121 (iv).
Rivière Batiscan, Dredging, 6121 (iv).
Rivière du Loup, (Fraserville), Harbour, 6122 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (en haut), 6123 (iv).
Rivière Maskinongé, Dredging, 6124 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Pier, 6124 (iv).
Rivière à la Pipe, Wharf, 6121 (iv).
Rivière Saguenay, Dredging, 6124 (iv).
Rivière St. Maurice, Channel, 6126 (iv).
Ste. Anne des Monts, 6128 (iv).
St. Charles de Limoilou, 6130 (iv).
St. François, Island of Orleans, 6130 (iv).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 6132 (iv).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans, 6132 (iv).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 6132 (iv).
Three Rivers Harbour, 6134 (iv).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 6134 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Last Mountain Lake, 7833 (iv).
Old Man's River, 7834 (iv).
Telegraph Lines, 7001 (iv).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Beauharnois, 7668 (iv).
Chambly:
Conduit at St. John's, 7536 (iv).
Improvements, St. John's Harbour, 5548 (iii).
Cornwall:
Enlargement, 5552 (iii).
Gate Lifter, 7533 (iv).
Galops:
Final Estimate, 7530, 7531 (iv).
Retaining Walls, 7533 (iv).
Shoals in River, Removal, 7530 (iv).
Generally:
Staff and Repairs, 7534 (iv).
Lachine:
Rebuilding Slope Walls, 5548 (iii).
Murray:
Concrete Piers, 7533 (iv).
North Channel, 7530 (iv).
Quebec Canals, Cement, 5551 (iii).
Rideau:
Generally, 7669 (iv).
To pay J. O'Toole, 7538 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie:
Construction, 7533 (iv).
Soulanges:
Bridge at Clement's Gully, 5548 (iii).
Generally, 7539 (iv).
Improvements, 5548 (iii).
Manny's Gate Bars, 5548 (iii).
Staff, 7535, 7666 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Trent:
Construction, 7531, 7667 (iv).
Improvements, 7534 (iv).
McLaren's Creek, Road, 7669 (iv).
New Boat, 7534 (iv).
To pay Curtis Bros., Damages, 7538.
Welland:
Port Colborne Elevator, 7531 (iv).
Retaining Wall, &c., 7533 (iv).
Miscellaneous:
Ry. Commission, 7534 (iv).
Remuneration to A. Brunet, 7539 (iv).
Railways:
Intercolonial Railway:
Amherst, Improvements, 7298 (iv).
Antigonish Accommodation, 7300 (iv).
Bridges, Strengthening, 7523 (iv).
Drawbars of Freight Cars, 7307 (iv).
General Vote, 7534 (iv).
Halifax Accommodation, 7300 (iv).
Increased Accommodation, &c., 7521 (iv).
Indiantown and Blackville, 7663 (iv).
Moncton, Shops, &c., 7301, 7521 (iv).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 7297 (iv).
Newcastle, Improvements, 7299 (iv).
New Glasgow, Improvements, 7663 (iv).
Pictou Accommodation, 7298 (iv).
Rolling Stock, 7664 (iv).
St. John, Accommodation, 7663 (iv).
Ste. Rosalie, Improvements, 7522 (iv).
Sackville, Improvements, 7298 (iv).
Stellarton Accommodation, 7298 (iv).
Sydney Accommodation, 7298 (iv).
Truro Accommodation, 7300 (iv).
National Transcontinental Ry.:
Surveys, &c., 7530, 7670 (iv).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Charlottetown, Accommodation, 7524 (iv).
Generally, 7665 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch, 7524 (iv).
Scientific Institutions:
Astronomical Observatory, 7269 (iv).
General Vote, 7684 (iv).
Hydrographic Surveys, 5878 (iii).
Steamer for B.C., 5879 (iii).
Meteorological Service, Gratuity to Widow of Thomas Harrison, 5960 (iii).
Surveys, &c., 7270 (iv).
Trade and Commerce:
General Vote, 6903, 7095 (iv).
Grain Commission, 7983 (iv).
Unprovided Items, 6902 (iv).
CONCURRENCE:
Agriculture, Live Stock Products, 7988 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Quebec, 7987 (iv).
Wireless Telegraph Stations, 7987 (iv).

Supreme Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'

Supreme Court, Apptmnt. of Judge from Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 2978 (ii).

Supreme Court, N.B., Apptmnt. of Additional Judge: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6765 (iv).

——— Reorganization, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 3641 (ii).

Supreme Court Bench, N.S., Cor., &c., *re* Vacancy, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 241 (i).

——— Complaint from Chief Justice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2998 (ii).

——— Delay in Apptmnt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 840 (i).

Supreme Court Vacancy in N.S.: Cor., &c., Read, Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3916; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 83) 3949 (ii).

——— Vacancy *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2981 (ii).

Supreme Court Judges of Saskatchewan: Prop. Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 6377 (iv).
See 'Judges.'

Surveys, &c.: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'

Surveys of Dom. Lands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).

Surveys, &c., of Public Lands: *See* 'B. No. 59'. 'B. No. 172'.

Sussex, N.B., Customs Port: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5973 (iii).

Sussex St. Properties: *See* 'Mackenzie Avenue.'

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Purchase by Govt., Quantity, &c., Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 719 (i).

Swamp Lands near Lake Manitoba, Leasing, of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Schaffner) 1564 (i).

——— Lease to Hon. Mr. Kirchhoffer: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1842 (i).

——— Leases to Sporting Clubs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1388 (i).

Swan Lake Reserve, Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 946 (i).

Swim's Wharf Wharfinger, Remuneration and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2830 (ii).

Sydney Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Sydney and Whycocomagh SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7120 (iv).

'Tagish' Charlie, Rep. *re* Recompense for Mining Property: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 890 (i).

Tariff: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1332, 1360 1858, 1879 (i), 2044, 2106, 2346, 2986 (ii).

——— Amended Resolutions: M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 2986 (ii).

——— Combinations, and Conspiracies, Proceedings *re*: in Com., 1230 (i).

Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 423 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 709 (i).

Tariff, Customs Act, Repeal, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4547 (iii).

Tariff Index, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 424 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 513 (i).

Tariff, Inter-Imperial, Preference, and Colonial Conference, Memorandum *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 892 (i).
See 'Colonial.'
Tariff, Intermediate, Application of Foreign Countries *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 489 (i).
——— Negotiations, Pourparlers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7938 (iv).
——— Relation to, Ref. to in Budget Speech (Mr. R. L. Borden) 297 (i).
Tariff Items, Allowed to stand, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 1868 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2405 (ii).
——— Procedure *re:* Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 514 (i); (Mr. Foster) 3889 (ii).
Tariff Modifications, Delegations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 891 (i).
Tariff, Preferential and Intermediate Effects of, Ref. to in debate on Budget Speech (Mr. Foster) 296 (i).
Tariff Resolutions: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 327 (i).
——— Clerical Errors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 513; Statement (Mr. Fielding) 524 (i).
——— Operation, Date of: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4439 (iii).
See 'Customs', 'German Surtax', 'Colonial Conference,' 'Preferential.'
——— Unenumerated Items: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2411 (ii).

TARIFF—THE :
(In Com. on Ways and Means).
Acetone, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).
Agricultural Implements: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352, 1375 (i); 4402 (iii).
Agricultural Products: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352 (i).
Alum Cake: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Animals, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1254 (i).
Animals for Breeding Purposes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4597 (iii).
Apples, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1892 (i).
Automobiles, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2398 (ii).
Axes, Scythes, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4418 (iii).
Bain, Mr. John, Gratuity *re* Tariff Commission: in Com. of Sup., 5977 (iii).
Barley: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1362 (i).
Beeswax: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1332 (i)
Beet Root Sugar: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4423 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4153 (iii).
Berries : in Com. on Ways and Means, 1894 (i)

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Binder Twine: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1208 (i), 4438 (iii).
Binder Twine Materials: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2368 (ii).
Binders for Harvesting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4427 (iii).
Biscuits, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1865 (i).
Blackberries, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).
Books: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).
Boots and Shoes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4558 (iii).
Boots and Shoes and Tanners Combine, Memorial to Tariff Commission: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4559 (iii).
Brass Band Instruments : in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Brass Bars: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2129 (ii).
Brass, Nickel, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4194 (iii).
Brass, Rolled, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Porter), 4554 (iii).
Bridging Material: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Britannia Metal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4204 (iii).
British Gum., in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
Bronze Works of Art: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4194 (iii).
Brushes, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Butter: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1352 (i).
Button Blanks: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).
Cant Dogs: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4430 (iii).
Casket Trimmings, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4432 (iii).
Caustic Soda: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4552 (iii).
Cements, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).
Cereals, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1858 (i).
Chains, Sprockets and Coils: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Cheese: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1333 (i).
Chicory: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1360 (i).
Coal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2397 (ii).
Coal, Bituminous, for Smelting Purposes : in Com. on Ways and Means, 4434 (iii).
Cocoa Nibs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1359 (i).
Collars, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Combinations, and Conspiracies, Proceedings *re*: in Com., 1230 (i).
Condensed Milk: in Com., 1361 (i).
Confectionery Sugar, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).
Cordage Lines, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).
Corks, &c: in Com, on Ways and Means, 2136 (ii).
Cotton Fabrics: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2347 (ii).
Cream Separators: Remarks in Com., 1190 (i).
Crucibles: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4190 (iii).
Curling Stones, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).
Customs Act, Repeal, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4547 (iii).
Dates, Figs, &c.: in Com. in Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).
Denatured Alcohol, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2045 (ii).
Diamond Dust, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2130 (ii).
Disinfectants, Non-alcoholic Liquids: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4185 (iii).
Drawbacks on Implements, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4423 (iii).
Drugs, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).
Dumping Clause: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1000; (Amts.) 1186 (i).
Excise Duty, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1252 (i).
Felloes of Hickory, &c.: in Com., 1190 (i).
Fire Brick: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4190 (iii).
Fish, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1919 (i).
Flax Seed: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1348 (i), 4143 (iii).
Florist Stock, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1868 (i), 4148, 4421 (iii).
Fruit, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1903 (i).
Fur Skins: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2400 (ii).
Galvanized Iron: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).
Garden Seeds, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4145, 4389 (iii).
German Silver: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4389 (iii).
German Silver, Nickel, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4204 (iii).
German Treaties, and Tariff, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 845 (i).
Glass Ware, Cut, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4193 (iii).

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Glass, Raw, &c. for Plate Glass: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4435 (iii).
Gloves, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2406 (ii).
Glue, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2118 (ii).
Glucose, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4181 (iii).
Glycerine, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).
Gold and Silver Coins, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2130 (ii).
Granite Ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Gypsum, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).
Hay, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1867 (i).
Hops: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1360 (i).
Horses, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2414 (ii).
Horse Powers, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4419, 4549 (iii).
Indian Corn: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1362 (i).
Intermediate Tariff: in Com. on Ways and Means, 529 (i).
——— *re* German Treaties, &c: Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (i).
——— *re* G.B. and Foreign Countries: in Com. on Ways and Means, 993 (i).
Iron Angles for Bedsteads: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4434 (iii).
Iron Piping: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2133 (ii).
Iron, Rolled, or Rolled Steel: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526 (i).
Iron or Steel Bars: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4208 (iii).
Iron or Steel Beams, Rolled, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Iron or Steel Billets: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Iron and Steel Ry. Bars: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2131 (ii).
Iron or Steel Scrap, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4206 (iii).
Iron or Steel Nuts: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).
Iron Tubing: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2132 (ii), 4549 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4265 (iii).
Iron, Wrought, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).
Lamp Black, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2120 (ii).
Lamp Springs, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4391 (iii).

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*

Lime Juices: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2044 (ii).

Liquid Fillers for Varnishes, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4186 (iii).

Locomotives: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).

Mackintosh Clothing: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4432 (iii).

McDougald, Mr. J., Gratuity *re* Tariff Commission: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).

Macaroni: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1866 (i).

Machinery, Packed, &c., from G.B., Preferential Duty, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4550 (iii).

Machinery for Sugar Refining: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2135 (ii).

Magazines: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).

Malleable Chains, Sprockets, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4390 (iii).

Malt Flour, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4182 (iii).

Manila Rope, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).

Marble: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2123 (ii).

Marble, Tombstones, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4191 (iii).

Matrices, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4548 (iii).

Matrices for Printing Newspapers, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).

——— Canada Newspaper Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4394 (iii).

Medicines, Patent, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2116 (ii).

Melons, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1909 (i).

Metallic Trading Checks: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2413 (ii), 4438 (iii).

Metals, Tariff Changes: Read in Budget Speech (Mr. Fielding) 313 (i).

Military Stores, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2408 (ii).

Mining Machinery: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4420 (iii).

Molasses: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4180 (iii).

Monotypes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4401 (iii).

Mould Boards: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2134 (ii).

Nuts, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1919 (i).

Oatmeal: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1374

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*

Oats: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1372 (i).

Oils, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2121 (ii).

Oils, for Paints, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).

Opium: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).

Paper, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2050 (ii).

Paris Green: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2120 (ii).

Pease: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1361 (i).

Pickles, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1886 (i).

Pig Iron used in Agricultural Implements: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4427 (iii).

Plums, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4148 (iii).

Portable Engines *re* Agricultural Implements, &c.: in Com on Ways and Means, 4407, 4414 (iii).

Potash: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).

Preferential Tariff, British: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526 (i).

Printing Materials, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4548 (iii).

Printing Paper: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2052 (ii).

Proof Spirits: in Com. on Ways and Means, 526 (i).

Pullman Cars, Duty *re:* Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4208 (iii).

Pulp Wood: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2063 (ii).

Quebracho: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2115 (ii).

Rice, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1858 (i).

Rice, Sago, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4143 (iii).

Roofing, &c. in Com. on Ways and Means, 2127 (ii).

Roofing Slate, &c.: in Com on Ways and Means, 4192 (iii).

Rye, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1859 (i).

Sago: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1859 (i).

Seeds, Timothy and Clover: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4144 (iii).

Settlers' Effects: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2407 (ii).

Spirits: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2106 (ii).

Springs and Axles for Vehicles: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4429 (iii).

Stallions, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2413 (ii).

Starch: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1361

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Starch, Potato Flour, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4143 (iii).
Steels Bowls, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2135 (ii).
Steel used in Cutlery, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4430 (iii).
Steel Shafting, in Com. on Ways and Means, 4209 (iii).
Steel Wire: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4264 (iii).
Stove Urns: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4419 (iii).
Structural Steel for Cars, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4207 (iii).
Sugar, 16 Dutch Standard: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4149 (iii).
Tariff, Customs Act.: in Com., 524 (i).
——— Clerical Errors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 513; Statement (Mr. Fielding) 524 (i).
——— Operation, Date of: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4439 (iii).
——— Presented (Mr. Fielding) 327 (i).
——— Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 514 (i).
Tariff: *See* 'Preferential.'
Time Tables, Pamphlets, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).
Tinplate: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4426 (iii).
Tomatoes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1870 (i), 4148 (iii).
Trees: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1870 (i).
Trunks, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2405 (ii).
Typewriters, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4549 (iii).
Unenumerated Items: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2411 (ii).
U.S. Duties, Comparison, &c.: in Com., 1196 (i).
Vegetables and Garden Produce: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1881 (i).
Vessels, Scows, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2389 (ii).
Wagons, Farm, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2397 (ii).
Wax, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).
Whale Oil Soaps: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).
Whips, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2402 (ii).
White Lead Oil: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).
Wines, medicated, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2048 (ii).
Wire Cables, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4421 (iii).

TARIFF—THE—*Con.*
Wire Fencing, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2133 (ii).
Wood Veneers: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2404 (ii).
Wool Batting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2347 (ii).
Wool grown in Canada: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2369 (ii).
Zinc Dust: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2128 (ii).
Tatamagouche Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (iv).
Telegraph Companies and Ry Commission: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Telegraph Lines (Govt.) Number of Miles, &c., Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1469 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7251 (iv).
Telegraph Service, Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 7001 (iv).
Telephone Cos. and Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Telephone Cos., Expropriation by Provincial Authorities: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3180 (ii).
Tellier, Judge, Travelling Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4860 (iii), 6635 (iv).
Temiscaming and North Ontario Ry., Cor. *re* Subsidy Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 239 (i).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7807 (iv).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Temporary Loans since 1st Jan., 1906, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 234 (i).
Territorial Boundaries, O.Cs. *re* &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sifton) 239 (i).
Thames River, Deepening Channel, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
——— Wharfs at Mouth: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
See 'Jeannette's Creek Wharf.'
Thermograph Records, Ventilation, &c., on Steamships; Names, Dates of Sailing, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 491 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in debate on Govt. Officials, &c., 6696 (iv).
Three Rivers, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4015 (iii).
Three Rivers Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3101 (ii).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4044 (iii).
Three Rivers Harbour, Deep Water Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 6134 (iv).
Threshers, Total Value of Importations: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3635 (ii).
Ticket Scalping: *See* 'B. No. 7.'

Timber Berths Nos. 824, 1062, 1107, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, Memoranda *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 6010 (iv).
Timber Inspector, Manitoulin Islands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Timber Lands sold or leased, Subsequent to 1906, Description, Area, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4458 (iii).
Timber Limits, Indian Reserves, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Timber and Lumber Importations free of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 570 (i).
Timber Protection and Tree Culture: in Com. of Sup., 7265 (iv).
Timber Regulations of 1897, Permits under Clause 17, Number granted, &c.: Ques (Mr. Burrows) 7007 (iv).
Time-tables, Pamphlets, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4184 (iii).
Tinplate: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4426 (iii).
Tobacco Duties, Change in Excise Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5861 (iii).
——— Total Amount collected for 1906, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1612 (i).
Tobacco Excise Duties, Change *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 6140 (iv).
Tobacco Industry in Western Canada: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Tobacco Manufacturers in Canada, Duties *re* Foreign Products: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1924 (i).
Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Amount imported from U.S., 1906: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 2141 (ii).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Tomatoes: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1870 (i), 4148 (iii).
Topographical Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6243 (iv).
Toronto Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4028 (iii).
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 4031, 4598 (iii).
——— Fort, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).
Toronto Harbour, Breakwater (eastern entrance): in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
——— Commissioners and City of Toronto, Cor. *re* Dredging, Breakwater, Piers, &c., M. for Copies* (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 240 (i).
——— Complaints and Pets. *re* Depth of Water: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i).
——— Life Saving Stations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 5768 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 487 (i).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
——— Works, Govt. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 7 (i).
Toronto Mails to East, Cost of Carrying, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1121 (i).
Toronto Postal Branch, in Centre Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 4861 (iii).
——— Station 'F": in Com. of Sup., 4035 (iii).
Toronto Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) 224 (i).
Tower, Collapse, Investigation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 3616, 3972 (ii).
Townships 10, 11, 12 and 13, Topographical Surveys, &c., Reps.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 1066 (i).
Trachoma Hospital, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 4011 (iii).
TRADE AND COMMERCE:
Commercial Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1127 (i).
Commercial Agencies for 1905-6, Names of Agents, Salaries, Locations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 241 (i).
'Favoured Nations' Treaties, between Can. and Foreign Countries, Names, &c., Commercial Arrangements with Italy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1123 (i).
German and Canadian Tariffs, Cor. between Govt. of Can. and German or British Govts.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1149 (i).
See 'Tariff,' &c.
Grain exported from Can. and U.S. Ports, &c.* Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 475 (i).
Grain Trade Commission, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7983 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid to Companies: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2979 (ii).
Kittson, Mr. C. M., Resignation as Canadian Agent in S. Africa: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1140 (i).
Leather Goods, Increase in Shipments to Canada: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1048 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7106 (iv).
Trade and Commerce: in Com. of Sup., 6903, 7095 (iv).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 2824 (ii).
Trade and Commerce Agents (Messrs. Jackson and Preston): Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 7096 (iv).
Trade and Nav. Rets.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
Traders' Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 110'.
Trade and Nav. Rets., Distribution, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6 (i).
——— Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
——— Misprint as to Years: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 278 (i).
——— Typographical Error in Rep.: Statement (Mr. Paterson) 424 (i).

Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Transportation Commission's Rep. (Mr. J. H. Ashdown) Consdn. of, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 1564 (i); Resuming adjnd. debate, 3698 (ii); 4092, Amt. (Mr. Campbell) 4115 (iii).
Transportation Commission's Recommendations, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6998 (iv).
——— Suggestion to Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 6083; Members remarks checked (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 6001 (iii).
Transportation Facilities, Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7819 (iv).
Transportation Question: *See* 'B. Nos. 159, 166.'
Travellers Indemnity Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Treaties, Commercial: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
Trees: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1870 (i).
Trent Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7667 (iv).
——— Curtis Bros'. Claims, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Lake Simcoe Section, ref. to, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Waterways (Mr. Bennett) 497 (i).
——— McLaren's Creek Road: in Com. of Sup., 7669 (iv).
——— Outlet, &c.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Ward) 3627 (ii).
——— Rice Lake Section, Reps. &c.: (Mr. Ward) for Copies, 1929 (i).
——— Severn Route, Par. in Toronto Globe: Remarks (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4839 (iii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
——— Survey by E. J. Walsh, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 4664 (iii).
——— Total Expenditure, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 713 (i).
——— Tow Boat: in Com. of Sup., 7534 (iv).
——— Water Powers, leased, owned, by Govt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 565 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 802 (i).
Trunks, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2405 (ii).
Truro, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Tuberculosis Cattle from Nappan, N.S., Treatment of: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1390 (i).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Two-Cent Passenger Rate: *See* 'B. Nos. 6 and 82.'
Two-cent Passenger Tariff, Control by Ry. Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2295; Amt. (Mr. Emmerson) 2324 (ii); Amt. to Amt. Agreed to (Y. 96; N. 36) 7576 (iv).
Typewriters, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4549 (iii).
United Baptist Woman's Missionary Union of the Maritime Provs.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'
U.S. Duties, Comparison, &c.: in Com., 1196 (i).
Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 6903 (iv).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2977 (ii).
Vacancies: *See* 'Electoral Districts.'
Valleyfield, Canal Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7668 (iv).
See 'Beauharnois.'
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Vancouver Island Marine Road, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 579 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Vancouver Post Office Building, O.Cs., Specifications, Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1066 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 894 (i).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 4042 (iii).
Vaulvagnas Beach Post Office, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1066 (i).
Vaux, Major F. L., Application *re* Leave of Absence: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4046 (iii).
Vegetables and Farm Produce: in Com. on Ways and Means, 1881 (i).
Ventilation in Chamber: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3605 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 582 (i).
——— Statement *re* Information asked (Mr. Fisher) 617 (i).
Ventilation of Ottawa Offices, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7820 (iv).
Vessels, Scows, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2389 (ii).
Victoria, B.C., Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco, SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7117 (iv).
Victoria Harbour and Ry. Station Mail Contract, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2144 (ii).
Victoria Harbour, P.E.I., Extent and Total Cost of Work done: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2979 (ii).
Visit of Prince Arthur: *See* 'Royal Visit.'
Voters' Lists, Printing and Distribution of: in Com. of Sup., 6763 (iv).
Wage-Earners, Bulletin No. 1: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7780 (iv).
Wagner, Philip, Emplymt. by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 229 (i).
Wagons, Farm, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2397 (ii).
Wainwright, R., Compensation *re* N. W. M. Police, Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 6901 (iv).
Walberg, E. A., Contracts *re* Govt. Rys.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1051 (i).

Walker, Mr. Bruce, Rep. *re* Remarks to Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 3630 (ii).
Wallace Quarries Ballasting, &c., I.C.R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2839 (ii).
Wallace Quarries, Branch Ry., Govt. Aid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2582 (ii).
Warburton Property, P.E.I., Purchase of for Rifle Range, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2584 (ii).
Warships on Great Lakes, from U.S., Rumours *re*, Par. in Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6279 (iv).
——— Further Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6378, 6618, 6910 (iv).
Water Powers near Grand Falls, &c., Applications for Leases, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3373 (ii).
Water Powers on Soulanges Canal, Leases, Transfers, &c., by Govt., Contracts, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 241 (i).
Water Power: *See* 'Electric,' 'Niagara,' 'Welland,' &c.
Water Reserves in Lethbridge, Sale of, Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4216 (iii).
Waubaushene Light: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5968 (iii).
Wax, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117
Ways and Means—The Budget—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 278 (i).
——— for Debate: *See* 'Budget.'
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 1097 (i).
——— M. for Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 219 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, Customs Act: in Com., 524 (i).
——— Tariff Resolutions: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 327 (i).
Ways and Means: *See* 'Tariff.'
Weights and Measures, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 219 (i).
Weights and Measures, Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Welland Canal and Cataract Power Co., Application *re* Water Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 3187 (ii).
Welland Canal, Port Maitland Wall: in Com. of Sup., 7533 (iv).
——— Water Power, Amount contracted for by Cataract Power Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1923 (i).
Welland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7531 (iv).
Wellburn Post Office, Pet. *re* Daily Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 896 (i).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
West Head, Cape Sable, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6067 (iv).
Westville Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).
Whale Oil Soaps: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2117 (ii).

Wharfingers, Apptmnt. of in Muskoka, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 1063 (i).
Wharfs and Docks, Ont., Govt. Assistance to: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6113 (iv).
Whips, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2402 (ii).
Whip's Rooms, H. of C., Better Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Conc., 7987 (iv).
White Lead Oil: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4186 (iii).
Wiarton Fish Hatchery: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5893 (iii).
Wiggins, Widow James, and Charles Malley, Property burned, Cor. with Govt. *re:* M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 4458 (iii).
Williamsburg Canal, Toll Collector, and Customs Collector: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii).
Williams Head Quarantine Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6999 (iv).
Willson, Thos., & Co., Amounts purchased by Marine Dept., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 472 (i).
Wilson, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 6013 (iv).
Winding-Up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 87,' 'B. No. 147.'
Wines, medicated, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2048 (ii).
Wingham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7822 (iv).
Windsor Branch of the Dom. Atlantic Ry., I.C.R., Expiration of Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 615, 1141 (i).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 4600 (iii).
——— O.Cs., Specifications, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1067 (i).
Winnipeg and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. 129.'
Winnipeg Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 4601 (iii).
——— O.Cs., Tenders, Specifications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1118 (i).
Winnipeg Terminals: *See* 'B. 128.'
Wire Cables, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4421 (iii).
Wire Fencing: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2133 (ii).
Wire Fencing on Boundary between U.S. and N.W.T., Contract, Prices, &c.: Ques (Mr. Clements) 232 (i).
Women's Art Assoc'n. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
'Women, Wine and Graft' Charges against Minister (Mr. Fowler) 3316 (ii).
See 'Insurance Commission,' 'Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Bourassa).'
Wood Alcohol: in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).

Wood, Dr. H. W., Transfer from St. John's Customs Collectorship, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3636 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 7802 (iv).
Wood Veneers: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2404 (ii).
Wool Batting: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2347 (ii).
Wool Duties imposed in 1897, Quantities imported, Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1125 (i).
Wool grown in Canada: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2369 (ii).
Wrecks on Great Lakes, Number and Causes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2295 (ii).
See 'Golspie', &c.
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 5771 (iii).
Yamaska River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6134 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6067 (iv).
Year-book: in Com. of Sup., 2971 (ii).
——— French Edition, Publication of: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1987 (ii).
——— Omissions from: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Kemp) 3641 (ii).
——— Translation into French: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6014 (iv).
Year-book: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 7810 (iv).
Yoho Park Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 7274 (iv).
Yukon Act (actg. commissioner) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Yukon Banks, Commission paid to Canadian Bank of Commerce: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4272 (iii).
Yukon Boundaries, Delimitation, &c.: M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 3102 (ii).
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4605 (iii).
Yukon Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 95.
Yukon, Charges *re* Administration of Hon. Wm. McInnes: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2978 (ii).
——— Commissioner's Residence: in Com. of Sup., 7824 (iv).
——— Concessions, Bronson and Ray, &c., Transfer to Guggenheimers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3425 (ii).
Yukon, Council Grant, Audit of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 6008 (iv).
——— Dawson Govt. House, Total Expenditure *re* for 1901-6: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1562 (i).
——— Gold Commissioners, Names and Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1135 (i).
——— Gold Output, Subsidy to Steamers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) on M. for Ways and Means, 4519 (iii).
——— Indians, Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv).
——— Judges, Living Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 7968 (iv).
——— Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3158 (ii).
——— McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Resignation as Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2293 (ii).
Yukon Mining Claims owned by Canadian Cos. and U.S. Cos., &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1560 (i).
——— Concessions, Cancellation *re* Failure to comply with Conditions, Names of Cos., &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 889 (i).
Yukon Officials, Absence from Duties: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 887, 1062 (i).
——— Absence of Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Liemieux) 888 (i).
Yukon Placer Mines owned by Messrs. Guggenheimer, Operations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 892 (i).
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Yukon Tel. Lines, Payments to Kelly, Douglass & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1554 (i).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 714 (i).
Yukon Ter., Grant to Council: in Com. of Sup., 7278 (iv).
——— Salaries and Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
——— Ordinances: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 274 (i).
——— Wheat Raising, Samples laid on Table (Mr. Thompson) 3548 (ii).
——— Whitehorse Govt. Lands, Patents issued, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4212 (iii).
——— Winter Mail Service, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 889 (i).
Zinc Dust: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2128 (ii).